

0

.. MODERN
SPIRITUALISM

COMPARED WITH
CHRISTIANITY,

IN
A DEBATE BETWEEN

JOEL TIFFANY, ESQ., OF PAINESVILLE, O.

AND

REV. ISAAC ERRETT, OF WARREN, O.

UPON

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- I. ARE THE PHENOMENA AND TEACHINGS OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM IDENTICAL IN CHARACTER WITH THOSE OF JESUS OF NAZARETH?
- II. IS THE DENOMINATION KNOWN AS DISCIPLES, ANTI-CHRIST IN FAITH AND PRACTICE?

A PHONOGRAPHIC REPORT,

BY

J. D. COX.

WARREN, O.
PUBLISHED BY GEORGE ADAMS.

1855.

Phi 7054. 137.3



Walker fund

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855,

BY J. D. COX,

In the Clerk's Office of the Northern District of Ohio.

HUDSON, OHIO:

Stereotyped and Printed by the Hudson Book Company.

INTRODUCTION.

IN order to understand several allusions made in the course of the Debate which is here reported, it may be necessary to give a brief account of the circumstances which led to the discussion, and which were the occasion of its taking the particular form in which it appears.

It would, perhaps, be hard to find a community which had been less excited upon the subject of "Spiritual manifestations," than the people of Warren had been prior to the fall and winter of 1854. During the course of the few years since the mysterious rappings were first heard at Rochester, an occasional visit from a "medium" had produced a momentary interest in the matter among the people of the village, a few communications had been spelled out by raps, a few tables had been moved, and a few individuals had become convinced that physical demonstrations of various sorts were somehow produced without any willful deception or conscious exertion of power on the part of the mediums. In various portions of the county, however, the thing took deeper root, and the number of professed mediums and of converts to a belief in the reality of spiritual communication had become considerable. The villages where spiritualists were most numerous were visited by several mediums of some note, from abroad, and had opportunities of witnessing all the various phenomena, from the simple rap up to fervid declamations under the inspiration of such master spirits as Channing, Rousseau, and Mrs. Hemans, and hieroglyphic writing in unknown tongues. In several places, "circles" were formed, and new mediums were discovered or "developed," so that the people were no longer dependent upon visitors from other counties or states for a display of the spiritual manifestations.

The progress of this belief in the neighboring towns had its natural effect upon the county seat, in confirming the faith of those who were already believers, and exciting in others a curiosity to see and hear these marvels for themselves. Accordingly, when Messrs. Finney and Lockwood visited Warren in December, they attracted large audiences, and the Hall was filled to overflowing during each of their evening discourses. These mediums were both young men, who professed to have had little or no advantage of early education, and to speak under the direct inspiration of spirits, with no volition or premeditation on their own part. Each had his own peculiar style of speaking calculated to produce a strong effect upon different classes of hearers.

Mr. Lockwood seemed almost unconscious of his audience, maintained a fixed position, gestured but little, and spoke with a very steady, rapid, and rather monotonous utterance. His language was exceedingly florid, and large portions of his discourse would consist of a nearly uninterrupted succession of highly-wrought metaphors and similes. The matter of his discourses was principally an inculcation of pure morality and a recommendation of Spiritualism as having a tendency to lift the soul above the

cares and temptations of this world, and to induce a life more pure and lofty than any which is enjoined by existing religious systems. He regarded Spiritualism as an advance upon Christianity, but admitted the value and purity of *both* the scriptural dispensations, the Mosaic as well as the Christian. He declared that modern Christendom had become enslaved to forms and creeds, and possessed little or no spiritual life; yet his style was rather conciliatory than irritating to his opponents, and he rarely indulged in denunciation.

Mr. Finney had more of the air of vehement popular oratory, and addressed his hearers as if thoroughly aware of their presence, and fully determined to produce an effect upon them. His style was less figurative and imaginative than that of Mr. Lockwood, and had more of an argumentative cast; though both of them were more exuberant in their imagery than is commonly allowed by good taste. His opposition to the churches of the present day was much more vehement than that of Mr. Lockwood, and his invectives against the "book religion" learned from the Bible were often exceedingly bitter. He classed the Scriptures with the Koran and the Zendavista, and would allow to the books of the Bible, their writers, and the men presented by them as saints, no superiority over the holy books and reputed holy men of heathen nations. The Mosaic dispensation he considered a most barbarous and brutal system, and the Old Testament heroes and prophets scarce elevated to the rank of common decency.

The philosophy presented by both these gentlemen (or by the spirits who spoke through them) was that particular phase of Naturalism which has been taught by A. J. Davis under the name of the Harmonial Philosophy, and of which the reader, who is not already familiar with it, will get some idea from the frequent references to it made in the following Debate. Neither Mr. Lockwood nor Mr. Finney spent any time upon the peculiar forms of spiritual phenomena, but referred only to the general principles and probable tendencies of the intercommunication between Earth and the Spirit world.

When these mediums had finished their course, three of the clergymen of Warren (Rev. Messrs. Bain, Maltby, and Errett,) reviewed their lectures, defending Christianity, opposing the doctrines of Spiritualism, and arguing that their professed inspiration was shown to be a mere pretense, by internal evidences found in their own lectures. In this review free use was made of fact, logic, and wit, to show that Spiritualism was essentially incongruous, self contradictory, and absurd, and possessed no claims to respect, being made up of shallow philosophy, puerile declamations, and stale objections to Christianity.

The result of this informal discussion upon Spiritualism was to excite much party feeling, without leading to any decided results. Those who were Spiritualists before, protested against a review of the doctrines of the mediums after they were gone and could not answer for themselves. To this it was answered that it had been intimated to those gentlemen that their opinions would be met, and the opportunity given them to answer for themselves, but that instead of lengthening their stay on that account, they had, on the contrary, departed a day or two sooner than had been expected. Meanwhile the large number whose curiosity had been excited, still remained curious, and the whole community was prepared to hear with interest whatever might be said upon either side of the subject.

In the course of about a month it was announced that *Mr. Tiffany* would deliver a course of lectures upon Spiritualism, and during his course of evening addresses, which lasted about a week, he spoke to large audiences of eager listeners, and evidently with very great effect. The number of people in attendance upon his course, was not so large as had listened to Messrs. Finney and Lockwood, owing to the fact that his lectures commenced while a series of protracted meetings was in progress in the churches of the village, and the lively religious interest which was felt, kept large congregations in attendance at them. In many respects *Mr. Tiffany's* advocacy of Spiritualism was very different from that of the lecturers who had preceded him. He did not profess to be the *mere* medium of communicating the words and thoughts dictated by spirits, but claimed an inspiration gained from spiritual communion and self-culture, which resulted in a general illumination and unfolding of the powers of his own mind, so that his perceptions of truth were greatly quickened, and his *in-sight* into spiritual things so increased that he attained a perfect assurance of the truth of his conclusions in the very highest regions of philosophy. His arguments being *his own*, therefore, and his long practice in his former profession at the Bar having given him a simple, direct, and forcible style, well adapted to close and vigorous argumentation, he was far better prepared to sustain his positions in public debate than any speaker who had addressed the community on that subject. The doctrines he presented were, of course, the same which will be found in this volume, with such slight difference in arrangement, form of expression, and qualification, as would naturally occur in the different circumstances under which they were presented. He read at the opening of each lecture, a passage from the New Testament, which he took as the basis of his remarks, arguing that Christ and his apostles really taught the spiritual truths and the doctrine of spiritual communication which he presented, and were inspired with the same inspiration, *in kind*, which is attainable in these days by a cultivation of man's spiritual nature; but he considered the inspiration of the New Testament, *in degree*, to be so far exalted above any that has since been experienced, that no form of spiritual truth that any individual has thought out for himself, or that the church has hitherto derived from those writings, can compare with them for excellence and perfect wisdom. Whilst, he said, he could receive no book as *authority*, he emphatically declared that he received the teachings of the Bible as *true*, and the Gospel of Christ as *Divinely inspired*. On this point his form of expression led to an opinion that the difference between his view of the Scripture and the orthodox one, was less than it really was, as will be seen by some allusions to this question, which occur in the course of the following debate.

During his course of lectures, *Mr. Tiffany* frequently gave permission to any who chose, to ask questions or suggest difficulties, and in a few instances, individuals proposed objections to him; but no one took advantage of his invitation to any one who saw fit, to take the stand and reply to him. Near the close of his course he took occasion to allude to the absence of the clergymen from his lectures, and to say that he hoped if no one made reply to him, to his face, while there, that they would not attack his positions behind his back, when he had gone. Just before he had come, a note from him had been received by one of the citizens, and shown to

several of the clergymen, in which Mr. Tiffany had expressed the same general willingness to have any person who attended his lectures propound difficulties and criticise his arguments. But the clergy were all busily engaged in the revival, and since both the note and the invitation were general in their terms, it was not regarded as a personal challenge to debate, and no notice was taken of it, until his allusion to the absence of the clergymen called out from Mr. Errett the following note:

"Warren, Jan. 30th, 1855.

Tuesday Afternoon.

DEAR SIR

I am informed from various sources, that in your public addresses in Warren, you speak with considerable emphasis of the ministers resident here, and express some anxiety that they should be present in your meetings to accept of your very liberal offer of the privilege of interrogating the speaker. An impression is also sought to be made, if not by you, by your friends, that some of the preachers living here have been challenged to discussion, and have not courage to meet you.

I presume you are aware, sir, that when you came to Warren, the pastors of the churches were all, or all save one, engaged in constant and arduous labors in protracted meetings; — meetings, the interest of which still continues; and that according to their views of the gospel, whatever you may think, they could not be expected to leave a work so important, to gratify the wishes of an enemy. How successful others may be in discovering *magnanimity* in these endeavors to make capital out of the necessary absence of the preachers, I know not: for my self, I could have thought better of this piece of policy under other circumstances, when the persons so anxiously invited were not *known* to be so situated as to compel them to decline the invitation.

I think you are well aware, sir, that so far as concerns the public teachers of the church in which I have the honor of membership, there has been no unwillingness to meet you in public debate on your peculiar views, or on the merits of Spiritualism. And if I am correctly informed, one of our number, well endorsed by our churches, has shown an anxiety to meet you thus, to which thus far you have failed to respond, after once testing his powers. You may affect to undervalue his ability as a disputant: I have only to say that if a respectable religious body approves a weak man as their champion, the victory is the easier for you.

We believe in free discussion. In my own pulpit, I have always allowed to those whose religious positions were reviewed, the privilege, not only of asking questions, but of replying as fully as they chose, to my arguments. If ever your positions are there attacked, there you will have the privilege of reply. Had I not been most busily and constantly engaged in labors in my own congregation, I would have been present to hear your lectures, and I wish now to say that if you have been correctly represented to me as being anxious for a discussion, before the people of Warren, of your principles, or of the principles and movements *generally known as Spiritualism*, you can be gratified. At a proper time, and with propositions mutually agreed upon; you can have a discussion.

As you have publicly alluded to the absence of the ministers from your assemblies, without saying a word of what you had abundant reason

to know of a sufficient cause, I respectfully request that you read this to your hearers to-night, in explanation of the absence of one of the class referred to.

Respectfully yours,
ISAAC ERRETT,
 Pastor of the church of the Disciples.

J. TIFFANY, Esq."

This note was read by Mr. Tiffany as requested, and a few comments made upon it. The next day the following reply was returned :

" Warren, January 31st, 1855.

DEAR SIR,

Your note of the 30th inst. was put into my hands last evening by Mr. Cox, and was read at the commencement of my lecture. I judged from its tenor that you must have been misinformed as to the course I had pursued in reference to the clergymen of this place. I had no hesitation in reading your letter to the audience, as they could not fail to understand the source of your misinformation. There was one part of your letter, however, which I had some hesitation in making public, not on my own account, but on yours. It could not fail to place you before the audience in an unfavorable light, as a gentleman and as a Christian. To charge one with hypocrisy and clap-trap, policy and low design, upon mere idle rumor, does not comport with that "Charity which suffereth long and is kind; which envieth not, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil," &c. Had I given any just cause for such an intimation, I should be sorry indeed. Hoping we may each be perfected in every Christian grace, I subscribe myself, very respectfully yours,

J. TIFFANY.

REV. ISAAC ERRETT,
 Warren, O."

The matter dropped there for the time, and Mr. Tiffany concluded his course of lectures, and left the village. Arrangements had been made of a permanent kind, for regular lectures upon Spiritualism, a subscription was obtained for the partial support of a speaker on that subject, and the zeal and interest excited became such that both parties were eager for a debate, in accordance with the implied challenge contained in Mr. Errett's letter. In the course of a few weeks, arrangements were made between B. F. Hoffman, Esq., on the part of Mr. Tiffany, and Mr. Errett, and several propositions for discussion received from Mr. Tiffany, among which were the two questions which are the subject of the present debate. The time finally agreed upon for the meeting, was Tuesday, May 8th, and upon that day the parties met, and the meeting was organized by the appointment of M. D. Leggett, Esq., as moderator, who presided throughout the discussion. It was conducted with great animation, and the large audience maintained an untiring interest throughout the whole ten days.

Such are the facts which led to the debate, as far as they are known to the writer. The results would be of no service in aiding to understand the debate, and therefore it would be out of place to say any thing with

reference to them. Indeed, little of a *positive* nature could be said, except that the full discussion given to the subject has seemed to satisfy the curiosity of the community, so that nearly every appearance of excitement upon it has vanished, and no public address upon the subject has since been delivered, except a brief review of some points connected with the matter, given in a course of two or three sermons from one of the pulpits of the village.

In relation to the *report* itself, I will only say that the public expectation had been that the debate would be published, and when it was found that no professional reporter could be obtained, I consented to undertake the report, although fearful that my command of phonography would not be equal to the task, since my practice as a reporter has been almost wholly confined to my ordinary business at the Bar. My success, however, has surpassed my expectation, and I can say with great confidence that I believe the report will be recognized by all who heard the debate, as a faithful transcript of the discussion as delivered. The disputants were unable to meet for any revision of the speeches, and the report appears just as it was copied from the short-hand, without any alteration, and for the most part without even being read by themselves or their agents. The reporter alone is responsible for its accuracy or its faults.

J. D. COX.

Warren, August 22, 1855.

DEBATE.

FIRST QUESTION :

Are the teachings and phenomena of Modern Spiritualism identical with those of Jesus Christ?

Affirmative, TIFFANY.

Negative, ERRETT.

FIRST DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—Mr. Errett and myself have conferred together with regard to the rules necessary to be observed in this debate, and find that we shall need but few, and those very simple ones. We have agreed to have sessions both in the morning and in the afternoon, and that five half-hour speeches shall be made in each session; giving to each party the opening and closing argument upon the alternate half-days. We shall meet in the forenoon at half-past nine o'clock, so that we may close at noon; and in the afternoon at two, closing the day's debate at four.

In entering upon a discussion for the purpose of ascertaining and maintaining principles, it is necessary that we have some fundamental basis, from which we may both take our departure and know whence we start. Whenever we intend to produce conviction in the minds of individuals, it is important that they should be made to understand the distinction between *facts* and *truths*, and I shall therefore make this distinction at the outset and observe it throughout the debate.

The position I am to maintain is, that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical in character with those of Jesus of Nazareth.

In the discussion of the second question I shall affirm that the sect known as the Disciples is anti-Christ in faith and practice.

I now proceed to those definitions and preliminary propositions which it will be necessary for my friend Mr. Errett and myself to assent to and observe in conducting the discussion.

1. That which perceives existence is called *mind*. I am to address this faculty in you, and I must so address it as to make you understand what I wish to develop. We talk about mental development,—by it we mean such a culture of the faculty which perceives existences that it can perceive them in all their forms and relations.

2. Existence in itself, independent of our perception of it, is a *fact*; but when the mind perceives the existence, then it is transferred from its fact into the consciousness of individuals, and the fact becomes translated, so to speak, into a *truth*. When I speak of a fact, therefore, I shall refer to an independent existence, and when I speak of a truth, I shall refer to the perception of the fact by a conscious individual. By keeping this distinction in mind you will find no difficulty in understanding my meaning, and I think my friend will not differ from me as to the propriety of such a use of terms.

This leads me to my *propositions*, and I shall arrange all my testimony under them, just as I should arrange the facts by which I might attempt to teach any science.

FIRST. *Man's belief in any fact or truth must correspond to his perception of that fact or truth.* A truth of which a man has no perception is not one of which he can affirm a perception, or in which he can have faith. The Universe itself is large or small to us according to our perception of it. If I had spoken upon the solar system before the planet Neptune was discovered, I should have spoken of it without reference to that planet, for *to me* it did not exist; but when science made it known, I took it into my conception of the system, and now in talking upon the subject, my idea of the system is so much larger. The planet had existed long before that, but I did not know it, and when it was revealed to me, it became for the first time, so far as I was concerned, translated from its fact into a truth. Thus, looking only at outward existences, there may be ten thousand facts which will be converted into truths to us when we progress far enough to attain the perception of them. Thus the human race progresses, and just in proportion as our idea correctly represents that which is without, so far the external becomes truth to us, and just in proportion as it misrepresents those outward facts, so far are they false and not true.

Man cannot believe farther than he can understand. He may believe that there are things existing beyond him; but the fact that he thus states his belief shows that he has no *definite* faith in any thing beyond him, and that he only knows that such things *are*,—not *what* they are. If you tell me that the square of the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides, you tell me a fact; but when I progress far enough to understand why it is so, it becomes to me

a truth which is incorporated into my spiritual being, and is there ever present to my mind when I have occasion to use it. My faith, therefore, is confined to the extent of my understanding.

Hence there follows several subsidiary propositions:

1. There can be no infallible revelation of a fact or truth to a mind that is fallible in its idea, understanding, or perception of that fact or truth. Inasmuch as it must be to us limited by our understanding and perception of it, it can be infallible to us, no further than our idea or perception of it is. I wish to be understood: every thing which exists is in harmony with all other things, but if we are unable to perceive that harmony, it is not to us an infallible truth. Suppose that you make the assertion that you possess infallible truth, do you mean to say that you are infallible in your determination of its infallibility? If you are not, if your perception is liable to err, you can not affirm that you have infallible truth. There may be truth, but it may exist as a fact to be brought out into your understanding and translated to you. Hence,

2. That which in itself is not infallible can not determine the quality of infallibility, and therefore can not affirm infallibility of that of which it has not the power of determining the quality. If the mind is liable to err in its deductions, its deduction of infallibility is liable to error, and may after all be false. Taking this as a proposition to be kept in mind, viz., that that which is not in itself infallible cannot determine the quality of infallibility, neither my friend nor myself can say of this or that truth that it is infallibly true, for in so doing we should affirm the infallibility of our faculties. Each may try a truth for himself, but to try it aright you must have that upon which you can safely rely in the trial. Hence,

3. To affirm that any doctrine is true beyond the possibility of mistake is to affirm that the human understanding, as such, is infallible. There has been a great deal said about infallibility; as if man could receive truth which should be to him an infallible guide! overlooking the fact that truth is to him what he perceives it to be, and that each may be unsuccessful in attempting to draw it out. When I affirm a truth, I affirm of my perception of it, and hence,

4. God can not make a revelation to man which can serve as an infallible guide to him, unless man is infallible in his understanding of that revelation; for man in his state of development is liable to err concerning that which it is attempted to reveal to him if his understanding is not prepared to receive truth in its true sense. Although the revelation God makes may be infallible truth in itself, man does not receive it as it comes from God; he receives it as weak and finite man, and it becomes to him true or false according as his idea corresponds to the fact or truth itself,

or is inconsistent with it. Therefore I say no revelation can amount to any thing as an infallible guide to man unless man is infallible in determining what truth is. To affirm that God has made a revelation to man is to affirm that He has *made something known* to man; but He has not really made it known unless man has understood the truth. Mind, I do not say God has not spoken truth, but that it may not have become a *revelation*, a *making known* of truth to man. It is upon this basis I wish to discuss all questions that may arise. Hence also,

5. To denounce the human understanding as weak, erring, and fallible, when it is the only means by which you can understand truth, and yet to affirm that God has revealed infallible truth to man, is to affirm what is contradictory and absurd in itself: the two propositions can not stand together: one must be given up. The great point is then;

6. All revelation to man must be limited by the degree of mental unfolding in the individual to whom the revelation is made. You can not reveal to a mind that which lies beyond the plane of its own understanding. No matter who speaks: God may speak in the voice of thunders with all the bright glories of lightnings flashing round Him, if man is not sufficiently advanced to understand the truth, it is no truth to him. This proposition is a most important one.

All these six corollaries flow from the truth I first enunciated. Admitting it, these consequences must follow, and many others also, to which I have not alluded. Let the distinction between fact and truth, then, be kept constantly in mind throughout our discussion.

SECOND. My second proposition from which also several corollaries flow, is this—*A truth must exist in the conscious perception of the mind, in order to become a truth to such mind.*

A little reflection will show you that this proposition can not be denied. You may talk of truths belonging to the spirit sphere, to the Paradise of God, and you may have in your mind a clear perception of these truths, but until *I* have a conscious perception of them they are not truths to me. They can not come into my understanding so as to become a part of my understanding, until I perceive them as they are, in all their true nature, relations, and tendencies.

Truth is to the mind what food is to the body. Unless my food is digested, assimilated, and incorporated into my body, it is not in any proper sense food to me. Instead of becoming strength and vigor to my system, it brings disease and death. So, if the mind does not digest and assimilate truth, it can not become a nourishing and unfolding truth to that mind; it becomes indigestible,—false in its form, relation, and effects. Being thus false in my mind, if I defend it as a truth of God, I am defending it as a

falsehood and not as a truth, though in its pure form it may have come originally from Omniscience itself. The mind which flatters itself that it is growing wise by storing its chambers with these unperceived truths, acts like a man who should feed upon pebbles, nails, and glass, and expect to develop his bones and muscles thereby.

If I receive into my spiritual nature that which I do not perceive and understand, I am no wiser, my spiritual nature is not unfolded, I have only multiplied darkness and error where all should be light and truth. My proposition must therefore be met if false, admitted if true, and then we can pass on.

The idea of a truth which is not adequately perceived is not truth to the mind: so long as dimness or mystery hang about it, the mind is and must be in doubt, and can not be said to believe it.

MR. ERRETT.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—We have before us to-day a definite question for discussion. The affirmative side of it asserts that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical in character with those of Jesus Christ. My friend here makes this affirmation; I come to deny its truth. It is one thing to submit a number of propositions: it is quite another thing to apply them to a case in hand; and since my friend has not as yet made the application, I may rightfully pass them by till he commences that part of his task. For myself, I have said nothing about an infallible revelation, and how far a discussion of that question can bear upon the proposition before us, remains to be seen. I am here to show that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are *not* identical with those of Jesus of Nazareth.

There is a great deal in this proposition, and it requires to be discussed seriously, soberly, and candidly. I wish to submit, first of all, this consideration as really bearing upon the question; viz.—

Spiritualists themselves deny and scout the identity which the gentleman affirms. The leaders of Modern Spiritualism say that its phenomena and teachings are *not* identical with those of Jesus of Nazareth. I shall therefore read from the teachings of modern spiritualists upon this point, and the first testimony I shall adduce is that of ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS. I read from his "Divine Revelations," page 558.

"I have but a few more remarks to offer concerning the Bible, and these are as follows: It does not teach that pure morality which belongs to the nature of man, and which will result from a superior condition of the race. From this remark must be excepted a few incidental expressions said to have been used by

JESUS,—such as the “Golden Rule,” which was comprehensively taught six hundred years before, by CONFUCIUS, the Chinese philosopher. Again: it does not prove *immortality*; neither does it teach the mighty truths contained in the successive spheres or degrees of future existence. Nor does it even present any substantial proof of the transition from this rudimental condition, to a higher degree of material and physical organization; or, in other words, it does not demonstrate a resurrection to a future life. Nor does it present *one proper conception* of the constitution, character, greatness, omnipotence, and majesty of the Divine mind. Nor does it do justice to his works, except in those meditations upon which I have heretofore commented. Nor does it contain one substantial proof of an unvarying law upon which to found a hope of ever being regenerated, or of ascending to a sphere of more perfect and harmonious existence. Nor does it teach that holy virtue, morality, and refinement, which should receive the name of religion.”

Now if this be a true statement of the belief of modern spiritualists with regard to Christ's teachings (and I apprehend that its truth or falsity is a matter which comes within the range of our perceptions), I presume my friend would hardly claim that the doctrines which are declared so false, absurd, and superstitious, are identical with those of Modern Spiritualism. Yet this is a statement taken from a great leader in Modern Spiritualism, the great Poughkeepsie seer and clairvoyant! I wish to read one more extract from the same volume, page 517.

“No class or series of expressions have been associated in the enfeebled mind of man with more fear and depressing dread than some of those said to have been used by Christ while preaching and prophesying.

“The well-informed mind is personally conscious that the causes of evil lie not IN man, but ABOUT him; and this knowledge at once creates a universal forgiveness, and forbids the application of any harsh terms to a brother—much more to a brotherhood. Persons who are not acquainted with the cause of moral evil, are in the habit of accusing each other falsely, and applying to each other terms no less unjust than such as, ‘Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?’ Surely a more unrighteous sentence could not proceed from an ignorant devotee of the Juggernaut!”

If this judgment upon Christ's doctrine and preaching be true, and if the teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical, then by the authority of the great seer himself, nothing more unrighteous could proceed from a devotee of Juggernaut himself! Either this is true or the teachings of the two systems are not identical, and my friend can choose which horn of the dilemma he will take.

I shall read still another extract from the same author, taken from an address delivered by him in Cleveland, in 1862, and quoted in Mattison's "Spirit Rappings Unveiled," page 90.

"From the New Testament alone you may find the entire vocabulary of the profane man. And when any clergyman preaches against the use of profane language—a habit, like smoking and chewing, unfit for man—would it not be well for him to look somewhat into its origin? Let him show the people—no matter what they say—how children learn to swear; and where, and from what *source of corruption*, the disgusting words are drawn."

This is another assertion of a modern spiritualist with regard to the New Testament and the doctrines of Christianity as taught by Jesus Christ.

I will now read from a new work, "The Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse," by Mr. Davis.

"I say this age *wants* miracle, and there is miracle; it *wants* sensuous demonstration of the truth of immortality, and there *are* sensuous demonstrations! But I do not regard these undeniable manifestations as the result of any special plan among the inhabitants of the spheres, nor as an act of special legislation or providence on the part of the Divine Mind, nor am I impressed to connect the spiritual manifestations of this age *with any occurrences of an analogous complexion and character* which may have been developed in ages past."

This does not look much like identity in phenomena, surely!

I shall read again from "The Spiritual Teacher," by R. P. Ambler, page 42. "The flowing stream of time rolls onward, bearing the truths and principles of other ages far away, that new truths and principles may be revealed which are in more perfect adaptation to the increased advancement of the race; and yet the bigoted and contracted soul clings, with childish and idolatrous worship, to the crumbling altars of the ancient error."

The "Spiritual Teacher" therefore makes Spiritualism a revelation of new truths and new principles, and *therefore* it can not be identical with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

I will read from another work, the "Review of Dr. Dods' Involuntary Theory," by W. S. Courtney, page 70. Speaking of the Christian rule of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, he says it "would constitute me the standard of other people's tastes, inclinations, pleasures, and attractions. I might wish them to do unto me what they might knock me down for attempting to do to them. It is evident, to adopt this as a maxim, each one would be incessantly offending and outraging the tastes and attractions of others, and getting himself perpetually into bad odor and broils with his neighbors."

It would certainly be a great pity to adopt rules which would

bring us into broils and strifes with our neighbors as the carrying out of the Golden Rule would do, according to Mr. Courtney!

Again he says, a little further on, "The principles inculcated in the various parables of the capricious father whose feelings overpowered his sense of justice, treating a drunken and profligate son with more consideration than his other sober and industrious children; of the unjust employer who paid the same wages to the laborers who had worked only one hour that he did to those who worked hard all day, and who even preferred the ones who came last; and many other parables that were never intended to embody a practical moral principle, but simply admonitory in their nature, and intended to exhort the people to do good, and be 'kindly affectioned one to another.' These boasted 'moral truths,' which Dods gives out as wholly beyond the attainment of man's moral perceptions, and which were accordingly revealed from heaven, are but the mere common-place admonitions and exhortations of some *good old grandpapa*, accompanied with *gingerbread*, and sundry pats on the cheeks and heads, to the 'dear children,' to be good boys and girls! Very few, if any of them, are axiomatical, and by far the greatest number *puerile and childish*."

These quotations are from authors and teachers who are recognized as having respectable standing in the spiritual fraternity, and as receiving veritable communications from the spirit world. The last extract is the judgment of Mr. Courtney himself, and his work is sent out and recommended as a fit one to make the world more familiar with the "teachings of Modern Spiritualism." No matter now whether these teachings be false or true, it is too evident for argument that they are very far indeed from being or claiming to be identical with those of Jesus of Nazareth. My first position therefore, that leading spiritualists scout the existence of any such identity as is here claimed by the gentleman, I shall consider substantiated.

My SECOND point is that *the whole Christian world denies and scouts the identity affirmed*. There is not a sect, orthodox or heterodox, which admits it. My friend said in his debate recently held at Cleveland, that there is not a doctrine held as essential by the orthodox churches which is not inconsistent with truth; but these doctrines have been held by the best minds in all ages, and therefore Spiritualism stands up in opposition to all the best minds of all ages, and what these minds regarded as the principles of truth. It stands in opposition to the glorious truths taught by the Apostles: the whole Christian world has been in idiocy, befooled by priests! You may count up your metaphysicians like Locke and Reid, Stewart and Coleridge; your natural philosophers like Bacon, Newton, and the rest; your theologians like Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Edwards; the great earnest minds like

Fletcher and Whitefield, and all, all were mistaken in the beliefs upon which they based their hopes of eternal life !

Since, therefore, the identity is denied by their own teachers, and by all Christians of all ages, how can it be pretended that it exists ! My friend stands alone in his affirmation ; none of either party is found by his side ! My reasoning therefore is, that both parties denying that the phenomena and teachings of the two systems are alike, my friend's affirmation that they are identical must be false unless he makes good his claim to stand alone against the world.

I will submit another proposition, for I wish my friend to come to positions and arguments which can be appreciated by the audience.

Jesus claimed that His works were wrought by power miraculously conferred, "by the finger of God." Nicodemus says "we know that no man can do these works except God be with him." When the disciples of John came to know whether He was the Messiah, the reply was, "Go tell John again those things which you do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them (Matt. xi : 4, 5); and He rested His claims to the Messiahship upon these *works* which were wrought as "by the finger of God,"—by the miraculous endowment of the Spirit of God. Again John says, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and that believing, ye might have life through His name." (John xx : 30, 31.)

Christ's wonderful works, therefore, were miracles, and the power by which they were wrought must, in the nature of the case, have been a special, extraordinary, and miraculous endowment. But it is not claimed by modern spiritualists that their manifestations are miraculous; on the other hand, they affirm that they are all performed in strict accordance with uniform natural laws. Here then is a great diversity in the two systems. Jesus claimed that He wrought miraculously. He said, "The works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." He wrought His works for the very purpose of making them believe that He was "sent from God." Modern Spiritualism repudiates all this. Let me read a word on that point. "If thousands of such experiments were performed, as the casting out of devils, or transforming water into wine, or destroying the lives of a number of undeserving swine, or the withering of a verdant fig-tree, what possible use, what grand design, what celestial result would be accomplished? Would not such means be altogether inadequate to the fulfillment of the end for which they are supposed to have

been originally designed? Are they not useless and insignificant manifestations, such as have a tendency to corrupt a just faith in the workings of the great Divine Mind? Are they not, indeed, most unworthy the dignity of any *human* being, to say nothing of the GREAT CAUSE, which is the very Essence of Infinite Perfection?" (*Divine Revelations*, 513.) He here affirms that all those wondrous works claimed as miracles by Jesus Christ when He wrought them, are unworthy the dignity even of a human being, and of no use whatever to mankind! Again he asks, "Are these celestial effects, indicating that the cause was divine intention, and born from the bosom of celestial Perfection?" and sums up the matter by declaring that "the accounts of these miraculous deeds were written under the promptings of misguided judgment; and having thus originated, their effects have fully corresponded in every generation." Every thing miraculous is therefore entirely ignored and denied so far as Christ is concerned, and it is admitted by necessary implication, that the phenomena of Modern Spiritualism ~~must~~ greatly transcend in dignity, any thing which Christ performed, to make them worthy the dignity even of a poor mortal! We shall see by and by how well they will stand the comparison.

I have now presented three distinct arguments, and I shall read in conclusion one more evidence, taken from page 531 of the "*Divine Revelations*."

"Remember these *external* evidences are not to be in any case relied upon as proving *any thing* to which they are applied. If what I reveal requires external testimony to prove its truth, then indeed its truth might with propriety be doubted." So, therefore, the phenomena attending upon the ministry of Jesus Christ, and those of Modern Spiritualism are alike ignored, and laid aside as utterly useless!

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend complains that he does not see the bearing of what I have already said upon the question under discussion. I am sorry, for unless he can fairly meet and defeat me upon the propositions I have laid down, he will not be able to escape the conclusions to which I shall drive him, and which I shall show are all-important in their bearings upon the question itself. He has failed upon the very point I cautioned him about, namely, the distinction between a truth and a fact. We are talking of the truths of spiritualism not of spiritualists. When I come to the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth, I shall seek them from Jesus himself, and not from the authors he has quoted and referred to. My friend would not think me just if I should judge Christianity by what the Methodists or the Presbyterians teach, and thinking so myself I shall quote no books of theology on that subject.

My friend DAVIS has illustrated the truth of the proposition, I have laid down, that nothing is true but in accordance with the perception of the mind which perceives it. My friend Davis understands truths in accordance with the perceptions of his own mind. So also with my friend COURTNEY, from whom a quotation has been read. With the last I do not agree, and think that in his argument he shows the very cause of his error. I am not bound, then, by what my friend Courtney affirms, but by fundamental principles to which I appeal. The same distinction should be made between the language of spiritualists and spiritualism, as between that of Geologists and Geology. If I would understand Geology, I have nothing to do with the dreams of the early Geologists; I must study the rocks, woods, and streams as they came from the hand of the Almighty.

The great difference between my friend and myself is that he refers to authority, whilst I reject authority. I shall by and by show some of the applications of the principles I have referred to. I shall show the necessity of some means other than external ones, for the purpose of conveying truth to man. When I show that we cannot depend upon external guides, I show that we must look in some other direction than toward books if we would learn the doctrines of men who have gone before us. I shall show the necessity of getting a guide *within* ourselves to save us from the errors into which we surely fall when we lean upon the understanding of another.

I am taking my position as in a field of battle, and bringing my guns to bear upon the point I mean to attack, and when my friend comes within their range, I shall discharge them at him. Unless he prevents me from establishing my battery, it will be better for him to keep out of the field. I do not propose to bring in a mass of authorities; I propose to establish truths, and let them have their own influence upon the discussion. If I proposed to demonstrate the 47th proposition of Euclid, I must first prove a number of others. I must lay down axioms and fix definitions. Until I am ready to apply these I must proceed with my preliminary propositions, and if my friend examines them carefully I think he will find that they give him something to do.

I have said a truth must exist in the conscious perception of the mind in order to be a truth to such mind, no matter whether God or an angel spoke it. Quotations may show what men's *opinions* of truth are, but truth itself stands upon a broader and deeper basis. I propose to show that certain propositions are true, and then I shall explain their bearing. Hence,

1. Truth received upon authority without a proper understanding of it will be error received upon the authority of him from whom we profess to receive truth; *e. g.*, if my friend teaches what he claims is truth revealed from God, when he misunder-

stands it, he will be teaching error and yet be giving God himself as his authority for it. I may believe New York to exist, and I may form any number of ideas concerning it, but it remains an *ideal* New York, and when I visit that city I may find that it has no existence which corresponds to the idea of it which was in my mind.

When it is brought home to my consciousness, it becomes a *truth* to my mind; before, it was only a fact. Facts are subject matter of faith, and can be believed upon authority; but a mere naked fact, divested of its true form and relation, is a barren thing incapable of producing any good effect upon the mind. Facts may involve truths in some mysterious way, but mystery does us no good,—it must be solved before the latent truths can be got at. We may believe there is a truth there somewhere, but till we understand it and get hold of it for ourselves, it is to us no truth, and only tends to lead us into error. Belief is dependent upon understanding, and when a man says of a thing, "it is mysterious," it is equivalent to saying "I do not believe it." Hence,

2. When a mind professes to receive truth upon authority, without perceiving it, it does not receive truth, but error. Give me any thing which you call truth, but of which you do not perceive the truth yourself, but receive it because some one tells you it is truth, and I will prove to you that to your mind it is not truth, but error. Hence,

3. As truth can only exist in the conscious perception, the only standard by which truth can be tried must be within the individual. We talk about outward standards of truth,—there are and can be no such things. A standard which is not within a man's own mind, cannot be a standard by which he can try truth. How does the mind get a standard? We hear it said that the Bible is a standard of truth. How was that fact ascertained? There must have been a standard by which we tried the standard, or there could have been no way to prove that it was a standard. It must ultimate at last in this, that to the mind itself, to our own understanding, must we refer all truths for trial. Let truth come from what source it may; though, as Paul said, an angel from heaven preached it, it must still be tried by a standard in the mind of the individual who receives it, and it is to him no truth till it becomes a part of his own spiritual being, by being apprehended and adopted by his understanding.

By the way, my friend read from a work written by Mr. Davis before he professed to be a spiritualist, but I claim nothing from that. I simply mention it as it occurred to me.

4. I wish this affirmation to be distinctly understood. If man is ever to know what is absolute truth, he must have an absolute standard by which he is to get it. Let the mind be candid in its inquiry whether these propositions are true, and the deductions

which flow from them will come up for examination by themselves.

I come now to my THIRD proposition. It is this—*Oral, written, or pantomimic representations are not sufficient to convey to any mind a truth, unless there is first in that mind the elements from which that truth is to be constructed.* For instance, suppose I wish to convey to the mind of a person born blind, the idea of light, what language can I make use of that will accomplish that purpose? That idea can only reach the mind by the organ of sight, and if that organ is wanting, it is in vain for me to attempt to convey the idea by means of any language I can use; for the mind being destitute of the elements of the ideas of light and color, the communication is impossible. Language is worth nothing any further than it can construct in the mind of the person to whom a communication is sought to be made, out of the elements already found there, the idea which exists in the mind of the one making the communication. The notion which has so often been promulgated, that language can convey ideas where the elements do not exist in the mind, is altogether fallacious, and has no basis in fact or in philosophy. Hence,

1. If a truth is to be communicated, the elements of which do not exist in the mind of the individual to whom it is to be conveyed, it must be conveyed by some other means than the common ones. If there be truths in the spirit world which the natural mind can not conceive in its natural state, they can not be conveyed at all, unless it be by some entirely new mode of communication. Unless the *elements* of spiritual ideas already exist in the consciousness, they can not be conveyed to the mind by oral language merely. Hence,

2. All ideas of existences, the manifestation of which transcends the natural means of addressing the human consciousness, and the natural powers of man's understanding, must depend upon some other means than external language for their presence in the mind. Hence,

3. If man has not a natural perception of God, in the divinity of His being and character, he can never acquire such a perception through the instrumentality of language alone. You may write a Universe full of books, and if there be that in the idea which transcends the means of communication belonging to the natural understanding, they will be of no service, for the idea can only come by means of such communication as shall also transcend the natural ones, and impress itself upon the mind itself, immediately and directly. Such a means of communication the mind must have, or it can never rise above the low state in which it merely combines and arranges the elements of ideas which it has received by mere sensuous perception, and it will be confined entirely in its researches to the natural world, and such depart-

ments of the scientific world as those in which it is addressed by the outward senses.

AFTER-NOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

It may be well to state again, for the sake of those who were not present this morning, that the proposition under discussion is, whether the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical with the phenomena and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

Mr. Tiffany said I had confounded Spiritualism with Spiritualists. The teachings of Spiritualism are under investigation, and if they are not to be found in the writings of leading spiritualists, and in communications professing to come directly from the spirit-world, I am at a loss to know where my friend would have me look for them. He justified his assertion by saying that I would not go to the books of Methodists to find the teachings of Christ. Very true. I should not go to their books nor those of our own denomination; I should take Christ's own teachings and those of His inspired apostles; but if I were seeking the teachings of Methodism, I should rightly go to the books of Methodists. The case would then be parallel. Therefore, when seeking the teachings of Modern Spiritualism, I have the most perfect right to go to the books of the teachers among the modern spiritualists. The books from which I have quoted are sent out all over the country to propagate Spiritualism, but my friend will not admit them as evidence! Andrew Jackson Davis is repudiated as a teacher of Spiritualism! The great Goliath of Spiritualism is fallen at the first stone from the sling!

I am told also, that I quoted from Davis' opinions held before he was a spiritualist. He was at least in some very lofty sphere, and his professions as to his mode of receiving communications may be found on the 44th page of his "Divine Revelations," from which I will read a short extract:

"It is impossible by words to convey a full and adequate conception of the manner in which I arrive at truth.

"My information is not derived from any persons that exist in the sphere into which my mind enters, but it is the result of a law of truth, emanating from the Great Positive Mind, and pervading all spheres of existence."

When Davis wrote his "Harmonia," he said he was in a sublime state, to which only *one in seventy-five millions* could reach;—yet his teachings are now repudiated, and when his words are quoted, they are all passed by with a "Pho! I don't receive that!" And so, I suppose, when this debate is over, spiritualists

have only to turn in the same way from Mr. TIFFANY, and then where is Spiritualism?

My friend says that we study *facts* in Geology, and not books; but even that does not help him, for he offers us no facts. He seems inclined to revel in the realms of abstruse mental philosophy, far above the "plane" of the mass of his audience, and by his own theory, such reasonings can not be *truth* to them, because they can not understand them. It is to facts that I would come, and prove by them whether the phenomena and teachings of Spiritualism are really identical with those of Christianity. When we looked to Davis' Revelations, and the "Spiritual Teacher" as our guides to Spiritualism, although the last was a book the communication of which we are told (page 10) "was responded to with songs of angelic praise and love by the host of the heavenly-born," all we read, it turns out, was the *private opinions* of Mr. Davis and Mr. Ambler! Is this the way the thing is to be met? The teachings that angels rejoiced over,—the teaching that made the skies vocal with gladness,—all nothing but Mr. Ambler's private opinion? I have said nothing about authority: I have only presented what these men say Spiritualism is; what they say is given them by spirits when they have no control over their own ideas, and which they even say is oftentimes contrary to their previous opinions and beliefs.

I do not intend to be led off very far into my friend's philosophy. We hold that the miracles and teachings of Jesus Christ are realities; they are, as has been admitted, recorded in a book, and we can find them there and judge of them, and we need not becloud ourselves in the regions of transcendental philosophy, till we all can say of metaphysics what the Scotchman did, that "when a mon so speaketh, that he that heareth dinna ken what he that speaketh meaneth, and he that speaketh dinna ken what he means himsel, that's metaphysic." I shall notice only a few points to show the ideas are not so clear as from their great formality might be expected. He holds that "fact is existence" and "truth is the conscious perception of existence." Now with all proper respect for the gentleman's judgment, I must say that he does not agree with our best lexicographers, Webster, Worcester, and the rest. Fact is something that is done; a truth is a proposition which conforms to facts. Truths are involved in facts. We believe facts upon testimony, and the belief involves both the fact and the truth, or the statement of the fact. To say that we may have facts and still be destitute of truths, would be like saying that if a farmer draws me a load of apples, I get no apples because the horses only draw the wagon.

Again: Truth, he says, is a conscious perception, and just as much as we perceive of truth, we get. That is, we *perceive* a *perception*, and just as much of the perception as we perceive, we

have ! Now, ladies and gentlemen, do you understand all this ? Do you comprehend that it is necessary for you to perceive perceptions themselves before you can fathom the depths of Spiritualism ?

Again : we are told that no person can receive a truth above the plane of his understanding. Then I humbly submit that it is vain to seek to elevate man. What means this "*Spiritual Teacher*," if man can not be taught ? Perhaps it does not intend to teach any thing,—it may be that it is the beauty of Spiritualism that it does not raise man to any higher sphere, or introduce him to any new views of more elevated thought and feeling. I certainly had supposed that all attempts at education were based upon an acknowledged capacity in the mind to expand itself by exertion so as to encompass and take in thoughts greater than it ever received before, and that thus by the aid of others more advanced, the mind is elevated by the power of truth. Were this not so, all hope of human progress might be laid forever in the grave.

Oral language, he tells us, cannot convey truth, unless its elements are already in the mind. I should like to have my friend inform us what are the *elements of spiritual truth*. Unless we have them, he is in singular business trying to convey any idea of such truths—proving to us as he goes along, that it is impossible for us to receive them. He should try those "other means" which he hints at, and not try to prove them by his "oral language."

Again, it is said by the gentleman, although God should speak the truth, if we have not minds sufficiently powerful to grasp it, it is not truth to us.

This is simply saying that God cannot give truth to man, and if He undertakes to do so, we shall pervert it and it will become false to us. I apprehend that the gentleman takes the ground that there is no objective truth—that all is spiritual. A hundred men may look at the moon, and owing to their different organizations, may see it of different sizes, but do they therefore see no moon, and has not the moon some size of its own ? Does it give them no light, because they do not judge alike of its magnitude ? Is there not rather a perfect moon, which perfectly fulfills its office, though men's conceptions of it differ ? Because there are different degrees of human progress, and different minds take in different degrees of truth, shall we say there is to them no truth ? It was said that I gave the opinions of the men I quoted, but the gentleman must have forgotten his own theory when he said so. I got from the books my understanding of their opinions, and you received from me, your understanding of my understanding of their opinions ; and since no two minds are exactly alike in development, and by this reasoning cannot perfectly appreciate the ideas in the mind of another, all men who receive or believe what

is communicated from other minds, are necessarily receiving lies, and not truth!

I must leave this and return to what I consider the subject of debate, only saying in passing, that if Mr. Tiffany's philosophising should turn out to be "Modern Spiritualism," I think it would need no argument to convince this audience that no such things are to be found in the teachings of Jesus Christ, and therefore the two systems cannot be identical.

Phenomena are appearances, and where identical phenomena exist, it is a simple matter to demonstrate it by comparing them and making the likeness evident.

In endeavoring to get at the similarity or dissimilarity existing in the systems, I have quoted those who are widely known as spiritualist teachers; but since the position has been taken that they spoke only for themselves, and could not be regarded as representatives of "Modern Spiritualism," I will read a statement made with regard to Mr. Davis, and the position he occupies as an expounder of what Spiritualism really is. In the 21st number of the *Spirit Messenger*, the editor gives an account of "another visit to Hartford," in which he says:

"It may be stated as an item of interest that Mr. Davis was consecrated to the work of human redemption under the name of a guide and leader, by the light of whose revelations those who now sit in the valley and shadow of death may be brought forth to the blissfulness of a new day."

The teachings of the *Divine Revelations* have never been taken back, and they have as much force to-day as ever they had. We hear nothing of spirits telling him to retract any thing said in that work, and it stands, therefore, professing still to be a *Divine Revelation*, and no human work. In the *Harmonia*, vol. 1, page 201, Davis says:

"Concerning *spiritual impressions*, enough cannot be written—so valuable and exalting are they to the spirit of man! * * * The superior condition is induced as above described, by a kind of semi-voluntary self-abstraction. But instead of the soft, clear light, darting in straight lines from the anterior brain to some particular locality of the earth, it ascends like a cloud or volume of light, a few feet from my head into the atmosphere, and here it suddenly blends with a Great Sphere of Light, which light proceeds from the concentrated intelligence of the spirit-world, as from a mighty sun! This light is impregnated with the knowledge which I seek; it possesses all conceivable intelligence, and it flows into the mind which is thus unfolded to receive it, as light and heat flow from the visible sun, into the objects and receptacles of earth. *I was in this state when The Principles of Nature, Her Divine Revelation, and a voice to mankind, were delivered to the world.*"

MR. TIFFANY.

I am happy indeed that my friend has paid a little attention to some of the propositions I have laid down, and I will notice some of the points of difference between us. He complains that I have presented no phenomena: it will be time enough to bring them forward when we have established some principles which shall be a standard of criticism by which to judge them, and by which we may also mutually understand each other. He says I have directed my remarks above the plane of the intelligence of the audience. I beg his pardon, I have done no such thing. I affirmed that some other mind which can perceive a truth, may receive it, whilst I cannot, because I may not have been able to obtain the perception. I place this affirmation upon such a basis that every individual may test the matter by the standard in his own consciousness, and see whether it be true or not.

He refused to recognize my distinction between truth and fact, and then went on to give the same distinction himself. We all understand by "fact," that which is done. I spoke of that which *is*, which has been formed, fashioned, or acted—not of God Himself, for I do not apply the term to Him, but of all subordinate existences.

He says, If we get a fact, we get also the truth. Let us see. How long had apples fallen before Sir Isaac Newton discovered, under that simple fact, the great truths of gravitation, which link together the whole material universe? Men had seen the dew-drop sparkling in its beautiful spherical form, but how much of the truth involved in it did they perceive? Not surely that it was the same principle which sustains the vast globes which go whirling through the abyss of space! In our childhood we saw the broken rocks and boulders which lie along our fields, but it was not till we learned the alphabet of Nature that we understood the truth which they contained. The voicing-forth of Nature was not intelligible to us till our minds had expanded enough to comprehend it, and the mind must still further expand before it can apprehend the truths pertaining to the *infinite* and the *all*. I say then, that my friend made the same distinction with regard to facts and truths that I did. That which exists out of us, independent of our perception is called fact,—truths are the perceptions of the fact by the mind itself. Different minds may see the same truth in very different lights, but there are truths which are such to all minds; as, *e. g.*, things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other, and so on throughout the whole range of mathematical science, which, basing itself upon axioms, compels assent at every step.

My friend asks, What is education? I will tell him. It is taking the truths which a man perceives and knows, and by combining them lead him on to higher truths, developing his mind as

he goes along. I commence by teaching a child the alphabet; I then teach him to combine the letters into words. If I should not succeed in making him understand the letters and simple words, I might as well stop, for I could not take him further until these are understood and properly comprehended. I shall by and by have occasion to notice the different departments of the human mind, but at present I shall pass by that subject.

Oral language can convey new truth, says my friend. I still say what I first said—If the elements of the idea are not in the mind already, oral language can not convey it. Let my friend take the illustration I gave before and explain it if he can. How can you convey by language alone the idea of light and color to the mind of one born blind? Or suppose I have been born deaf, and have no perception of harmony in sound, or of discord, how would you go to work to convey the idea of music to my mind? Try it, and you will find in that as in all things else, that human language is inadequate to convey an idea, unless the mind already possesses its elements. The whole truth is involved here.

He wanted me to explain what were the elements of spiritual truth. You all understand what I mean. We describe things by their form, color, size, roughness, smoothness, hardness, softness, &c. If you know what is signified by these words which denote attributes, you have the elements from which to construct the ideas of material objects. We put them together to form a complex description of an object; as, if I should say, I am thinking of a white, round, smooth, hard object, no one of you would have any difficulty in constructing the idea in your own mind. If now, I would describe an object in the planet Jupiter, I can only do so by comparing it with things on the Earth, and if there were qualities which could not be compared to any thing on Earth, you could not understand my description nor construct an idea of the thing because you have not the elements from which it is made. The "things of the spirit" are of a similar nature, with respect to the natural mind, and we must have spiritual perceptions before the statements of spiritual truth can be definitely understood.

I said also that a truth is not a truth *to us*, except we understand it. It may have an independent existence, but *to us* it can only exist when we perceive. The illustration taken from the Moon, by which my friend attempted to refute my position, seems to me an unfortunate one. If the visual angle at which persons see a thing, be different for different individuals, the object will appear of different sizes to them, but the *relative* size will appear the same, for the size of the common standards with which they compare the object will be proportionately changed in appearance.

I must now proceed with my propositions. Metaphysics may be what the Scotchman said it was, but there is nevertheless a

philosophy of mind, and if the Scotchman does not understand it, it is his misfortune.

My FOURTH proposition is this—*External language, according to its natural significance, is not competent to convey spiritual and divine truths.* I take this broad proposition, and affirm that revelation, in its true sense, becomes necessary on account of this incompetency in natural language. I am to show that the natural mind can not perceive the things of the spirit, because they must be “spiritually discerned,” and this, I take it, is no new doctrine. The reason is obvious:—the natural mind has not associated a spiritual significance with external language, and that language is not understood to denote spiritual things. Hence,

1. When truths peculiarly spiritual, as distinguished from natural and scientific truths, are to be communicated, they must be impressed directly upon the consciousness of the individual. That is, they must be communicated *by inspiration*, by the *in-breathing* of that truth into the individual's consciousness, either with or without the aid of external language. Now here is a fundamental proposition, and one which we will do well to weigh and understand, when we attempt to compare the teachings of the spiritualism of Jesus of Nazareth, with those of Modern Spiritualism. The proposition is almost axiomatic, that if spiritual truth be such that it is necessary that God should inspire men that they may perceive it, because natural language can not convey it, and the natural mind can not understand it, and if it must be written down, then it is just as necessary that the mind which reads it should be inspired, as that the writer should: else he is left to attribute to it a natural significance, and to understand it according to the plane of the natural understanding. Hence,

2. Any truth requiring the inspiration of the Spirit to enable man to perceive it and write it down, will require the inspiration of the *same Spirit* to enable another to understand it when it is written down. Try it in any way you please, you can not avoid that conclusion. Hence,

3. If inspiration is necessary for one to perceive and write down truth, it is necessary for another to perceive it and understand it when it is written. For this reason, of all who read the Word of God, so called, in which they believe they have the very spirit of truth itself, you can scarcely find two who understand it alike. Like the disciples of Christ, though they had His teachings day by day, hearing, they heard not; and seeing, they did not understand; and even when Christ left them they were still blind, for the Spirit of Truth had not yet come to enlighten them. Therefore it became expedient that He should go away that that Spirit might come to them.

4. I take the broad position, and I shall have occasion to use it, that he who attempts to learn the truths of the Spirit by

studying the literal words merely, without the aid of the Spirit, will necessarily fall into error. It is in the very nature and constitution of mind that it should fall into error under such circumstances, and obtain false ideas of spiritual life and truth.

My friend quoted me a little too broadly when he said I admitted that the teachings of Christ are found in a book. I said they are found in Christ's words, and I admit that the facts and phenomena are narrated in the Book. We must find a standard for the interpretation of Christ's language, and the phenomena which attended His ministry, before we can learn what the "teachings" are.

MR. ERRETT.

When my friend was here in the winter to instruct the people in the beauties and mysteries of Spiritualism, he took up the Bible and read from it, professing to base his lectures and instructions upon it, and told the audience he professed to receive it as containing the inspired teachings of Jesus Christ.

MR. TIFFANY. I say so now.

MR. ERRETT. But you said a moment since that we did not have the "teachings" there. If I understand what you now say, I was right in the first place, and it is an admitted point that we have the teachings of Jesus in that book.

According to my friend's doctrine, it is necessary for a man to be just as fully inspired as Jesus was, in order to understand Him. It takes the same amount of inspiration to receive as to impart, he tells us; and if this be so, the conclusion is plain that God might have spared the world the incalculable labors and sufferings of His Son, by inspiring all mankind in the first place, so that they might know the truth as Christ knew it, and not be obliged to have the same inspiration afterward to enable them to understand it when He had spoken it. For these eighteen hundred years the world has been trying to understand the teachings of Jesus; yet, the gentleman tells us, they know nothing about it, and now at last *he* must come to *teach them their ignorance!* Jesus was with His disciples three years and a half, and yet never succeeded in giving them the first idea of spiritual truth! He then sent them out to teach the world, giving them the Holy Ghost to instruct and guide them, yet they too have utterly failed! Why was all this done, when by "propositions almost axiomatic" it is shown that unless the hearers had the same inspiration as the teachers, every thing they received must be a lie? The whole scheme of apostleship is a nullity and worse than a nullity, according to such a system; for since God has not given to every man the same inspiration which Jesus and the apostles had, but has left the whole church to run into total darkness and

delusion, and this, too, in accordance with the "fundamental laws of mind," He must Himself be the responsible cause of the disastrous results!

My friend quotes the apostle Paul to show that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned; but what folly to quote Scripture, since by his theory it is and must be a lie to us who have not the requisite amount of inspiration to understand it! He quotes it as high authority; he is careful not to say *how* high; but no matter if he made it as high authority as we do, it would be of no service, for we have not Paul's inspiration. If, however, we might venture with our weak understandings to read Paul's words, we should find some things not very consistent with my friend's system. He says, "I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in great trembling, and my speech and my preaching was not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power." There were *words*, then, and *speech*, but not "the enticing words of man's wisdom," as in the teachings of the Greeks and of my friend here. The very subtleties with which the audience is entertained to-day, are things the apostle disclaimed. "Howbeit," he says, "we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery!" My friend says there is no truth in mystery:—was it then a lie which Paul spoke? He says of the things he taught (1 Corinthians, 2nd chapter), "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him, *but God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit*. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but [in words] which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual [explaining spiritual things in spiritual words]."

The things they thus received from the Spirit of God, they *spoke*, that others might understand; they were sent into the world on purpose to speak them "to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Did Paul say he was sent to give light unto those who had as much as he? No, it was to the Gentiles, to turn them to God. They spoke in words, and in words taught them by the Holy Spirit. It was not only a revelation, but an *inspired* revelation in *human language*, for the instruction of the world. It is clearly shown that these spiritual things were communicated in language,—in language which the Holy Spirit taught the inspired apostles. Things were communicated which they had not previously understood at all. There is not a word about the inspiration of the hearers. Christ said, "the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are

dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed, lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." (Matt. xiii: 15.)

The result of hearing with the ear was to be understanding, the result of understanding was to be conversion, and the result of conversion was to be healing. Christ often said, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Every person was required to take heed how he heard. What was the meaning of all this? What difference did it make if they did not understand, nay, if it was to become *lies* to them? Was Christ thus befooling the people? No.

I am sorry if I have misquoted the gentleman, but I am more sorry that he should thus misquote the words of Christ. The words were addressed to those who were trifling with the truth, and were not candid hearers; and after the parable was ended Christ took His disciples aside and explained His words so that they could understand them; yet this was, as my friend says, before the coming of the Spirit of Truth. He said to His disciples, "Hear ye therefore, and *understand*." He calls upon them emphatically to understand. He explained to them the things spoken of in the prophets concerning Himself, and used all the *common* means of explanation. What was all this for? Was it no communication of truth? Did He not most manifestly proceed upon the supposition that there was such a thing as conveying truth to their minds by the use of *language*? Those who rejected the truth, were called "uncircumcised in heart and ears," and they were said to reject the Spirit of Truth, who rejected the communications in language which God made. I should like to have the gentleman communicate some truth to the audience without speaking a word,—some truth belonging to the "spirit sphere," and which they never knew before. I affirm that there has been no communication of truth to the human mind, which was not conveyed either in language or by signs of some kind; either through the ears or eyes.

I do not wish to cavil over metaphysical subtleties, but the gentleman found fault with me for criticising his definition of "fact," and I must give a word in reply. He defined fact to be "that which is," and in the same breath took it back, saying that God is, yet He is not a fact!

I did not say that the person who had facts, necessarily comprehended the truth in them;—I said the fact and the truth were there. In the falling of the apple was a truth, and it was there to reward investigation when the fact was properly investigated. Take away the fact, and the truth does not remain. The truth rests upon the laws of evidence for its disclosure: apply those laws to the facts, and you get at the truth.

Now, whether this be true or false, what is the audience learning of the "Phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism" and those of Jesus Christ? They are beginning to learn that my friend will not admit that they can find Christ's teachings for themselves in the Bible. They are beginning to be disabused of the impression left upon them last winter that the gentleman believed in the sacred word as much as we. I will not say my friend purposely made that impression, but somehow it was made, and I am glad to have it corrected. It is now shown that he regards it as necessarily giving to the uninspired reader false ideas and not truths. It is to such a one, a power to damn, and not to save; to curse, and not to bless! And it must be so till the Spirit of God is given to them without measure as it was to Jesus Christ! Such are my friend's principles plainly expressed.

I shall not spend much time upon these reasonings. Whether my friend will or not, I intend to go directly at the "Phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism,"—the audience expects it, and I shall not be led away from it. If I have been seeking these teachings in the wrong way, I shall be glad to be set right—to get the requisite amount of inspiration to understand them; and I hope I shall make some progress.

In speaking of education and development, my friend admitted that we should reach after something higher, by means of what is already in the mind of man. But how are we to attain that higher position if man can understand nothing higher than the plane of his present condition? His philosophy is swept away. Man must, in his present situation, perceive truths of a higher plane, or he never can improve, for it is by the earnest and determined labor to comprehend a truth too great to be easily received by the mind, that its capacity is enlarged, and it enabled afterward to take in such truths without exertion. When the comprehension of those greater truths becomes thus easy, the higher plane is reached, and the mind gathers its energies for a new step. This striving, stretching, and reaching after truth proves that it is beyond and above our present plane.

MR TIFFANY.

My friend appears to have heard, but not understood. If I should attempt to describe a spirit, I should be obliged to describe it by something with which we are familiar, and if there were any element in the description, which we could not recognize, we must get it by some new means. I have said, things of the spirit must be communicated by the impressions of the spirit directly upon the mind. In the illustration I have already given, a blind man may be made to understand color, and a deaf man, sound, but not by the eyes or ears; those ideas may be impressed immediately

upon the consciousness. If an individual comes into *rapport* with myself, I will make no sign, speak no word, but he shall partake of my own consciousness, and he shall get my ideas upon the same principle as that of inspiration. Do not suppose that I call this inspiration in the higher sense, I only give it as an illustration of the principle. Let a deaf man be brought into spiritual *rapport* with one who has a perception of sound, and he will have just as perfect a conscious perception of the sound as the other. This is done in thousands and thousands of instances. Here is the general idea; and when I come to speak of inspiration, I shall try to present my views in a tangible form.

To return to my regular course of argument:—

5. Revelation of facts may come upon authority, but belief in the truth must be by the perception of it. In speaking of Jesus of Nazareth, I shall notice that a part of his teaching refers to spiritual things, and this part must be spiritually discerned, whilst another part refers only to our moral duties, and the necessity of putting ourselves in such a condition that we can appreciate spiritual truth, and this part we can understand by the use of our ordinary intellectual faculties.

My next, and FIFTH proposition is, *the spiritual and intellectual faculties of the human mind are finite*. I think we shall not disagree about this. Every thing which my intellect reveals to me is finite and limited in its revelation. The thoughts and images given by these faculties are limited by the finiteness of the faculties themselves. Hence,

1. Whatever the human mind embraces in its thoughts and images is necessarily limited and rendered finite. You may take the infinity of space, or the eternity of duration, and attempt to embrace the whole idea in your thought, and you will find that it becomes finite in the operation. These are fundamental principles which need to be understood, and my friend ought not to complain that I spend time upon them, because we shall need them as criteria by which to tell whether we judge rightly of the phenomena and teachings of the systems we shall have under examination. These propositions are absolutely essential. I am not trying to dodge the real issue. I am willing he should bring up all the weak, simple, and silly phenomena he can find in Spiritualism, and I will show that they have truth in them, as eternal as the universe of God. A little mind sees little things, but the mind that can appreciate the universe, sees in the smallest particle of dust the principles which rule the heavenly spheres. I say, therefore,—

2. Since our intellectual faculties are finite, the infinite in being is not the subject of the thoughts and images of our minds; and as soon as we attempt to represent to ourselves the infinite, we bring it into the finite and our idea of it is false.

3. If God is infinite in being, He is not a proper subject for the thoughts and images of the finite mind.

I have a SIXTH proposition, viz.—*Whatever the human mind contemplates as existing out of itself, it contemplates as an object; and whatever is thus contemplated as an object, is necessarily limited and made finite.* Contemplate GOD as existing out of ourselves, in the outer universe, and we limit, restrict, and make Him finite. I do not deny the infinity of God, but I deny that our minds can comprehend the infinite; and hence,

1. All theology which treats of the Infinite, and attempts to introduce Him to the finite mind, is false; for it makes God finite and limits Him. He can in no such way be correctly represented. Hence,

2. All conceptions of the Divine Being as an object of religious worship, are finite and false. I do not mean to deny that man should worship God; but to worship Him truly is a very different thing from what is commonly called worship.

3. My next inference is, that true worship is not an exercise of the finite faculties of the mind.

This leads me to the SEVENTH proposition. *Religion has respect to the condition of the soul, and depends upon that condition of the soul in its allegiance and devotion to the Divine Father.*

Religion does not pertain to the finite faculties of man, and the question will arise by and by, whether man has in him any thing that is infinite. Hence,

1. Religion can not be taught by one finite mind to another. Jesus of Nazareth never attempted to teach the world religion; and all religious teachers are "blind leaders of the blind," who ditch themselves and others.

2. All religious forms are idolatrous. These are bold and broad propositions; but I will stand by them, and I should like to have them met if they can be.

I have still some others. EIGHTH.—*The Omniscient can not be informed; the Omnipotent can not be frustrated; the Omnipresent can not be evaded; the All-wise can not err; the All-perfect and Good can not be changed.* These propositions can not be doubted; but there are conclusions to be drawn from them of great importance.

1. Any faith respecting God, which involves a thought or imagination contrary to these propositions, must be false. You may make what form of faith you please, it can not be true if it contradicts, or is inconsistent with these truths. Again,

2. Any act which presupposes any liability to change on the part of the Divine Being, must be conceived in error, and be false. Any act which assumes that He can be persuaded or changed, is founded in error; Hence,

3. *Verbal prayer*, when interpreted by the finite under-

standing, must have its basis in error. Prayer is necessary to the life of the soul; but the conception that prayer is used to affect the Divine Being in the state of his mind or action, is erroneous, and all deductions based upon that idea, can not be otherwise than false.

NINTH.—*The Omnipresent can not be conceived in space*; or, using a figure, I might say space can only be conceived in that Being. That which has no beginning and no end can not be conceived in time. Hence, Heaven, in respect to God, can not be in time, and all ideas of Heaven as a place where God dwells, are false and idolatrous.

TENTH.—*The Divine Omnipresence can only be made known in the conscious perception of an intelligent being.* Hence,

1. Heaven can only be present where there is an intelligence sufficiently unfolded to perceive the Divine presence. Hence,

2. Heaven has respect to the state or condition of a conscious intelligence, and not to place or locality.

3. Therefore, wherever there is an intelligence sufficiently unfolded to perceive the Divine presence, there is Heaven.

This brings me to the conclusion of my ten propositions, and I shall next proceed to show how the religion of Jesus of Nazareth differed from all other religions in its external doctrines and teachings, and what it requires of all individuals to do and become, in order that they may be taught of God. I desire to do this that we may settle as far as possible the true meaning and intent of Jesus' teachings, and thus obtain a standard of comparison, by which to test the truth of my position with regard to the identity of the two systems,—Christ's own Christianity and Modern Spiritualism. We shall see whether it presents a view of religion adapted to man's necessities; whether it corresponds to the necessary truths which relate to the mode of obtaining our perceptions of truth. It will also be seen how much is implied in the blood of Christ, how much in the washings of that blood, and what is meant by putting on Christ. These and many other points will come up, and the inquiry will be made whether the modern views of Christianity are not gross perversions of the teachings of Jesus Himself. We must see why it is that the promise of "peace on earth, and good will among men," has not been fulfilled; why it is that man shuts up his understanding from the influences of the Spirit; why it is that Christianity has not wrought its perfect work in the world; why it is that if Christ should come, He would not find faith among us. If, upon such examination, it appears that the Christianity taught at the present day is a powerless thing, working no good in the world, it may be well to seek by new means to discover the inner truths taught by Jesus, and see if there be not a power in them to give a higher view of religion as adapted to man's necessities, and man's nature.

I have now reached the point it was necessary for me to arrive at, before I could investigate those things in Christianity which can be communicated by word of mouth; for, as I have already said, there are things in it which can be so taught.

MR. ERRETT.

The gentleman says he has now erected a standard of criticism by which the audience may judge of the correctness of our views concerning the teachings of Christ, when we submit them. I humbly submit that he is mistaken. How can you tell whether our views are right or wrong unless you have the same inspiration in the reception of Christ's teachings that he had in imparting them? We cannot lift you up, you know, even in the slightest degree above the plane of your present enlightenment. We may perhaps let you down, but elevation, by my friend's theory, is impossible. We have not the power to put you into "*rapport*" with Deity. When we have done, you must remember that you can not have heard a single spiritual truth from either of us, unless you had all the "elements" of spiritual truth in your minds, and in that case you would not need to learn from us, for you would have it all within yourselves! My friend can hardly talk with consistency of *investigating* the teachings of an *inspired* person.

Facts, says the gentleman, may be received upon authority, but not truths. But if the truth be really contained in the fact, you get both truth and fact from authority. Till you can divorce the *fact* from authority, you cannot divorce the *truth* from authority. This is not saying we must take as truth whatever is told us; we are to exercise all the powers of mind God has given us, in determining what are the facts *and* the truth. We are to judge from the testimony,—the evidence,—and when we have judged carefully what the facts are, we may safely take all that is contained in them.

Again he says, Truth may be conveyed without language. *How does he know?* How does any one know that he has conveyed a truth to another mind, even though it be in "*rapport*" with it? They can only tell by receiving it back in words from the one to whom they gave it. How then can you tell that it was not *thought* in words originally, and given in words? To say that truth is conveyed without the utterance of words falling upon the ear, is a very different thing from affirming that it is conveyed without the means or aid of words at all. I know the gentleman makes a distinction between things close about us, and those which are far away, beyond the ken of our senses. But if such things are conveyed to us through mediums by spiritual intelligences, how do they convey them but in words, for the mediums speak

them out in words, and some of the language they use we may freely admit no mortal would think of employing. I have found some things in their books which are not like any thing in the heavens above nor the earth beneath, and of which I am so unfortunate as to be unable to obtain the most imperfect idea.

There are some other points in the gentleman's philosophy which will come up later in the discussion, and which it is unnecessary to notice now, since they can be better attended to hereafter. At present I shall content myself with noticing two or three things.

We are told that any verbal prayer addressed to God, objectively considered, is idolatrous. The gentleman has also said that the apostles did not receive the inspiration of the Spirit during the personal stay of Christ with them, and therefore in their uninspired minds their ideas of God would necessarily be objective and finite, and their prayers to Him idolatrous. Yet while Jesus was with them, and while, by my friend's doctrine, he must have known that their prayers would be idolatrous, he taught them to pray, and to pray *in words*,—*verbal prayer*. He told them, "When ye pray, say, 'Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name.'" Did he then teach them to do that which was either wicked idolatry, or unmeaning nonsense? Was it to them the same as if he had used the jargon of Modern Spiritualism, and taught them to say, "O, great positive mind, inhabiting the great vortex! Hallowed be electricity, magnetism, and od force!" mingling words without meaning? Was such teaching consistent even with the gentleman's idea of Jesus, as merely an inspired man?

I cannot wonder that the gentleman objects to prayers, even the Lord's prayer, for in that simple petition, every child who is taught it at its mother's knee, has a safeguard against such fearful delusions as these which are sweeping across our land. It was that prayer, so taught, which John Randolph said was all that saved him from the blighting influences of French infidelity. Alas! all the men of pure and profound piety, who have blessed the world by their labors, were but poor, ignorant idolaters! They trusted in a falsehood, and all their piety sprang from a lie! I shall not now inquire into the pretended philosophy upon which such conclusions rest,—I am only reducing them to an absurdity, by showing to what end they lead.

I now wish to submit a few more thoughts with regard to the phenomena of Spiritualism. I know the audience has been waiting to hear something which might have some direct reference to the question, and that they would go home as wise as they came, so far as Spiritualism is concerned, if we went on forever with abstruse disquisitions.

In entering into an examination of the phenomena, I wish first

to call attention to the fact, that *a large portion of them are regarded by spiritualists themselves as entirely unreliable.*

In proof of this assertion, I shall read from the "Present Age," a work written by Andrew Jackson Davis, *since* he became a spiritualist. On page 184, he says :

"The spiritual manifestations will come to a CRISIS very soon, and be rejected *in toto* for their worthlessness and transcendent absurdity, unless media and spiritualists generally consent to conduct themselves more in harmony with a comprehensive reason, and the principles of a universally applicable philosophy."

Was there ever such a thing said about the phenomena connected with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth? But this is said of Modern Spiritualism by the "Poughkeepsie Seer and Clairvoyant," since he was lifted up to an appreciation of the wonderful truths of Spiritualism.

I turn now to the 196th page of the same book. Speaking of "impressional media" he says, "From this source there is now flowing into the world a mass of literature—a strange combination of prose and so-called poetic verbiage—which, it seems to me, the world might easily progress without receiving. Undeveloped spirits, still sectarian and in bondage to earth-life doctrines, taking advantage of the passivity of certain correspondingly organized and conditioned media, become authors, and publish to the world with an authoritative emphasis, a species of literature absolutely no better than the majority of sermons and religious tracts which are constantly showered upon North American communities. *And yet we welcome it!* It is all *liberalizing*, generalizing, universalizing in its effect."

He welcomes all the nonsense, absurdity, and littleness, although he believes the world might easily progress without receiving it! It is all liberalizing and universalizing in its effect! He goes on, "When the reader conceives of the almost endless contrariety of media, and realizes the multitudinous phenomena of various degree and import, which so many different channels are constantly engaged in unfolding to the world, he will have but 'little difficulty in reconciling to his mind the causes of numerous contradictions. Now there flows into my mind'—*flows into his mind*: this, I suppose, is something received without words, according to the principles which have been elaborated here. You see it has all been revealed to Mr. Davis;—it won't do for my friend to repudiate him. "Now there flows into my mind a classification of the various causes of spiritual incongruities." He then gives a classification of the causes under seven heads, making six per cent. of the phenomena referable to voluntary deception, fifty-four per cent. are referred to various natural and physiological causes, and *only forty per cent. to departed spirits!* He says, "Moved by the above unpremeditated, and, therefore, *unexpected* classifica-

tion, I affirm that, when the unprejudiced eye scans the whole field, occupied by these wonderful developments, the mind can not resist the conclusion that full forty per cent. of all and every description of the manifestations are truly spiritually originated; that about thirty per cent. is epidemical psychology; about twenty-five per cent. sympathy and misapprehension; and the remainder, six per cent. is simple deception or voluntary imitation, by persons fond of attention and approbation." Sixty per cent., therefore, of the so-called manifestations are utterly false; and are these phenomena what we are to compare with those of Christ's mission? His admissions are pretty well for the *guesses* of a spiritualist on the subject, but I can not help fancying that if the facts were carefully sifted, far more than six per cent. would be found to be voluntary deception. Now my friend Tiffany is reported as saying in his Cleveland debate, page 34, with regard to those which are real phenomena, "*These phenomena, though full of contradictions, of absurdity, of puerility, all indicate the law of their plane, and demonstrate the source from which they come.*"

Sixty per cent. gone by the board as not spiritual manifestations at all, and the remaining forty per cent. full of puerility and absurdity! How can he pretend, then, that they are identical with the phenomena and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth? These are the matters the people of this community want to understand. Their confidence has been asked for these phenomena, and it has been demanded of them that they should explain them or receive them as coming from a higher power. They wish us to come directly to these things, and do something toward solving the character of these phenomena. Remember, I have not been reading statements of my own, I have been reading admissions of spiritualists. The phenomena are full of puerilities, full of contradictions, and yet identical phenomena and teachings with those of Jesus Christ!

I will now read a short extract or two from the "Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse," by the same author, upon the means of communication by raps and sounds. He declares, on page 26, that it is by means of "organic electricity" very "refined and attenuated." "It is a species of spiritual exhalation, which, when the mind is constantly and vigorously exercised, is rapidly drawn to the cerebrum to sustain the mental action; but in the absence of deep mental activity, these electrical elements flow down from the brain to the nerves, and into all the infinite ramifications of the nerves, and thence into the atmosphere which we breathe. Whenever the minds of the mediums were unduly excited, the sounds, and consequently the spiritual communications, *would suddenly cease.*" Upon the next page he refers the phenomena to the same causes, saying, "They can not, it is true, come in immediate contact with gross substances; but they *can* and do act

upon them with powerful effect, through the agency of *magnetism* and *electricity*.

Thus we have given from their own authorities the cause and mode of performing their manifestations; a cause certainly very different from that assigned by Jesus of Nazareth for His miracles.

SECOND DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—The first proposition which I wish to bring before your minds this morning, as applicable to our investigation of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, is that which regards the omniscience, the omnipotence, and omnipresence of the Divine Father. You will remember the proposition; it is the eighth in the series I have laid down.

I remarked yesterday that the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, in regard to the Divine Father and religion, were different from those of any one who had preceded him, and different, perhaps, from those of any one who succeeded him, unless we have derived our teachings from the same source.

All religions from paganism upward, taught that God was an objective being, and that the human race sustained objective relations to him, and hence all their theological speculations were based upon the hypothesis that Deity was thus an object, and the subject of influences with respect to man; and hence that man had power to exert an influence upon the mind and action of God himself. Jesus of Nazareth, however, in his teachings, affirmed and exemplified a proposition entirely opposite. The difference between idolatry and true Christianity is, that the latter, properly understood, teaches the utter unobjectiveness of Deity. To suppose that God becomes the subject of influences from the universe in whole or in part, so as to change his condition of mind or action, is to render finite the Infinite and Perfect. To suppose that man can do any thing to affect the Divine mind objectively, is to render God the subject of outward influences and make him finite. You may call this metaphysics or what you will, but the truth remains, and all who think must acknowledge it.

To suppose that I have power to please or displease Deity by the course which I pursue, and that I have power thus to originate thoughts, feelings, and actions in him, is to make him to that extent responsible and subject to me; and, in that case, whether he shall be pleased or displeased, depends, not upon himself, but upon me, and upon conduct originating in my will.

Here is a fundamental error, in not distinguishing between the subjective and objective in respect to the Infinite and Perfect; for if He be the Perfect and Infinite in every respect, he cannot be subject to influences. A doctrine which supposes that he can, only leads into gross error and falsehood, and cannot prepare the mind of man for the reception of natural or spiritual truth.

Christ's position was different from this. He taught that the Father loves all. The Divine love is universal and perfect. Friend is loved as well as foe, to use terms which have only a modified application to the Divine. Christ also taught that he who would become the child of the Divine Father, must come into the same state of mind, and love not longer objectively, but from the innermost soul love all alike. Christ said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." (Matt. v: 43-45.)

You understand by the idea of being a child, that one is begotten in the likeness of the father; we are to become the children of our Father in heaven who dispenses the blessings of sunshine and shower alike upon the evil and the good. "For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?" Therefore, to make God love only those that love Him, is to make Him a publican in character. "And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Here, in this simple declaration, we have, in as high and figurative language as Christ could use, His representation of the universal and unobjective love of the Divine Father. No form of language could convey that thought better than the words He used.

God's love is as wide and as universal as the universe itself!

I propose therefore to investigate this grand proposition, and see how much is included in it.

1. In the first place, it denies that the character of an individual has any thing to do with the state of the Divine affection or love: and hence,

2. If there be any results of consequence, which will follow from a change of character, it is not because there is a change in the Divine mind, but because of the change in the individual himself.

3. Instead of making man look upon God as one who can be made angry or pleased, this doctrine calls his attention home to himself. The question is solely with regard to your own state or condition; all turns upon that. If you are in the plane of Divine blessing, you will receive all the blessings pertaining to that plane, no matter what be your character; the wicked and the righteous alike receive the natural blessings which flow from His love. Whether your fields shall bring forth their fruit in their season does not depend upon your belonging to the church. The

Divine Father's blessings are infinite and universal, bestowing themselves upon all who come within their reach.

This is the doctrine of Christ. If you are lustful, false, and selfish, and do not receive the blessings which pertain to the plane of the just, the good, and the loving, that is not God's fault; it is because the blessings of justice, love, and goodness, can only be known in their appropriate plane; and when you live in the plane of selfishness and falsehood, you can not receive the blessings of a higher plane. The doctrine simply predicates of God, this;—that He is infinite and unchangeable, and His blessings are offered to all who will come to receive them. His love is illustrated by the figure of the sunshine. The sun does not shine objectively; it shines forth into space whether there be a planet to receive its rays or not, and it will illuminate whatever comes within the reach of those rays, and all will receive the benefit of its light and heat, who are within the scope of that light and heat. Light is the type of wisdom, and heat is the type of love, as we shall have occasion to demonstrate, and God is no more objective in His wisdom and love, than is the sun in its light and heat. Take us away, we are told, and the sun would cease to shine! It would cease to shine *to us*, but the great luminary itself would still be there, shining in all its glory. The cloud does not choose whether its drops shall fall upon the fruitful field or the barren rock. The dews do not distil objectively;—all within the range of the law by which they are deposited, receives the full benefit of their influence. I may plant my field, and then I have done what I can do; but the rains will fall none the more or less; the dews will descend none the more or less; the sun will shine none the more or less! Christ, then, used the figure to express the idea that God does not love objectively; to teach that you and I have not the power to please or displease God objectively, and that our happiness depends entirely upon our own state and condition of mind and heart. Christ laid the axe at the root of the idolatry which had been prevalent before His coming.

The universe exists in phenomena, relation, and essence; but unless I possess a faculty by which to perceive its existence, I am none the wiser:—this desk is none the wiser because God is, and the universe is! All turns upon the power to perceive, and wisdom will be according to the truth of the perception. If the mental representation of a thing is false, the idea of it is false; hence, I must see to it that there is no conflict between what I perceive, and what *is*. It is my business to harmonize good and evil; to make it appear how evil exists in harmony with omnipotence and omniscience—with all the perfections of God. We can not show it by making the Divine, a finite and objective being. The difference between what is commonly called idolatry, and that which I have declared to be such, is, that in the former case a graven

material image is set up for worship, and in the latter the object of adoration is a mental image. Both classes of idolaters worship a being other than the great omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent Divine One, — the true God! If Jesus Christ had taught to worship an objective being, He would have taught a falsehood; but He taught no such thing.

Another proposition comes in here with propriety. Whatever the human mind contemplates objectively, it finites and limits. Let my friend deny this if he can. No matter whether it be the physical or the mental universe, either is made finite by objective contemplation. To contemplate the Divine Being as an *object* of religious worship, is to make Him finite, and such objective worship must itself be false. Hence, verbal prayer, according to the usual manner of praying, when it is interpreted by the understanding as an address to an objective being, is idolatrous and false.

MR. ERRETT. If, then, a man prays without understanding, I suppose it must be right and true!

MR. TIFFANY. If you choose to make that inference, I will take care of it. I will test my proposition in any way my friend chooses. He may make a prayer if he will, and he need not address it to *odid force* either; that might be as idolatrous as any other; but by any example he chooses to give, we will see if you can pray to an objective being without being guilty of idolatry. I shall take up Christ's prayers and analyze them, and see if they were objective — see whether "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us," means, "We wish thee to change thy state of mind towards us, as we change our feelings and state of mind toward others."

MR. ERRETT.

I wonder if the audience has any idea that we are discussing a definite question! Does any person who has heard my friend's speeches have the slightest idea that we are professing to examine the phenomena and teachings of *Modern Spiritualism*, and their claims to identity of character with those of Jesus of Nazareth? The gentleman has made six speeches, and he has not, as yet, so much as offered a *definition* of Modern Spiritualism, nor, from any thing he has said to-day or yesterday, would any one suppose he had any thing whatever to do with such a subject. He attempted a definition of Religion, and could he not do the same for Spiritualism? or is it so infinitely sublimated that the mind of man can get no idea of it! There is something called Spiritualism; it is a *fact*, and being a fact it is capable of being reached by the human mind, and of being defined. When I read yesterday from well known spiritual books, the gentleman said the books I have produced here are not Spiritualism! If he is cor-

rect, one of the books at least has a lie printed upon the outside and inside, for it professes to be "*Spiritualism*, by John W. Edmonds, and George T. Dexter, M. D." Now, whether you will believe Mr. Tiffany or Judge Edmonds, depends, I suppose, upon whether you are more in *rappor*t with him or the Judge. I said, we must try to find out what Spiritualism is from the writings of spiritualists, which they have sent out into the world to spread their doctrines; but the gentleman swept all this away, as the private notions of the writers, Davis, Edmonds, Dexter, and the rest. How, then, in the name of common sense, can we ever reach a point where we can form any idea of each other's position! Dr. Dexter and Judge Edmonds have *prayers* in their book,—recorded *verbal* prayers; yet these verbal prayers are, according to my friend, objective, false, and idolatrous! I wish the gentleman to tell us what Spiritualism is, and then we can take issue.

He talks about subjective and objective truth, as if there could be subjective truth where there is no objective truth. If a thing has never been before us objectively, how can it ever come into the mind subjectively? And if the subjective truth be our perception of the objective reality, how can it be any thing more than the objective itself was? If there can be subjective truth without a corresponding objective, the gentleman might imagine a pair of subjective stairs from the window, when he goes to dinner, and try if they would answer his purpose as well as the objective ones in the hall!

He says our petitions to our Father must not be objectively, but subjectively made: but cannot the Father hear and answer the petitions of his child and be influenced by them, and his conduct still be based upon infinite and immutable principles? We shall see by and by.

The ideas the disciples of Christ had of God, were received by teaching. I will read a moment from the 11th chapter of Matthew, v. 25. "At that time Jesus answered and said,"—it was *verbal* prayer, therefore,—“I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.” I wish the gentleman would inform us whether Jesus Christ had an infinite mind or not, when he offered this prayer, and whether he had the capacity to take in the infinite and comprehend the ideas in the mind of God; for the Saviour goes on to say—“All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” How, I would ask, by the gentleman's theory, could the Son reveal the Father? Did he mesmerize the people and make them pass into

that extraordinary state in which "only one in seventy-five millions" could get? In the 17th chapter of John is another prayer that was offered *verbally—spoken in words*—and which must be absolutely idolatrous by my friend's principles. I will read only that short portion of it which refers to the ideas of God obtained by the apostles, whilst they had only their natural understanding, for I believe the gentleman holds that they did not become inspired till the day of Pentecost (v. 3, &c.). "And this is *life eternal, that they might know thee* the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Again (v. 6)—"I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee; for I have given unto them the *words* which thou gavest me; and they have *received them*, and have *known surely* that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me."

All that the apostles knew, therefore, they received from the teachings which Jesus communicated to them by means of *words*; it was the result of his communication with their minds by means of *human language*, and in that language he both prayed for them, and taught them to pray. But, according to my friend's position, if the ideas which the apostles had were not perfect, their prayers were idolatry, and their thoughts of God false! Who can believe that! Every imperfect idea of Deity is idolatrous; but, since finite minds cannot comprehend the infinite, every conception of the Deity, in every finite mind, is idolatrous—those of my friend among the rest—unless perchance he claims something like infinity! Indeed, I am not sure what he will claim before he gets through.

He said, God could not be influenced. Does he mean by that, that God will always do the same things, or only that He always is governed by the same principles? Which is his idea of immutability? If the last, I shall not differ from him. I claim that a being may act upon unchanging principles, and yet may, nay *must*, change his course of action in accordance with circumstances. The immutable principles of God's government may not permit Him to bestow certain gifts upon selfish sinners;—repentance, contrition, and *humble supplication*, may be the conditions of obtaining certain blessings, and when these conditions are complied with, the same immutable principles may demand that He should bestow what they made Him withhold before.

But to return to the "teachings of Spiritualism." I shall next show that Spiritualism makes man a mere machine, utterly without responsibility for his actions, and since the teachings of Jesus are every where full of the opposite doctrine,—that of man's responsibility to his God for every thought, word, and act,

it must be manifest that the two systems can not be identical. I do not wonder that the more sensible of my spiritualist friends do not like these books, for they are, too manifestly, as full of nonsense and falsehood as they can be crammed; but until the gentleman consents to fix some standard by which we can fairly judge what is Spiritualism, no one can blame me for looking in the "*Great Harmonia*" for it. I read from the second volume of that work, page 212. Speaking of the formidable array of authorities in favor of man's freedom of will, he says, "I am nevertheless impressed to enter the field against them, and demonstrate the fallacy of their decisions, by proving (as far as a negative is susceptible of proof) that *man is, in every possible sense, a being of necessity*—a depending and necessary part of the universal whole." This, mind you, was said when he was in that exalted condition to which only "one in seventy-five millions" can reach, and as there are not seventy-five millions in this country, it is natural to conclude that my friend here is crowded out, and Mr. Davis is so far above him, that he must be careful how he is so presumptuous as to despise his authority! The spirits are teaching *facts* now, the facts of man's mental and moral nature, and these, you know, "may be received upon authority." Upon page 215, Mr. Davis attempts to lighten the shock his blow at man's responsibility would give, and therefore explains that there may be a "kind of responsibility," and what would you think it is? why, "it is summed up in the simple statement, that we expect or require of every thing a continual manifestation or representation of its characteristic power and abilities. Thus we expect (and therefore *require*) certain odors from the violet, the rose, the strawberry, and the peach; and *this is the kind of RESPONSIBILITY* which all individualities should be expected to sustain!!" As much responsibility for your conduct as a strawberry has for its flavor, and no more! A most singular "kind of responsibility," truly. Once more, on the 216th page of Mr. Davis' "*Present Age*," we read, "Man is just what his organization compels him to be. * * * Thus, for illustration, in one set of circumstances, one child may advance rapidly toward genius, glory, honor, and emolument, while his brother, with a *different shaped head*, and a different combination of temperaments, may, *under the same circumstances*, become a dejected misanthrope, or an accomplished villain. In either instance, the inmost nature or essence is not corrupted; it is *still pure and immaculate—tending*, like the fragrance of flowers, *toward heaven*." My friend may as well throw responsibility upon a strawberry, therefore, as upon man, and all the talk about our responsibility to worship God, subjectively or objectively, purely or idolatrously, means just nothing at all, Spiritualism itself being judge.

We are told that Christ taught that God loved all alike:—

what does the sentence of the Great Judge mean, when he says, "Depart, ye cursed?" Was it not represented by Jesus as the *Divine* sentence; and will my friend say it means precisely the same as "Come, ye blessed?" If it were so, they were certainly very different ways of expressing an identical emotion,—the same love! Again, Christ says, "If any man love me, he will keep my sayings, and he shall be loved of my Father,"—that is, as he would not otherwise be loved, and the result was to be—"we will come unto him, and we will take up our abode with him." All this, it will be seen, is made the result of the change in man; man loves the Son, and the Father *comes*. No matter what is meant by the coming, it necessarily implies some change in God's action with respect to the man, in view of the previous change in man's heart. You cannot get away from it; no such proposition as that "the immutable cannot be changed" will help the case. Immutability in *phenomena* cannot be predicated of a living, conscious, soul; immutability in essence, in character, in principles of action, is what belongs to Him, and we show that under various circumstances, the very immutability of the principle makes a change of action necessary. There is, therefore, an influence exerted by man upon the Infinite, and exerted without infringing upon God's immutability in any rational sense. Jesus Christ was "one with the Father," yet he loved some more than others, and "having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." (John xiii: 1.) And unless there be some difference of sentiment in God's feelings toward the holy and the sinful, what means this passage, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii: 36.) To make the "wrath of God" identical with the "love of God," is to take away meaning from language. The difference is too obvious to be denied or overlooked.

The gentleman told us in his "first proposition" that man's belief in any proposition must correspond to his perception of it. Well—if a fact is an existence, as the gentleman says, then, since God exists, God is a fact, and our belief in the fact corresponding with our perception of it, and our faculty of perception being finite, we must necessarily, according to my friend's own philosophy, have a limited and finite perception of God,—the subjective perception and belief being absolutely determined by the objective fact *as perceived*; and my friend must therefore deny God's existence at all, or admit that he has an *objective* existence.

Again, my friend admits that facts can be received upon authority; that is, upon testimony. But if God has made a revelation to the human race, that existing revelation is a fact, and can be received upon sufficient testimony or evidence, just as any other fact can be.

I call attention to these points, because in his argument this morning the gentleman has utterly ignored all these admissions that he has made before, and proceeded upon another basis entirely.

He asks me for a prayer, and promises to prove it idolatrous, if it is *understood* according to its natural language by the person using it. I will simply propound to him the question, whether when our Lord taught his disciples to pray, and to *say*, "Our Father which art in heaven," he taught them to say it according to the obvious understanding and meaning of the words or not?

MR. TIFFANY.

I regret that my friend does not succeed in getting a better idea and understanding of these propositions. However, it is his part to understand as well as he can. He begins by complaining that I do not touch the question under discussion. Now, whether he thinks he has ground for that complaint I don't know: charity says he must believe so. If I show what the teachings of Jesus were, according to the propositions I have laid down, I am going directly to the purpose before us. If my propositions are true, my conclusions must follow as a matter of course. My first business was to take these propositions and show by them what were the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and these being shown, I should compare them with those of Spiritualism. If my friend does not see my point now, I must ask him to be patient and he shall see it. He may be too late in seeing, but he shall see it.

The sect to which my friend belongs, and which I am to prove Anti-Christ before I get through, say they have no creed but the Bible, and I am taking notes, a little, of my friend's ideas of the interpretation of the Bible, and he will find them coming up to trouble him after a while.

He says, God may be compelled to change his position. Away with such a God from my ideas of the universe! Talk not to me of compelling the Omnipotent! But such, it seems, is the doctrine of my friend and his sect. As to the "wrath of God," I will attend to the explanation of that when I come to the doctrine of eternal punishment. I will simply ask the question here, does God *feel* different when he is pleased and when he is angry.

He says he does not believe in any such idea of the infinity and immutability of God, as would prevent him from changing. He had better look a little closer to his Scotch metaphysics that have been exploded so long. If the *law* is supposed to be fixed and immutable, he argues that the product must be so considered also. Then you might say that because the laws which control the weather are fixed, the weather itself is unchangeable.

He quotes from Davis, to show that man is a machine. But

Davis refers to man in his present condition, simply as a creature of circumstances. There is a point which he may reach, when he is raised above the influences Davis refers to. That higher position, in which man comes into such relations to his fellows and the universe as to have the highest sense of responsibility, will come up for examination by and by.

If God be really subject to influences from all outward circumstances, as my friend declares, and if he is made angry by all who oppose him, I can only say he must have a hard time of it. No,—the language of Jesus of Nazareth is not used to convey the idea that God is literally angry, and literally changed. If the gentleman will refer to some of my earlier propositions, he will remember that it has been shown that Jesus (I speak of him now simply as *teacher*, and therefore say, Jesus) taught that we must love every one without regard to their character, and we must do so that we may be like God, for God does so—"that ye may be the children of your Father."

My friend says that if we cannot perceive a thing here, subjectively, without first perceiving it objectively, neither can we perceive God subjectively without first perceiving him also objectively. That is a strange conclusion. I am finite; the things about me are finite, and therefore *objects*; but is God an object? the infinite, the omnipresent, an object? Try your metaphysics and see if you can make the infinite an object. The objective is limited and finite, and when you objectify the infinite, it is no longer infinite.

I take another position; namely, that the things of the infinite cannot be brought down into the sense of the finite, and words cannot be fashioned so as to represent in any degree the infinite. Hence, if man is to get any conception of the infinite, he must first get that nature of which it is said, "thou canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth."

* I come now to the subject of prayer. I can only say that if prayer be necessary to our condition here, without which we can not progress in spiritual things, and obtain from God the favors we need, how comes it that it was so long before Jesus taught his disciples to pray? It was not till they came and *asked* him to teach them as John also taught his disciples, and he had then been with them from ten to fifteen months, by any chronology you can make. The reason is perfectly obvious to any mind which is capable of investigating the objects of Christ's mission. The truth was that the disciples were ignorant men, Jews, educated in the Jewish religion, having the Jewish ideas of God, which were all objective, and of which Paul said they were ideas of "no God." Christ had not to teach them the idea of a God, for that they had already; but the idea of the "living and true God." Now he could teach them no faster than they were qualified for

his instructions, and their teaching must be in a manner more or less according to their existing ideas. Their ideas were that God was an angry and vengeful God, and this seems to be my friend's idea also;—he is a Jew in this respect. Now, to teach them high and spiritual things, Christ had first to raise them up out of the plane of their self-love,—the plane of the first covenant, which made God a selfish being. Christ was not responsible for their believing so, nor for their ceasing to believe so; for, although he knew the truth, they had not an ear to hear it, and he said to them once, as to others, "how is it that ye cannot understand my speech?—because ye cannot hear my words." He was talking in their presence, and was accused of blasphemy, hunted, and stoned for the doctrine he taught! Yet they could not hear his words, and when Peter recognized him as the Christ, he said, "see thou tell no man of it." Why was this? When he sent them out to preach, why did he tell them to preach the coming of the kingdom of heaven, and not the kingdom of heaven already come? Why did he thus restrict them? The reason is obvious enough. My friend will not deny that these disciples understood the kingdom of heaven to be a temporal kingdom, and Jesus to be a temporal prince, and when he went up to Jerusalem amid the shoutings and hosannahs to the son of David, with garments and branches of trees strewed in the way, that he was going to take possession of his temporal kingdom. They thought, as they said after his death, that it was he who should have redeemed Israel. The women who went to embalm his body at the sepulchre, did not expect to find him alive, neither did the disciples believe it when they were told, and had even *seen* him; for they thought they had seen a spirit. Thomas refused for a whole week to believe, and demanded physical demonstration. He must put his hand into the hole in his side, and his finger into the prints of the nails. If natural language could have conveyed to their minds the difference between the true and false worship of God, do not tell me that Jesus of Nazareth would have been with them instructing them privately for three years, and then left them in such ignorance as that! When Christ was foretelling to them the things which should come upon them, and for which sorrow was filling their hearts, he said, "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth, It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." (John xvi: 7.) Why could not the Comforter come? I say, all these things indicate that natural language was not competent to convey the true spiritual idea; they must have a spiritual influence impressing it directly upon their consciousness. Christ had the idea, and he had language; but the possibility of conveying the idea depended upon the advancement of the disciples' minds, and their ability to comprehend. It was

because they lacked this power, which they were to receive when the Spirit of God should come to them, that Christ was forced to adapt his language to their comprehension, and speak in parables and figures. He told them there was before them a time of trial and tribulation, as "a woman when she is in travail hath sorrow because her hour is come; but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world" (John xvi: 21); and so they would have their joy when their suffering was past, and the Spirit of truth had come to illuminate them, and make them comprehend the meaning of what he had said to them.

So when he spoke of prayer, he referred, not to the effect prayer was to have upon God, but to its effect upon themselves. Thus when he put in the conditional petition, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us," and again in the passage, "if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Matt. v: 23, 24); it is perfectly clear that he meant, that we are to examine our own condition, and unless we find it in harmony with the Divine harmony, peace, goodness, and love, we are not to think that we can make an acceptable offering, or have the Divine blessings flow into our souls. As we hope to be in harmony with God, so as to receive the love and life-giving influences of his love-sphere, we must be like him, having our love flow out upon all beings alike, without respect to their character or condition toward us. If we hate an enemy, it brings us into the plane of hate, and we can not receive the blessings of love, unless we come into the plane of love, ourselves. To be unjust, unkind, or wicked in any respect, is to deprive ourselves of the power to receive the purity and love of God into our souls. Christ said again, "As ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me," that is, as is your state of heart toward men, so will be your state toward God. That was his meaning; and therefore, whatever language he used expressive of repentance toward God, or of any change in God's attitude toward man, was used as a figure of speech, to represent the change necessary in the state of man, in order that he may receive the blessings which are constantly radiating from the Divine.

What is implied in forgiveness? I am supposed to have done you an injury, and come and ask your pardon. This implies that I myself see, and desire to have you know that I see, my error and folly, and that I come into the same state with reference to you, that I occupied before I injured you.

MR. ERRETT.

Have the audience learned yet what *Spiritualism* is? If the people really want metaphysics, I shall presume to say that I can go as deeply into that, as my friend can. But I am very confident that you wish no such thing, and that you will agree with me that a fight of the kind which the people can know nothing of but the roar of the *artillery*, is of little real consequence. The gentleman succeeds better in preaching than in discussing Spiritualism. When he talks upon the practical moral duties of loving our neighbor, &c., he says many things with which we can all heartily agree. But still, I could not see any full explanation of the Lord's prayer, and its petitions for favors and blessings, for forgiveness and for food. If he gave one I could not understand it, and it must have been above the plane of my understanding, and by his doctrine, it would be in vain for me to try to get above that. By his doctrine, I insist that the disciples could never learn any thing more of God than they knew at first. He says it took Christ a long time in his course of instruction to bring them up to the point where they could be taught to pray; and yet, only yesterday, he told us those same disciples were left, at Christ's death, just where they were when he began with them.

MR. TIFFANY. I said, ignorant of the true nature of his mission.

MR. ERRETT. But you said they could not be instructed in spiritual truth, unless they had the elements of spiritual ideas in their minds.

MR. TIFFANY. I said that spiritual truths, which are peculiarly such, must be taught by being directly impressed upon the mind.

MR. ERRETT. Tell me, then, whether the truths taught in the Lord's prayer are spiritual or merely scientific truths. If spiritual, the disciples would, by the gentleman's position, be unfit to receive them, and Christ was wasting his time in trying to teach them. They needed the same inspiration to receive the truth, which Christ used in imparting it, and since my friend holds that when Christ taught them that prayer, they lacked the inspiration, they could not understand it, and the Lord must have been teaching them idolatry. Either the natural understanding of the prayer, the *verbal* prayer, was sufficient to save them from idolatry, or they had the same inspiration which Christ had, or they were taught idolatry by him. Both the former propositions my friend denies, and therefore he can not escape the last.

He says I used the expression that God is compelled to change. If I used it unqualifiedly, it may have been an ill-chosen expression, but my idea was clear; I meant to express the contrast between my friend's position and my own. He says God *can not* change under any circumstances;—I say God *can not but* change under some circumstances, and my expression is less

antagonistic to the idea of God's freedom than his, as I have already shown. But take the extremest expression of the necessity of God's actions, and I will show from leading spiritualists that they hold to it in its most ultra and absolute form. I know that, to my friend's taste, quotations from spiritualists can not compare with metaphysics, but in their mixture of materialism with idealism, they are part physics and part metaphysics, and I shall take the privilege of going into them for that purpose before we get through with the subject.

The gentleman quoted a passage upon which I corrected him yesterday, and I shall correct him again. He said that Jesus spoke to his disciples in parables, in accommodation to their weakness. I said he told them no such thing, and to close the matter, I will carefully read the passage itself. It is in the 13th chapter of Matthew, and commences at the 10th verse. "And the disciples came and said unto him, Why speakest thou to them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Here it is exactly the contrary of my friend's assertion. The parables were to "*them*," the great multitudes; but unto "*you*," the disciples, *it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven*; and again, after giving the reasons for so speaking to the multitudes, he continues (v. 16)—"*But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear; and still again (v. 18), 'Hear ye therefore the parable,' &c., and then follows the explanation. So far from using the parable by way of accommodation to the weak intellect, he distinctly asserts that he used it to make the thing obscure to the men of 'gross hearts,' who were trifling with the truth, and he took great pains to explain it to the disciples. The gentleman refers me to another passage in John xvi: 25. 'These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs.' Does he mean that the Saviour taught in proverbs while with the disciples, and that these things were explained to them afterward?*

MR. TIFFANY. So he says.

MR. ERRETT. Well, let us read on in the 29th verse: "*His disciples said unto him, 'Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest now proverb. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things,' &c.*"

MR. TIFFANY. Read on further.

MR. ERRETT. I have read all I consider applicable, and the gentleman may take it up there, in his argument, and we will see how he answers the objections. I hope he will either quote the Scripture rightly, and abide by it, or leave off pretending to reverence its teachings, and take open ground against it.

He told us that fact was existence, and truth, the conscious perception of existence. I have shown that by these definitions

he makes God a fact, and as such, objective and finite, by his own principles. In this, at least, he agrees with Andrew Jackson Davis, for he also makes God a fact. He told us further, that facts can be received upon authority. I have showed the inconsistency of the conclusions he must draw from these propositions, and have claimed that the chain of his argument is completely broken, but he has not attempted an answer.

Again, he told us that no spiritual truth could be comprehended, till the elements of that truth were in the mind. I have demanded what were the elements of such truth, and by what criteria we can judge whether the disciples possessed them, while Christ was with them. Still no answer—only repetitions of propositions, such as that truth is a conscious perception of existence. We have not only got to perceive a perception, as I have shown already, but we must first *perceive the elements of a perception!* I begin to have an *internal feeling* that we must be upon the borders of Spiritualism, if not within them.

As an illustration of his proposition concerning the impartation of truth by direct impression upon the consciousness, without language or a medium of any kind, he gave us the example of a blind man thus receiving notions of light and color by *rapport* with one possessing sight. I asked how he *knew* this could be done, except as the person tells him of it again, and then the only evidence you have that the blind man possesses the idea of light, is by his use of the word "light." His point is not proven, therefore; for in such a way he could only show that the blind man has the word "light," and he may be entirely destitute of the idea. I may safely defy him to prove the possibility of such a fact in any way. If he should impress upon the consciousness of any of you some new idea, it would only be evidence to the single individual, for signs or words would be necessary to enable that individual to make known the experience to us, and so, nothing short of a separate demonstration upon the consciousness of each of us, would answer his purpose.

He is constantly making the assumption that his proposition concerning the same inspiration being needed to receive as to impart truth, is unassailed. I have shown it to be false by the example of Christ himself. He said, by the way, that Jesus meant teacher. I beg his pardon; the word does not mean teacher.

MR. TIFFANY. The word means Saviour.

MR. ERRETT. Yes, sir, it means Saviour, and that is quite a different thing from teacher, and although there is a great and important difference between the offices of Jesus Christ, indicated by his different names, the office of simple *teacher* is not the whole of either of them, as I shall show if I have occasion. But the particular point before us is, to determine what use there was in

Christ's mission, if his disciples had not the means of understanding his spiritual teaching. It is all a perfect nullity, and there can be nothing in it which was necessary or of value, on such a hypothesis. The whole tendency must have been to lead the world astray, and now, by my friend's theory, it is necessary to bring them back by explaining entirely away the natural and obvious meaning of language which the enlightened world has for centuries agreed in interpreting, but which he proclaims that they have entirely misunderstood and falsified.

The gentleman was going to sweep me away with his terrific batteries, but unless he answers the objections I have already raised to his fundamental propositions, the execution they will do will not greatly alarm us. Indeed, I rather fancy the batteries themselves will be missing.

Religion, he tells us, can not be taught in human language; yet he gives us a definition of it in human language! How is this? By his principles, the very utterance of it is suicidal, it objectifies and utterly changes the nature of the thing. Let him tell us how he can define it, if it can not be taught in human language.

He affirms that Jesus Christ did not undertake to teach religious or spiritual truth! I hope he will enlighten us a little more fully on this point, and say whether it was natural or scientific truth that the Saviour taught, or what it was. When he taught the disciples to say, "Our Father which art in heaven," was it natural, scientific, or spiritual truth? When he taught them that they might become one with him, as he was one with the Father, was it natural, scientific, or religious truth? When he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," was it natural, scientific, or religious truth? Did he in none of these cases seek to utter religious truth? The gentleman's definition of Religion is very different from that of the "Spiritual Redeemer of the world," who was anointed and sent forth from Hartford. I know the gentleman will say, it is only Mr. Davis' notions; but our old question remains, If this is not Spiritualism, by what right does he call what he teaches, Spiritualism? Mr. Davis says (*Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse*, page 165), "Religion, in its broadest and most comprehensive sense, is the principle of righteousness which governs in harmonious concert, the world of matter and the world of mind. It is the moral and just relationship, universally existing between all men, spirits, angels, worlds, and the Deity;—in a word, it is universal justice."

Did Jesus Christ teach none of all these things? What, then, did he teach?

MR. TIFFANY.

I suppose my friend would not be willing to receive Mr. Davis as his authority, and he can not demand that I should receive him as mine. I am arguing with *him*; he may argue with Mr. Davis as long as he pleases.

As to teaching religion, I will say that there is a great difference between teaching *about* a thing, and teaching *it*. I suppose my friend would say that he has heard the Methodists teaching about religion without teaching it, and they would say the same thing of him.

We must give some attention to the things to be observed before a person can come into a condition to receive the teachings upon spiritual truths. Jesus taught what he taught as *only the way* to religion, not as religion. He said he was the *door*, not the entering in. There is a difference between the door, and the entering in by the door, and one which my friend should notice. He finds fault with my saying that a man must have the same amount of inspiration to receive a truth, as to impart it. I did not use it exactly as he puts it. In regard to Christ's teachings I used it thus;—when he taught things in the moral, relational, or intellectual sphere, his disciples could understand him; for if it require any inspiration to reveal natural truths, the mind which receives only needs as much inspiration as was necessary to reveal *that* truth, and not as much as may be necessary to understand and reveal all the other truths that are in the mind of the teacher.

I am asked how I know that man can reveal ideas to another's mind, without words. I answer, I know it as I know that the sun shines. I have done it myself, and received the impressions myself, when there was no external sound uttered, or sign made. My friend does not believe it, perhaps, but that does not alter the truth. I referred to this as one mode of making an impression upon consciousness from consciousness without language, to support my assertion of the necessity of such a means of communicating high spiritual truths.

My friend says I make God a *fact*. I have already said that I did not use the term *existence* as applicable to God in the same sense, as in my definition of *fact*. He may think it is truthful and honorable to overlook such explanations, but I demand that my arguments be fairly met. He says facts imply truths, but facts can be received upon authority, therefore truths can be also received upon authority. Wonderful logic! Meet, if you can, the proposition that truth is in the mind, only as it is perceived by the mind; and if you have truths in your mind, which it does not perceive, let us have them.

He wonders how a man can be educated, if he can not receive a truth above the plane of his unfolding. I can only say, look to your own mind. How do you learn mathematics? Do you

not expand the mind by practicing upon combinations of the ideas which you have? You make deductions from these combinations, and thus expand the mind, and give it ideas which it can use afterward in a higher plane. Does not that which enters into the body become assimilated to it, and develop the body, in its bone, its nerve, and muscle? In like manner, what enters into the mind develops it. Take these propositions, and, if you love truth, either receive them honestly, or answer and reject them fairly.

As to God's changing, I have already explained that the change is not in him, but in us. The fact is, we are unjust, and God is just; we are impure, and he is pure; and we must become just and pure before we can come out of our antagonistic position with reference to him. What makes harmony and oneness between God and man, is the change in man, not in God. This idea of God's changing to suit circumstances, and being compelled to change his plans to avoid having the Devil get the start of him, is heathenish, and will beget bigotry, intolerance, and the spirit of Satan.

I will now come to the passage my friend began to read, but did not finish. I will say first, however, that if an individual uses language properly, he makes use of such words as will come nearest to awakening the true idea. Christ told Peter when he asserted the true Messiahship of Christ, that he could not have done that unless the Spirit of God had revealed the spiritual truth to him; Paul expresses the same idea, and I say so too, and that makes three.

MR. ERRETT. I should like to see where Christ said that.

MR. TIFFANY. I will show it by and by. I stand here to prove what I say by a direct appeal to your own understanding and consciousness. Christ says, in the passage I was about to refer to, "Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave me alone!" And yet they believed him to be the Son of God, the Redeemer of Israel! The truth was, they did not believe it in the true sense, and when the sword was drawn, and Christ had commanded Peter to put up the sword, they gave up all for lost, and that same Peter turned round and swore he never had seen him. Peter's false idea was swept away in a few hours, and his faith in Christ went with it.

What was the parable? John says it was a description of his resurrection. Had that idea entered into the disciples' minds at all? Take the thing and look at it like rational men, and you will see that they did not understand.

I still affirm that in the sense I use the words, Jesus *did* leave the disciples as ignorant as he found them. He taught them merely intellectual truth. He could teach them concerning love and hate, because they had the elements of those ideas; but when

he would teach them concerning his spiritual kingdom, they could not understand. They were as firm in the persuasion that his kingdom was a temporal one, the hour before his arrest, as ever they were; and even up to the day of Pentecost, they did not know this. I will demonstrate from the Book, as well as from Spiritualism, that inspiration is progressive. There are as many degrees of unfolding in this, as in any thing. I will show that every phenomenon in the history and development of Christianity, manifests this same law.

Now to the subject of prayer, which my friend says I have not taken up. My proposition was this,—that when we attempt to address the mind, we must address it according to its power to perceive, and we must make use of such figures as the mind can understand, and as will best represent the truth we wish to communicate. If, owing to a false standard in their minds, they can not understand, the teacher is not responsible for that. Before Christ taught his disciples to pray, he told them to remember that their Heavenly Father knew what things they had need of before they asked him. Why this caution? Why also the teaching that their Heavenly Father was more willing to bestow good gifts upon them, than an earthly parent upon his children? Notice now, what are the subjects of the prayer. He reduces them to the simplest possible expression of feelings of adoration, veneration, and respect for the Omniscient, as far as they could form any conception of his being, and tries to bring it down, as it were, to their comprehension, as far as possible, so that they may gain some understanding of His character. "Hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come,"—where was to be that kingdom of Heaven, which was to be like the little leaven that leavened the three measures of meal? I was to be "*εντος*"—*within* you. There was where the temple was to be found. "Ye are God's building," God's temple, and it was into that temple of the soul man was to go to worship, not into the temple at Jerusalem, or that upon Mount Gerizim: it was upon the altar of the heart that the sacrifice was to be offered,—the incense of love and affection,—the sacrifice of the lustful nature of man was to furnish the victim. Every thing belonging to the selfish man was to be slain and offered up, and then there would be a oneness between them and the Father in the inmost soul. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us."—Hope not for forgiveness but as ye forgive! No matter how cruel, how wicked your enemies are,—if ye do not from the heart, from the inmost soul, forgive and love those that trespass against you, ye cannot come into communion with the Father, nor can his Spirit come into communion with you. The object of the petition is to teach us that as our hearts are pure, and our affections embrace both friend and foe, so shall we, being like God, have communion and peace with

him. It is then that we shall have love, confidence, trust and harmony in the presence of the Divine and the Infinite, and thus it appears that the only change is in the suppliant's own condition, and not in that of God. This is what we mean by being in harmony with God and with all the angels of the higher spheres. This it is, to be in *rapport* with a higher plane of consciousness. Thus shall you be prepared to make offerings in righteousness, and be ready for the "refiner" who shall come to burn away the dross and refine you as by fire! Then, washed and made white in the blood of the lamb, you shall be presented immaculate even in the presence of God himself! It is because you are not able to receive God into your consciousness whilst you are full of lust, impurity, and sin, that it is necessary to pray thus. The only salvation is in the perfect sanctification and purification of the soul. Christ taught us a *way* to that salvation, by coming down and beginning with us where we are, in our animal natures; leading us up out of our condition, step by step, into the moral or relational sphere; giving us the new law to love one another; to love neighbor as self,—and this once thoroughly accomplished, we may then be permitted to "come up higher" and enter into the very Paradise of God. These matters will be more fully unfolded as we proceed.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

We were informed by my friend in his last speech, that Jesus, during the three years and a half of his public ministry, did not teach Religion, but was teaching *about* Religion. There is evidently a great difficulty in this matter of teaching spiritual truth: I begin to appreciate my friend's course as he progresses in his remarks, and to enter somewhat into his feelings. He is so fully impressed with the difficulties of approaching high truths, that he apparently intends to follow the course he says Christ took, and will introduce us to *Spiritualism* by talking three years *about* it, and will probably get no further than talking *about* it, then.

He has said many things in his last speech about kindness and enmity, selfishness and love, which we all heard preached long before Modern Spiritualism was born, or Mr. Tiffany known to us. It formed a part of the common stock of religious feeling and sentiment throughout Christendom. This is not that distinct actuality known as *Spiritualism*, and therefore, again, I call for a definition of that term. Let us have it distinctly before us.

He has rejected Andrew Jackson Davis as an authority, but Jesus is, to him, no greater authority than Davis; he openly scouts all authority. But since he has admitted that true Christianity can be found, to some extent at least, in the book which

gives the life and words of Jesus, so I claim that he cannot consistently refuse to admit that true Spiritualism can be found in the writings of their most noted mediums, under the so-called inspiration of spirits.

They put "Spiritualism," as I said, in great letters upon the back of a book, and upon the title page within, and therefore I said we have a right to assume that the book contains Spiritualism, unless the contrary is proved. The mind of Davis is said to be in *rapport* with superior minds, and the professed truths and principles which he gives, are communicated, it is said, from the minds of spirits in a very high sphere, by means of the direct impression of consciousness upon consciousness, that we hear so much about. Hence there must be a transfer to his mind of all that is in the spirits' minds, and he therefore gives the very ideas or truths or falsehoods, as the case may be, that the spirits themselves possessed.

Why should I receive Mr. Tiffany as teaching Spiritualism, and reject Mr. Davis? He may repudiate Davis, and Davis may repudiate him, and they both may repudiate Judge Edmunds and Mr. Ambler, and Mr. Courtney in turn may repudiate the whole four, and they may thus eat each other up after the fashion of the Kilkenny cats, and what shall we do about it? I can not see that the gentleman's position amounts to more than this, that he repudiates every thing which does not agree with his own fancy.

I must refer, while I think of it, to another point; the gentleman was somewhat excited over my criticism of his definition of fact, and declared that he at first limited his definition so that infinity could not be included under it. He is mistaken; it was not till I took him to task on that point that he made the exception or limitation, and by so doing he destroyed his definition; it fell to the ground, and there it still remains. He must either abandon his definition, or admit, that according to it, God is a fact, and take all the consequences which I showed to follow from it.

I asked how he knew concerning his assertion that there were three spheres; how he could tell whether there were three or five, or seven; but he has not told us yet, although he promised it.

Some of these questions are met in a way which reminds me of a newspaper discussion which I once saw. An article appeared in one paper which was a very able and conclusive one, and I looked the next morning to see how it was answered by its adversary. I found the article quoted, followed by the overwhelming answer, "Oh, scissors!" That was of course conclusive. The gentleman's notice of some of my arguments is similar in kind. He exclaims, "wonderful logic!" and so settles the whole matter. A most convenient answer, truly!

I took the gentleman's own propositions with regard to spirit-

nal truth, and quoted him as he spoke. I then showed that Christ conveyed spiritual truth to his disciples by means of words in current use among men, and not by unnatural or preternatural means. He met me by the assertion that Christ talked to his disciples in parables: I then showed by full quotations that he talked to the multitudes in parables, but explained them to his disciples. I have not asserted that the disciples *perfectly* understood every truth which Christ uttered. The question was simply whether they received any spiritual truth, for if they received any, they could receive more; and if they did not, it would not be from any fault in the language, but owing to opposing influences which are constantly working in men's minds to hinder the reception of truth. The way to make them more fully comprehend and understand, is to remove these opposing influences, and then truth becomes clear and plain. The gentleman said that Christ told Peter that flesh and blood had not revealed his Messiahship to him, but the *Spirit of God*. I said he could find no such assertion in the passage, and I say now, that he will have to go to a higher sphere for such a quotation. The passage says, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, *but my Father which is in heaven.*" (Matt. xvi: 17.) And it *was* revealed by the voice from heaven when Jesus was baptized, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." (Luke iii: 22.)

In reference to the assertion that Christ taught *about* spiritual truth and not the truth itself, I will read from the 17th chapter of John. "Father, the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him, and this is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This was what Jesus Christ communicated to them,—the knowledge of God *which was eternal life*, and which, certainly, must have comprehended spiritual truth. And *how* did he communicate? In the 8th verse he says, "I have given unto them *the words* which thou gavest me;" it was therefore knowledge of God received in that way, "and they have received them, and *have known surely* that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me."

To say that Jesus taught only moral truth, or that which concerns man in his relations to his fellows, is to leave out of view a very large and prominent class of Scripture passages. Did not Christ teach, "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God*, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," as well as "thy neighbor as thyself."

"They had no proper conception of the kingdom of heaven;" yet in the midst of their ignorance Jesus taught them that first

petition in the Lord's prayer, "thy kingdom come!" All this was idolatry, according to my friend's position, and the only excuse he offers for Christ is that he found the disciples in ignorance, and was obliged to teach them what they could receive. Are these, then, circumstances which make it proper to teach men *false* notions of things; to teach them lies and lead them into idolatry? The fact is, to have imperfect conceptions of Deity does *not* necessarily involve us in idolatry. Jesus gave the disciples a prayer adapted to their condition and views of things, at that time, and this shows that it was not idolatry for them so to pray, even in their partial ignorance.

Again, we were told, the petition "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven," means, Thy will be done in my heart. But, he also says, an objective God is no God, that the only God is subjective, that is within us. Therefore he makes the petition mean, Thy will be done in me, as it is done in me. At that rate, I don't wonder that the disciples did not understand it. I think it would take the gentleman full three years to make sense of it. That *terrible battery* of propositions turns out rather harmless, after all.

His reply to my criticism upon the possibility of conveying new truth by direct impression upon the consciousness of another, does not meet the point. The supposition is that the individual to be impressed, has not even the elements of the idea to be conveyed, and I said you could only know that he had *certain words* by which he declared his perception; but you could never know, in the very nature of the case, whether the perception itself, in his mind, corresponded to the meaning of those words. As I said, the only possible proof is the experience of each individual for himself. My objection remains wholly unanswered.

Another of his points was, that the mind can receive no truth beyond or above its present plane, or of which it has not the elements already. I have already argued, and still insist, that by such principles there can be no upward progress. Truths higher and greater than those which the mind can easily receive, and does habitually receive, are the only ones that can elevate and expand the mind. The introduction of mathematics does not help the case. The simple question returns, is the mind upon the same plane when it finishes the study of Geometry as when it commences? Unless it could expand itself at some point so as to comprehend truths of a higher grade than it had before received, there was, there could be, no progress whatever. If you should keep a child at the elements of any science, it would not grow more than was necessary to comprehend those elements easily. He must be put at higher truths, which it is *hard work* for him to understand if we would *enlarge* his capacity.

We have also from the gentleman one more attempt to support

his argument upon the immutability of God. My own position was not that the immutability of God consists in his always doing the same things, but in his always acting upon the same principles. My friend called this "compelling God to change." My reply was that the principles of his argument *compelled* God *not* to change, just as much as my expression would intimate that God *was* compelled. The truth is, there is no compelling in the matter. The only meaning of the words "must change" or "can not change" in such a connection is to imply a *certain* sequence or the contrary, judging from known principles of mind. When God says, "ask, and ye shall receive," a man may refuse to ask to-day, and consequently he does not receive,—God does not give : *to-morrow*, he may ask, and obtain the blessing, God does then give. The gentleman may make such a definition of the word *change*, that this will not be changing ; but the thing remains, and it would be folly to deny it. Indeed he admits the fact, and quarrels only with the word applied to it.

MR. TIFFANY.

As to quarreling about a word, I should like to know if my friend is not doing the same thing. All I have insisted upon is, that upon the change in the condition or state of man, there is no need of a definite new impulse, in God, to impart. The only change occurring is in man's opening up to receive that which God is constantly imparting. My friend uses words strangely. I should really like to ask him whether words originate ideas, or ideas words. Here are words in different languages, conveying the same idea : what is there in the word *sombrero*, to give any idea, in and of itself ; what in *chapeau* ; what in *hut*, or in the English word *hat* ? These are very different words, yet all mean the same thing. Which is first, the word *hat* or the idea ? Is the idea the sign of the word, or the word the sign of the idea ?

I propose now to run back rapidly over my friend's objections to my interpretation of the Lord's prayer.

He does not notice the difference between the presence of God and the perception of his presence. Is not God as truly present here as elsewhere ? I place a blind man in a beautiful garden, amidst glorious flowers, whose splendid images fill every point of space in the garden, and where an unveiled eye can see every one of their beautiful forms. But the blind man says he does not believe they are there. This is my friend's difficulty ; he does not see God here, and does not believe he is here. This principle of unfolding from one degree of conscious perception to another, from observing the facts and truths belonging to one sphere, to perceiving those which belong to another, is that which explains

the rise of mind from one plane to another, higher and higher, till it can realize something of the absolute. The law is the same in education and elevation of all kinds. Either my friend does not understand how it is, or I do not understand him. Cannot a mind learn without receiving truth above the plane of its comprehension? Well! I will not say "scissors!" but I will ask in return, can a mind receive truth which is really above its comprehension? The argument is, unless I can eat meat when I am a babe, I shall never arrive at a point when I can begin to eat meat!

When I begin to teach arithmetic, I begin with teaching such things as children can understand, and by their learning these things, they get a basis for instruction in other truths of a higher order. I remember that when I began to study Geometry, it puzzled me greatly to demonstrate that triangles are equal to half the parallelograms which have the same base and altitude; and in like manner, as I progressed to new propositions, they seemed very difficult at first, but I found that they were solved by simply combining the truths I had already learned. This is the way the mind grows.

So Jesus speaks of unfolding the minds of his disciples, and says in the chapter from which so much has been quoted, "And now come I to thee, and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves. (John xvii: 13.) He spoke these things in the world, that they might hear; that their minds might be led in the right direction to attain a perception of spiritual truth.

My friend says that Peter heard the assertion of Christ's Messiahship on the banks of the Jordan, when Jesus was baptized by John. Now, I submit that Peter was not there at all. I grant that he had been a disciple of John the Baptist, but the narrative of the evangelist shows that it was some two or three days after the baptism that Christ was pointed out to Andrew as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world" (John i: 36); and he brings Peter to Christ, telling him "we have found the Messiah." This is the reason I said Peter did not hear it at the baptism. I have taken some pains to inform myself with regard to the history of these events, years ago, when I was an Atheist, and did not believe the Bible; for I had to become a believer by the study of these things. I claim therefore that the evidence is that Peter was not there.

If the gentleman believes that Christ taught his disciples spiritual truth, I should like to have him point out some of these spiritual truths. Mark, I do not say natural, or moral, but spiritual truth. I am not bound to prove a negative,—let him give us a positive case.

As to whether there are three, four, or seven spheres, the

proof lies in the principles I have laid down. You must perceive for yourselves whether they do not necessitate the existence of just three spheres and no more. I shall have occasion to go into this distinction at large before long.

A moment now as to the "oh, scissors!" anecdote. Let us look again how the case stood. The gentleman's logic was this: an individual can believe facts upon testimony or authority; but the fact includes the truth, and hence you can believe the truth upon authority: the truth, which is *the perception of the fact by your own mind!* You can believe that which you do not perceive,—of which you are not conscious! I do think it would be right to say to such logic, "Oh, scissors!"

My friend says I have tried to reason upon the existence of God. So I have, and consistently too. Does he not recognize the difference between the *esse*, the *I am*, and the *existere*,—that by which God is revealed to others. In the *esse* he is not a fact, and cannot be a fact in any sense of the word, but in his manifestation, the *existere*, he is objective. Hence, in the former, his absolute essentiality, he cannot be known as an object, whilst in the latter he may be.

I must now dispose of the "Kilkenny cats" in a few words. The gentleman argues that we spiritualists eat each other up, so far as views and doctrines are concerned; but my business is not to show that Spiritualism agrees in its teachings with Davisism or Tiffanyism, but if you please, with *Jesusism*. Therefore, when I take up the teachings of Jesus, to show what they are, and try them by the principles I have established, I am in the right way to show afterward that these correspond with the true teachings of all the spiritual manifestations. If we spiritualists did not agree, we should only be in the position which theologians have been in all along. They profess to draw their doctrines from the same books, and yet they have constantly been playing the "Kilkenny cat."

I propose to take my own course, without dictation: to examine first, what were the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and then, taking up the teachings of Spiritualism, will bring them along, step by step, and piece by piece, till we see how they agree.

My next step in showing what Jesus taught, is to take up his doctrine with regard to Angels. The word *Angel* signifies a messenger. Are they messengers for God's convenience, and benefit, or man's? If God be omniscient he needs no messengers. Whose messengers, then, are they? I want my friend to give us his ideas upon this point, and tell us whether it is God who needs their use. There is much involved in our ideas about them. The New Testament certainly recognizes their existence. No matter how they communicate. My friend will allow that they used to talk with men, and I know they do now, for I have heard

them. God does not need them to convey intelligence, for he is omniscient and omnipresent. He does not need them to help him, for he is omnipotent. What, then, is their use? I don't feel disposed to give my own ideas till I hear what my friend thinks on the subject.

If they sung over the plains of Judea, if they appeared at the sepulcher of Jesus, if they came to Peter, and Paul and Silas, in prison, for what purpose and for whose benefit did they appear?

Again, I don't know whether my friend believes in the doctrine of *guardian* Angels, or not. I rather guess not. I guess he is Sadduceeic, rather than otherwise: but if he does, what does he think? Are they Devils? Are we intrusted to such spirits? If not, if they are to "minister unto the heirs of salvation," I should like to know what sort of beings they are, to be fit for that purpose. They can not, of course, minister to God objectively. But if you and I have guardian Angels who hover over us, yet can not speak so that we can hear them,—can not move a finger to help us, can not lead us to God,—what use is it to have them about us? Why their constant watching day and night? Now my friend, if he makes any use of them at all, will not say, as we hear them spoken of in the figurative speech of an excited revival meeting, that they are waiting to carry to heaven the news of sinners coming forward to the "anxious seat!" I suppose, for my own part, that if they are of any use, it must be during the time man is too low to receive the Divine influences, which in a higher state may be directly poured in upon him. God is present. Why does not my friend perceive it in his consciousness? Simply because he has not that development which will enable him to perceive it. But there are minds between his and that of the absolute that can influence him, and in this relation, when I come, by and by, to notice more at large the difference between the spheres, I shall show abundant use for them. I hope, therefore, that my friend will either deny that Angels are messengers at all, or that he will admit that you and I, human beings, are the subjects of their ministration.

The idea has somehow obtained in many minds that when we come to die, we shall go to another world, and fall to singing and making music, but that we shall not do much; having a good time ourselves and striving to add to the happiness of God, which is already infinite and perfect. Now it seems to me that having something to do in the economy of God's government, would glorify him more, and make us happy in a higher sense. It would be a nobler idea, that it was our office to return to earth, and by instruction and spiritual aid bring man up out of the wilderness of his animalism into the happy land prepared for those who love truth and holiness.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend tells us that if spiritualists do not agree, theologians are no better off, and so comforts himself that we are in as bad a fix as they. Perhaps "misery loves company" in this case, as well as others. But he can not shield himself so. If he wishes to prove that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical with those of *Modern Sectarianism*, he should change his proposition. The teachings of Jesus are a unit—harmonious—and to admit that those of Spiritualism are discordant and sectarian, is to yield the question of identity. These spiritualists profess to give us pure Spiritualism, and I intend to hold my friend to that, and make the audience see and know what are the things they put forth to the world as such.

I must say further that there is no comparison between the sects of Christianity and these. These scout each other, and find no common ground whatever. They deny each other's statements at every turn, and neither agree as to what God is, or what man is; with regard to human relations and responsibilities, nor those of spirits and angels. The idea of Christians singing in heaven is ridiculed, but I can prove from "the spirits" themselves, that *they* sing there, and are busied about the very things my friend would call folly and trifling.

The gentleman persistently avoids committing himself to any definition as to what are the teachings and phenomena of Spiritualism, but wants me to turn in and give my notions and speculations about Angels! When I have any favorite theory on the subject to submit, I may do so, but I confess that I can not see any present obligation to affirm any thing on the subject.

In regard to his question about the priority of ideas or words in the mind, the gentleman has utterly failed to understand my argument, if he thinks it makes any difference in it, which is first. The simple affirmation was that ideas already in one mind can not be conveyed from it to another, without the use of some kind of language, in words or signs. It was a simple denial of the proof, or the possibility of proof, that thoughts can be conveyed by the so-called impression of consciousness upon consciousness. With this reiterated explanation, what I have said on the point is sufficient; and unless some direct proof of the possibility of such communication is given, the proposition falls, with all that hangs upon it.

I have not yet done with the application of the gentleman's philosophy to the Saviour's teachings. We have seen that Christ did really depend upon words to convey truths respecting the relations of God and man. That he commanded to love the Lord with heart, soul, mind, and strength, and although I have asked whether this was or was not spiritual truth, the question remains unanswered. I showed that he taught in words what was "life

eternal," that it was "to know God," &c., and I also asked whether this was spiritual truth. Again, in the 13th of Matthew, which we were quoting, the Saviour compares the word of God to seed sown in the soul, which produces certain fruit. He says, some fell by the way side, that is, the "word of the kingdom" was heard, but not understood; some fell on stony ground, where it took no root, but the truths were abandoned because of trouble or persecution; and other fell into good ground, which is the case of him "that heareth the word and *understandeth* it, which also beareth fruit," &c. You will notice that Christ expressly explains that the seed is the "word of the kingdom," or, as we have it in Luke viii: 11, "the seed is the word of God;" and the fruit, whether it be thirty, or sixty, or a hundred-fold, all sprang from that word when received and *understood* by a good and honest soul. This was the necessary condition, and not till it was fulfilled did the fruit of love, purity, and holiness, come. The "word of God," when understood, was the means of producing such results, and there is not a word about "impressions of consciousness upon consciousness. The use of language, properly understood, and its teachings appropriated by the soul, was what spread the truth through the whole inner being, and brought forth fruit to the honor and glory of God. And when the word failed of its effect, Christ showed that it was because their hearts were hard, their ears dull of hearing, and their eyes blinded. This was what hindered them from seeing, hearing, understanding, and being converted and healed. In the philosophy and teaching of the Great Teacher, first came hearing, then understanding, then conversion, and then healing. Now all this was without inspiration on the part of the hearer. The speaker communicated the truths with which he was inspired to uninspired minds, and illuminated them, and turned them from evil, falsehood, selfishness, and wickedness, unto God. Hence you hear the Saviour say so often, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Shall we, then, believe that in the whole ministry of the Saviour, there was no communication of spiritual truth? He said, "the words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit* and they are life" (John vi: 63), and to those who heard and believed, he said, "if ye *continue* in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." (John viii: 81.) But the gentleman says, Truth, which is not fully understood and comprehended, can not be appropriated by the human mind at all, nor can it be benefited by it, any more than the physical system can be supported upon stones and rusty nails! If this were so, then were we left utterly without spiritual truth; without spiritual food, and there were no hope for us!

I have taken issue with the gentleman, and I think I have shown from the Saviour's own words, that the views and teachings presented here, are any thing but those of Christ. If, therefore,

what he has given us is Spiritualism, I claim that it is proven to be very different from Christianity. He says he does not want us to receive Tiffanyism, but if not Tiffanyism, what is it? Is it Davisism? How are we to know that it is Spiritualism? Will he give us any test? His "axioms" so complacently arrayed do not help the matter; for the question *now* is, not whether what he says is true or false, but is it *Spiritualism*, and if it be shown to be, then is it identical with pure Christianity? When I urge these points, the gentleman turns and catechises me as to my views about Angels! I ask any hearer what he knows of Spiritualism more than he knew yesterday morning? What ideas are given, what principles settled, that were not well known long before our friend came? What is there that any other spiritualist may not sweep away as this gentleman does all other spiritualists, with a "Pho! I repudiate all that!" What have we better than our humble trust in Jesus of Nazareth? What comfort, what hopes, what elevated ideas of God, of humanity, what clear perception of human duty, what truer ideas of the relations of man to man, and of man to God, have we, than we had before we ever read or heard of Modern Spiritualism? Revolve these things a few minutes in your mind! What does it all amount to? Is it not really a little amusing, that after all the time we have spent with the expectation of having some thorough investigation of Modern Spiritualism, we have got no further than to learn that Christianity and the spiritual teachings of Jesus Christ can not be drawn from the New Testament, and that the gentleman would be pleased to have *me* tell something about Angels! He keeps promising that it is all coming after awhile, but we can not wait forever. Part of his propositions have been struck down, and he fails to meet the objections raised. No matter how long the connection of links in his chain, when one of them is broken, the chain is broken. Like the sailors, in the laughable story, who hung in a long chain, each holding the feet of the man above him; when the upper one let go to take a fresh hold, they all came tumbling in a heap together.

In his dissertations upon moral duties, he tells us nothing new. The ideas have been elaborated and impressed upon men's minds by multitudes of those who fear God and love their fellow-men. They are old, very old ideas: Modern Spiritualism can not claim them. I have nothing special to do, then. If the gentleman chooses to tell us what Angels are, I suppose he will do so; but he should not get tired of affirming so soon, and wish me to take the lead on a positive theory of angelic ministrations, leaving to him the task of tripping me if he can. If there is any thing of that kind to be done, it is properly in my place to do it, since I am on the negative.

I have prepared myself to show, with some degree of fullness

and accuracy, what has been put forth as Spiritualism, not by weak, erring mortals, but, as is claimed, by minds in the very highest spheres of the spirit world, and, of course, entitled to far more deference and respect than any thing my friend can present. I have waited long, and unless he gives us what he really considers Spiritualism, I shall feel myself obliged to take hold of the matter, and make the audience understand what Modern Spiritualism is, according to the best means which we possess of getting at it.

There are communications with regard to time and eternity. God and man, science and prophesy. We are kept back from all this, and our time is taken up by a series of propositions, about and round about every thing, without ever coming up to the real question at all. I demand therefore, for the sake of the audience, that the phenomena and teachings of this system be fairly brought before us, that we may be fairly enabled to form a judgment upon the question directly under discussion.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend says that the spiritual truth Christ taught his disciples, was "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." Did he teach what that love was? He told the young ruler to love the Lord supremely, and his neighbor as himself; but did he understand what it was to love the Lord supremely? Was it consistent with loving God, for the disciples to call down fire from heaven upon their enemies? Did he not tell them they knew not what spirit they were of? I said they were moral, social, and rational beings, and he could teach them in that plane, but as religious beings they were not developed and could not be taught. We shall come to this by and by.

My friend talks of the "Word of God" as if it were the Bible, but I tell him it is not used in any such sense. Christ says once, "Why did ye not understand my speech! because ye could not hear my words." Now they could hear his words in the literal sense, in the natural signification; what then did he mean?

Take an illustration: "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." Does my friend understand the *literal* blood? Must men eat Christ's literal flesh, and drink his literal blood? The disciples, many of them, were offended at these sayings. They heard the literal words, but they did not hear the words which were spirit and life. So all the way through his teachings, they applied a natural signification, and like my friend, had only the literal understanding. My friend says, a man must go down and be buried in the water literally—he must sit down and eat bread and drink wine on the first day of each week, not dis-

cerning the spiritual meaning of Christ's commands. But I say the "word" means infinitely more than the literal language, Greek or Hebrew. I grant, if my friend would be a disciple of *Moses*, and live under the natural dispensation, that blood would mean blood, and flesh would mean flesh, because it was a dispensation of force,—of natural things; but when we come to that "better covenant," we have a different dispensation, and another law-giver. We have then come out from a carnal dispensation into a spiritual one.

At present my friend declines giving his views of Angels. I will therefore take positions, and he may commence "tripping" if he likes. I say Angels are messengers of God, but not *to* God. They can tell God nothing he does not already know, and give him no power he does not already possess. They are not in any sense ministering spirits *to* God, although ministering spirits *of* God. The individual to be raised and lifted up is poor, fallen, ruined man, and the angels as ministering spirits have this office to perform. Being ministering spirits, they have power to minister physically and spiritually. They have power to impress thoughts, feelings, and impulses upon man, and they do it. They have power, when man is in danger and not so absorbed by his passions as to be insensible to better influences, to approach him and impress new thoughts and new strength, by a direct influence upon his spiritual being. We have guardian spirits, and they also have guardians over them, and these over them, and so on, till the highest archangel that stands before the throne of God has a band of spirits under him, reaching down to man on earth.

When I spoke of the singing in Heaven, and the saints wasting their time doing nothing, cooped up in a corner of the universe with God in their midst, I spoke of the foolish ideas men have on such subjects. It is not so with the spirits there. They are upon their works of mercy and love, elevating and purifying man. They do sing and shout for joy when they succeed in their work. There is "joy in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance." There is my position, and my friend may commence "tripping" as soon as he pleases.

With God, all things are present in one eternal *here and now*. He needs not to be informed of our wants, nor told of our condition. He knows what beings we are, in ignorance, in self-love, in ill-will towards others; only rising in our understanding as we receive truths which we are qualified to receive; only knowing the Divine as we are lifted up and fitted to receive the impressions of Divinity upon our souls.

This doctrine, both as to God and angels, is the one taught by Jesus Christ, and supported by all the phenomena of his mission, and no other consistent doctrine *can* be taught. My friend thinks

it has nothing to do with Spiritualism, but even going to the spiritualists for it, we find many of these fundamental doctrines in them all. They certainly believe in the immortality of the soul,—that it does not unconsciously sleep in the tomb, but that after we leave this body, our spiritual faculties are considerably increased, and that we are then in no worse condition at least, than when we were in the body. These things are agreed upon, and if you can find in your ten thousand sects, any doctrine of Christianity better agreed upon, name it! They believe that the spirit may unfold and improve forever, that this power is not ended when the spirit leaves the body: that angels are ministering spirits, watching over us and ever hovering round us. That they have power to make physical and spiritual manifestations to man,—all these things they are agreed about, as I believe. In giving these things I am not going into any of their sectarianism. My friend says I am to be held responsible for the sects of spiritualists, although he is not for the sects of Christians. What is the difference? When I attempt to discuss Spiritualism, I try to begin in your understanding, just as I should in mathematics. I take my position, and go step by step, until I bring you to recognize the principles underlying both Spiritualism and Christianity; and now as you recognize these principles, I am approaching a point where I can show the similarity between the two. When I said that Jesus, as an exponent of Christianity, taught that God is not affected by what is done in the world, I showed that it was also in accordance with my principle that God is not finite. I supposed my friend would agree with me here, but he says, God is an object, God is changeable in the condition and state of his mind, to suit the condition of feeling or action in man: that when you and I are good, he is pleased and loves us,—when we are bad he is displeased and hates us: that God is subject to motives, and acts under them as we do: that he wills objectively and acts in time. Now, all this is finite and imperfect. Just as finite as any heathen God that ever was got up. He says our ideas of God are necessarily imperfect. That is true enough: it is a good admission. Of course you cannot get the infinite into a finite, and if you attempt it, you will make a false image of the infinite. He says Jesus did not speak in parables with the purpose of instructing, but of deceiving. That “hearing they might not hear and not understand, lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.” He interprets this literally, and I suppose that when Christ says a man must hate his father and mother, if he would be his disciple, he will take that also in its literal sense. In its proper sense, though strong language, it has a most beautiful meaning, but that sense is far from a literal one. The doctrine that Christ would deceive is not consistent with his character, or his other teachings; but I will not dwell upon this now, for I have

something in another part of the discussion that will apply to it more properly.

My work, now, is to show that when you interpret the teachings of Christ by the false ideas of the common mind, you get only false ideas; that, when so interpreted, the mission and character of Jesus are infinitely misapprehended. It makes mere nonsense of some of the highest and holiest truths ever uttered on earth. The idea that you are eating the blood and body of Jesus Christ when you partake of the bread and wine, is superlative nonsense. Christ's dispensation is a spiritual dispensation: his language is spiritual: the literal word profiteth nothing, it is the Spirit which giveth life. The idea that a water baptism is a spiritual baptism, cannot be consistent, philosophically or otherwise, and this I will show under the propositions I shall take up to-morrow morning; namely, that the baptism of Christ was a baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire. This is the only baptism, and when one receives it, the proper *signs* will follow. The reason the signs do not follow this water baptism, is because it is a kind of John Baptist's baptism, which does not "so much as know if there be any Holy Ghost." Christ said John the Baptist was Elias; John said he was not. Who are you, it was asked of him; Christ? No. Elias? No. Are you that Prophet? No. Who are you, then? I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Yet Christ afterward said that Elias had already come. If you take this in the spiritual sense there is no contradiction. It must be taken as Zacharias understood it, that John went forth "in the spirit and power of Elias." (Luke i: 17.) When the disciples asked what was meant by saying Elias must first come, Christ referred to it in the spiritual sense, saying he had already come, but they understood it literally of John the Baptist.

MR. ERRETT.

I presume we shall get along after a while. My admonitions are not without some effect upon the gentleman, and there is some prospect that we may reach the question after a time.

I wish at the beginning to make a single remark about a matter that escaped my memory, when I was up before. It was in relation to Peter's obtaining his knowledge of the Messiahship of Christ. It will be seen at a moment's glance, that there is nothing whatever in the first chapter of John which is inconsistent with the supposition of Peter's being present at the baptism of Christ, or that he did not know that he was the Messiah before Andrew told him to go to see him. All that is implied in the passage is that they had not known where he dwelt. But this is only a subordinate question. The original one was, did Peter receive that truth directly from the Holy Spirit in accordance with

my friend's theory. My reference to the passage first misquoted by him, proved that I was right in denying his position.

The gentleman says Christ did not communicate to his disciples the proper love of God, and to prove it, says they called down fire from heaven upon their enemies. But he admits that they were instructed in the moral relations; they were taught to love their neighbor as themselves; and would not *this* hinder them from calling down fire from heaven? His proof, if it amounts to any thing, proves too much; it proves that Christ taught them *nothing at all*, not even moral truth. Does the gentleman deny that men may yield to temptation and fall into sin, notwithstanding they may have been instructed in their duties, and understood the nature of love? He must find some other reply to the passages I have quoted to prove that it was "life eternal," and the spiritual truth of God which Christ taught.

A few words now, with reference to interpretation of language. When Christ says, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," when he talks of their "hearing the word," is it not *language* he is speaking of? We are to take his words as we take other words, and interpret them according to the fixed laws of the science of Hermeneutics. There is literal language and figurative language, but the gentleman makes the sweeping assertion that all that is literal is devilish. He quoted a passage concerning hating father and mother, but if he would take the parallel passage he would find a key to the figurative expression, at once simple and conclusive. It there appears that the words he quoted are a strong hyperbole, and mean that no one can be Christ's disciple who loves father or mother *more* than God. The strong figure is used, as we find such figures used every day, to force upon the mind the great superiority of the love we must have for our Heavenly Father. The little children in our Sabbath schools understand this; there is no need of stumbling upon such simple matters. But suppose we take the literal sense of the passage as being a command to hate, by what scheme of correspondences can the gentleman get out of it a precisely opposite and contradictory meaning? As another instance of his "spiritual sense," he gives us the declaration of Christ that John the Baptist was Elias. But every reader of scripture sees that the disciples who supposed Christ meant to affirm personal identity between John and Elias, misunderstood his language, and Christ corrected their mistake *by means of language*;—there was no "impress of consciousness upon consciousness" in the matter. I hope the audience will keep distinctly in mind, in following the gentleman, the difference between figurative language, and what he is pleased to call the spiritual import of language. The spiritual import of language is by his definition, as I understand him, simply the truth intended to be conveyed by the language. He tells us that the old testament is literal, but I

can find as many passages in the Old Testament which are utterly unintelligible, in the gentleman's idea of a "literal sense," as he can in the New, and a very great many more. I can hardly believe that my friend can imagine any one so foolish as to think that a sound interpretation of any book can be made without noticing the figurative language it may contain.

The gentleman said further, that when we understand by baptism, the mere putting a person under water, it is not spiritual baptism! that a man may not be the better for that! Is that, my dear sir, one of the profound revelations of Spiritualism that we did not know before you came here? We do pretend to have some common sense, and I have never heard of a Disciple who took the absurd position you have intimated we take.

But I should like to know, distinctly, whether the gentleman means to say Jesus Christ did not teach water baptism?

MR. TIFFANY. I do, sir.

MR. ERRETT. I will read, then, from *Tiffany's Lectures*, page 292, and we will make the gentleman refute himself:

"As typical of the condition of man, after the spiritual nature had triumphed over the animal, and the animal man was figuratively slain, *he* (Christ) *used* a symbol most beautiful and appropriate, to express that new condition. I refer to the ceremony of baptism; which, *as used by Christ*, was typical of a burial and resurrection, a death and burial of the old man and his deeds, and a resurrection into new life, the life of the spirit. Before man could become a member of this spiritual kingdom, the impulses of his animal nature, which carried on a warfare against the spirit, must be put down, or figuratively slain; and, so far as their power to control or give direction to the man was concerned, must be destroyed, as at physical death. Now, as emblematical of this state of animal death, and spiritual life, the ceremony of baptism *was used*; not as a birth of water; but, on the contrary, as a death and burial to that birth, and a birth into the true spiritual state; as such, the ceremony was most beautiful and instructive. When an individual, *listening to the teachings of Christ*, became satisfied of their truths, and resolved to conform his life to their requirements, to subject his animal selfishness, appetites, and passions, to the dominion of his spiritual nature, *what could more beautifully typify* that destruction of the old nature, and that rising into life in the new, than *going down into the water*, and being buried, as dead unto sin, and coming up again, as being born or risen into a new life, a life of love and righteousness."

I have made a long extract that you might lose no part of his idea, and there stands Mr. Tiffany against Mr. Tiffany. Yet it will be easy to waive this aside, like the rest, with a "Pho! I repudiate all that." The passage, however, is one of the best in the whole book, and as it is, may be taken as a quite felicitous

expression of our own views concerning the symbolism of the ordinance of baptism. Yet he presumes to intimate that we Disciples believe that mere water baptism is all that is necessary for the salvation of the soul! While I am upon the point, I wish to notice this slander in a manner that can not be misunderstood. It is not spiritualists alone who say this of us. There are others who say it, and have not the manliness to say it where it may be publicly met, but go skulking from house to house, asserting it to be our doctrine. Now, once for all, let it be understood by this whole community, and by every one whom my words may reach, that I declare the assertion is *unqualifiedly false*.

As to the gentleman's idea of the Lord's Supper, I am of opinion that, under a little different circumstances, he might give as good and as interesting an interpretation of the symbolism of that ordinance, as he has of baptism in his lectures, and therefore I do not feel under the necessity of following him very closely in such vagaries, since he has so flatly contradicted himself. A little care in applying the common rules of rhetoric, would avoid all the difficulty found in the words "eat my flesh," and "drink my blood."

Now, as to Angels, I will make only one criticism upon his statement thus far, and pass on. He said, "Angel" means "messenger." True; but every messenger is not an Angel. I sent a friend out for a book awhile ago, but he was hardly an Angel, for all that.

He said again, There was joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. Was it in an *objective* or *subjective* heaven? He has denied that heaven is a place. Again, he talks of the "archangel nearest the throne of God." Was it an *objective* or *subjective* throne? He had better be careful how he falls into *idolatry*! Man is finite, and his conceptions are all finite. If, then, as my friend asserts, man can not find God in the objective,—without—but must find him within, then must the finite comprehend the infinite.

He was almost "orthodox" in talking of "fallen, ruined man," but it is not orthodox Spiritualism, for Mr. Davis declares that sin comes not from the heart, from within, but is wholly *without*, external; and the soul remains immaculate and undefiled. So, as to the essence of spirits, he is as far astray. Davis says spirit is matter, and repeats it again and again; saying that it has a material organization, lives on material food, has lungs and a heart! The same writer declares that God himself is matter! But, then, in comes Mr. Ballou, saying that any man who says spirit is matter is a deceiver; and so they go, asserting and contradicting each other at every step.

Again, my friend says they are agreed as to the conscious existence of the soul after death, and that it is, at least, no worse

off than before. I must beg leave to say they agree upon no such thing. I have here spiritual communications which show that at least fifteen per cent. of the human race is damned for ever and ever, in a hell as horrible as that "orthodox" one at which some of their writers delight to sneer. They assert also that spirits may grow worse and worse, and they even say it is *worse* with some spirits, "than any Presbyterian hell that can be conceived."

I can show from their teachings, that bad as it is with the poor slave who toils under his task-masters in this world, it is worse with him when he gets there, where he is placed among idiots, and murderers, and whoremongers, and all the vile and abominable that the lowest dens of iniquity pour into that sphere. That the negro and Indian, after all their sufferings here, pass into a state of slavery there, which must last for so many millions of ages that man cannot conceive the duration! Then up comes another medium with another "communication," which says that the Indian is in no such sphere at all, but away up above all that.

Again, although my friend thinks the singing of psalms in heaven would be very silly, we have the word of the spirits for it, that it is the chief employment of many in that other world to congratulate themselves that they are in a higher sphere than others upon whom they complacently look down. They tell us of great and valuable labors performed by my friend's "angels," such as administering *lobelia* to sick *cows*, to cure the *croup*,—of prayers sent up for the help of spiritual physicians in the higher spheres. Spirits come down to wash shirts, and take care of horses. And then others will *repudiate all this*. Now what is the truth? These things have been solemnly sworn to;—whether in the name of an objective or subjective God, I know not. Is it true that spirits bake buck-wheat cakes? Do they turn them over on the griddle? and do these cakes mysteriously disappear down spiritual throats before the astonished eyes of witnesses?

This is certainly important: we should know about it. If it be really so, I can only say that I have not a doubt that such spirits will only go out by *fasting*.

We have pictures of spirits about to leave their clay tenement in this world, and they charm us with views of angelic glories, but when they reach the heavenly spheres, are their employments such as I have referred to?

I hope my friend will admit or deny, and we shall soon come hand to hand in our friendly combat.

THIRD DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—I will commence this morning by reviewing my friend's *funny* speech of last evening. I am one of the kind that do not like to be *funny*. I wish to deal with existences as solemn realities. I have found during the last few years of my life, in looking out upon the universe, that everything, viewed with a proper eye, proclaims its Divine Original: that all power speaks with God's voice if we have ears to hear it, and that there is nothing to trifle with, nothing to ridicule. Therefore, if in presenting my views I should excite a laugh, I shall not feel flattered by it, and shall feel that I have spoken to the trifling nature, and not the deep and serious nature of man—to that which makes him foolish, and not that which makes him wise. The bee finds honey in every flower, and although some facts may appear idle and foolish when disconnected with other facts, the mind that would be properly instructed, would endeavor to take such a view of them as to ascertain whether there is not an important truth under the apparently ludicrous phenomena, that may make the soul wise unto eternal life. Christ never trifled; and I would be like Christ.

Now, when my friend conveyed the idea that high and holy spirits come down to doctor cows, he did not do himself justice; he did not do God and the universe justice. I can conceive that there may be a power that can even heal a sick cow, and that that power must come at last from God, and that an individual, in the body or out, may be the minister of that power, and yet be acting in obedience to the Divine will. The wise mind will try to trace the teachings of even such a phenomenon, and to see what he can learn from it. When the widow prayed for her daily bread, and a neighbor coming in with a basket of provisions saved her from starvation, we are told that God answered her prayer; but how was it done? by means or not? But suppose her cow had been sick, so that she was in danger of being deprived of the valuable animal whose milk supported her life, might not the cow be healed, and there still be nothing foolish or simple in it? I care not how simple or foolish the facts my friend may introduce, I will show before I get through, that there is something wise in them, and that they help to demonstrate great truths, even the truths of Christianity perhaps, for all truth is a unit.

So of the other phenomenon which my friend presented in a ludicrous light,—representing spirits as coming down to bake

slap-jacks,—it was a fact with a principle involved, and in it there may be disclosed a department of power and mind in God's universe, as well as a department of character; and we will find the place for it before we get through. Those who deny the spiritual manifestations, as many denied the demoniacal possession in the days of Christ, should remember that there were, in Christ's day, not only possessions, but transfigurations! The same principle may be involved in both, as one law fashions a dew-drop and the universe. God is in all things, and if we make them foolish, we make God foolish. They were established for good, else God would not have established them. It is our business, therefore, as learners of God, to find out the good. I shall have little more to say in regard to foolish phenomena, till I come to that branch of the subject, where each will receive its proper attention.

At present I have to do with another matter,—that of Tiffany against Tiffany. I thank my friend for bringing it before the audience, for in so doing, he has located himself, and located himself where I would have located him. Now, I intend to prove that the Disciple faith is not a Christian faith: it is a John the Baptist faith, and although John the Baptist was the greatest born of woman, yet the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he. My friend asked if Christ taught baptism with water. I said no. I say no, still, and yet all I said in that book is true. I stand by both. We can easily arrive at an understanding of all this. My friend said the extract he read was Discipleism.

MR. EBBERT. No, sir! I did not endorse it. I said it was one of the best things in your book, and a good view of a *part* of the subject.

MR. TIFFANY. Well! suit yourself! Now you will bear in mind that Jesus himself baptized not with water, but his disciples. There was a reason for it. You will remember that he spent his time for three years in preparing a band of men for introducing the world to a higher plane,—to an acquaintance with higher ideas of morality and love, and so prepare them for a knowledge of the absolute and Divine. And he sent them forth to teach what? Christianity? To teach the world that Jesus was the Christ? Certainly not. He always charged them to see that they told no man of it. It is singular, to most minds, that Jesus should come into the world to be the Messiah, labor and die as the Messiah, and yet tell his disciples to keep that important fact to themselves! What then were they to do? They were to teach and preach that the kingdom of heaven was at hand,—not come. I speak now of the time which elapsed before Christ left the world. They were to go forth and satisfy the people that the time was come that that kingdom should be introduced;—to prove it from their scriptures and their faith. They went forth and preached and

baptized; but did they baptize with Christ's baptism? How could they, when they themselves had not yet been baptized with it? Do you call that preliminary baptism, Christian baptism? Wherein was it different from John's baptism? As yet the Spirit had not descended upon them. When the priests and Levites came and asked John why he baptized, if he was neither Christ nor Elias, he said, he indeed baptized unto repentance, looking forward to something yet to come, but he that was to come after him, should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The signs which Christ said should follow, could not follow till the true Christian baptism was had. When that kind of faith should rise in the Christians' mind, which the Holy Ghost would put into their souls, and the power was received which that Holy Ghost should give them, then would be fulfilled the promise, that they should work greater works than Christ himself,—then would come the "signs."

The disciples themselves did not reckon John the Baptist's baptism as Christian. When they had found some who had been baptized with John's baptism, but who did not so much as know whether there were any Holy Ghost, they took them and baptized them again, and immediately the Holy Ghost came upon them. I say that baptisms, previous to the descent of the Holy Spirit, were not recognized by the disciples as Christian baptism. The book quoted from as *Tiffany against Tiffany*, represents the baptism as a type of what was to come;—the death of the animal nature which reigned under the old dispensation. When the new dispensation was come, then that which was a shadow was done away, in this case as in any other. The baptism with water was of the first dispensation. It belongs to the ceremonies of the first covenant. The second covenant, the spiritual, needed not a substitute for the baptism of the Holy Ghost itself. If my friend does not profess to have come under the second covenant, he is right in staying in the dispensation of forms, but if he does so profess he should put away the type. But it may be asked, did not the disciples continue to baptize with water? Yes, they did; but they also ate of the feast of the Passover, and performed the rite of circumcision. The feast of the Passover was not discontinued till the reign of the Emperor Julian, called the Apostate, and then the portion who put away the ceremonial law were looked upon as heretics by the Ebionites and Nazarenes. The Nazarenes believed that the Jewish Christian should be circumcised and keep all the law, but not the Gentile. The Ebionites said that every one must come under the ceremonial law. This was the first division of the Christian church into Judaizing and non-Judaizing. Paul kept the ceremonial law and performed a Nazaritish vow, and the controversy that arose some fourteen years after, when for the first time they learned that the Gentiles were to become disciples, showed that even with the advent of the spirit on the day of

Pentecost, they did not understand the whole of Christ's religion. The great idea they first received was, that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews; that he was to collect the tribes of Israel, and under his reign the nation of the Jews should be one, and be established forever. It took years and years to bring in a reformation of the early religion of the church. I cast no blame upon the apostles for this. It only exemplifies a great law of the human mind. It only shows that they were not plenarily inspired, and that they were not at first led into all truth, although that was to be the final result. I shall come to a chapter upon inspiration by and by, and shall show that there are different degrees of inspiration, and yet only one perfect inspiration, which they shall receive who so perfect themselves that when the "Prince of this world" cometh he shall find nothing in them. Then they will be in such state that they can receive the full influence of Divine truth, and be freed from all liability to err. In order to show the sameness of the power exercised by Christ, and that which is manifested in Spiritualism, it will be necessary to investigate all these things. We shall find that all the evil which now curses society, is only working out the Divine will, which will make it all redound to the glory of God and the good of the universe. I do not intend to go into this at length now, but only to show that my remarks, in the extract read, had reference, not to the Christian dispensation, but to that of John the Baptist.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend is unusually grave this morning, and I don't at all wonder at it. He was fairly and thoroughly tripped up yesterday in the quotation of Tiffany against Tiffany, and all his efforts to extricate himself this morning, do but entangle him more hopelessly. He does not intend to raise a laugh; he would have us think there is nothing ludicrous in existence; yet he was quite free, yesterday, to talk in the most trifling manner of sentiments cherished most warmly in the hearts of all Christian people. It is a grave offence for me to refer lightly to the mission of spirits from the fifth sphere, to administer lobelia to a poor cow, sick of the croup! I deny that *I* made the thing appear ridiculous: I could not do it. It is in itself the quintessence of ridiculousness. But the gentleman shall not be grieved by my version of it; I will read the account itself, without a word of comment. (*Astounding Facts from the Spirit World*, page 31.)

"In March, 1853, my best cow was very sick; her horns felt like icicles, though I was sure it was not horn distemper. I ordered her some medicine, two or three times, while I frankly confessed I did not know what ailed her. For three days she had taken

neither food nor drink, her breath every hour became more labored, till near night; on the fourth day I visited her, found the eye-balls greatly protruded and glassy, her breath extremely labored, indicating the greatest distress. I said to my son that she could not live over a couple of hours, *but we can cheerfully trust her, where we have ourselves, in the hands of our Heavenly Father.* My son replied that perhaps Albert (a spirit) would tell us what ailed her, and what to do for her. I answered, he may. * * * I now left the stable, intending to visit it no more. I had not got over ten feet from it, before I *was impressed* what ailed the cow, and what to do for her. I stepped into the house and said to the family, 'the cow has got the *croup*.' * * I at once prepared a bottle of medicine of the most irritating articles that I could find, that were not absolutely corrosive, and it was poured down her; she coughed *three times*, and brought out over *four feet* of false membrane that had formed in the trachea (windpipe), that averaged more than an inch in width. * * *Seventy-five per cent.* of the difficult respiration was now relieved. In the morning, I threw some of the same preparation up her *nostrils* with a syringe, with similar results. A head of thick, heavy membrane, nearly as large as a hen's egg, that *evidently sat upon the first bronchial branch*, with three long and distinct membranes that run down as many different bronchial tubes, were now discharged. One of the last-named strings drew off another head from a still lower branch of the lungs, when the cow appeared well, and has ever since. She took food and drink the same day. I have named these things, not so much for their intrinsic worth, as to convince the foolish mammonist that '*Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, as well as that which is to come.*'"

I can not ridicule that. I have not the slightest inclination to try it. I must deny the charge altogether.

I have here another statement with regard to matters in Mercer County, Penn. I will read a little from it, to help along the appreciation of the dignified, solemn, and instructive manifestations, which make my friend so grave. It is in the form of an affidavit before a Justice of the Peace in this County, and has been extensively copied by the press. The person making the affidavit says:

"About the third day after these manifestations commenced, my wife brought a ham of meat into the house, laid it on the table, and stepped to the other side of the room, when it was carried by some invisible agency from four to six feet from the table, and thrown upon the floor. At another time, a bucket of water was, without human hands, taken from the table, carried some six feet and poured upon the floor. This was followed by a large dining-table turning round from its position at the side of the

room, and carried forward to the stove, a distance of more than six feet. This was done while there was no person near it. The same table has, since that time, been thrown on its side without human agency, and often been made to dance about, while the family were eating around it. At one time, 'dishes, knives, and forks were thrown from the table to the opposite side of the room, breaking the dishes to pieces,'—at another time, the dishes 'flew from the tub to the chamber floor, over head, and were thus broken to pieces,' and finally, '*nearly all the crockery about the house has been broken or destroyed.*' If Spiritualism be godliness, as the gentleman claims, I should hardly think it was profitable, in that case, 'for the life that now is,' for although it cured the cow in the other, it broke the crockery in this. The part of the story relating to the buck-wheat cakes you shall have in full also, that there may be no suspicion of *my* ridiculing any of them. "Frequently while Mrs. Richardson had been baking buck-wheat cakes on the stove, the griddle has, in some unaccountable manner, been taken from the stove and thrown across the house; and often cakes have been taken from the griddle while baking, and *disappeared entirely.* At one time the voice said it (the spirit) could *bake cakes for George*, a boy eating at the table. Mrs. Richardson stepped away from the stove, when the batter already prepared for baking cakes, was by some unseen agency taken from a crock, sitting near the stove, placed upon the griddle, *turned* at the proper time, and when done, taken from the griddle, and placed upon the boy's plate at the table. * * I will only add that the spirit (the voice) gave as a reason for breaking crockery and destroying property, that it is done to convince the world of the existence of spirit presence."

Now you have the matters before you just as they are given, and I will add no single word with a view to present them in a ridiculous aspect. I don't wonder the gentleman feels grave over this. I should not wonder if he felt ashamed of presenting such things as identical with the phenomena and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. To do so is an outrage upon all that is holy. The gentleman says Christ never trifled. I know he did not. He had more important things than these to do, and by the gentleman's own showing, his works had nothing in common with these trifling and foolish things. If my friend expects us to be grave and serious over such things as these, and to treat them as solemn truths, whilst he himself has distinctly admitted that they are *full of trifling and puerility*, he is asking altogether too much at our hands.

As to the quotation from Mr. Tiffany, I do not wonder that he was puzzled. He had better say he was inspired and that we have not the inspiration to understand him, and let it go at that, for in his book, there is not a word which connects the passage

with John's baptism, not one word. He expressly says Christ in *his* teachings resorted to symbols to impress *his* truths upon the minds he taught; *His* truths, not the truths of John the Baptist. Remember, he says the ceremony of baptism was used by Christ, "not as a birth of water; but, on the contrary, as a death and burial to that birth, and a *birth into the true spiritual state.*" He makes it "typical of the condition of man *after* the spiritual nature had triumphed over the animal," and says he refers to the "ceremony of baptism *as used by Christ.*"

The change from animalism to holiness, the development of the spiritual nature, he has expressed in that passage just as he has expressed it here, when he has been telling of the work of regeneration to be wrought in man. This same work, he tells us, is to be accomplished in every individual of our race, and the practice of immersion is the very thing which he says so beautifully typifies it and was so useful a ceremony to impress the magnitude of the change upon the believer and all who beheld it. When the gentleman saw all that, and wrote all that, if he had faith in Christ, he ought in conscience to have been immersed, and then, when following out what he conceived to be his duty, I am inclined to think he might have arrived at more consistent conclusions concerning the teachings of Jesus. What can we expect from one who makes such contradictions. The gentleman emphatically denied that Christ taught water baptism, and now we find him just as emphatically affirming the very thing he denied.

But, after all, what is Spiritualism? We are upon the third day of the discussion, and we are not yet favored with a definition of it. I have waited patiently, and have avoided all the bluster which my friend has made so much use of. But now I challenge him to give a definition; I defy him to do it. If nothing else will do, let us see if a little bluster will bring it out. He has carefully avoided it from the first. He has promised it "by and by," but he should remember that "hope long deferred maketh the heart sick." If I thought the audience were getting any light upon Spiritualism by discussing water baptism, I would as lief keep on at that as at any thing else, and perhaps, as my time is so short, I may as well devote it to noticing one or two of his positions, premising that it is mere gratuity to do so whilst he remains in such inextricable contradiction upon the subject.

He says that water baptism belongs to the old dispensation. I want him then to tell us what Christ meant by commanding his disciples to go forth and baptize "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost?" What does he mean by Holy Ghost? One of these spiritualist writers has blasphemously said the Holy Ghost is God's wife! Another says it means excellent laws: that the communication came down from the fifth sphere. Will he tell us what he believes? Those who have written what I have quoted

are responsible for the silly wickedness of their definitions, and not I.

The simple reading or mention of many of these things convulses the audience, and it is indeed too much to ask them to receive such trash with gravity.

As to the point before us. I am free to admit that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a different thing from water baptism. There is also no controversy with regard to the fact that John's baptism was not Christian baptism. But if the gentleman assumes that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the *only* Christian baptism, he has some things to meet. Was it a commandment and law? What were the promises connected with it? If it were a duty, a command, a law, were there any special promises connected with it, which were to follow from obedience to the ordinance? Perhaps we shall see some other distinctions as we go on. The gentleman admits that water baptism was used by the Apostles, and he is therefore reduced to a denial of knowledge, on the part of the apostles, of what Christ intended to teach with regard to baptism. They continued always to practise it, and therefore, the gentleman must take up the position, that notwithstanding the gift of the Holy Spirit, they continued all their lives in that ignorance! But *he* sees so clearly the "spiritual sense" of Christ's words, that he is qualified to judge both the apostles and the church! We acknowledge that we regard baptism as an ordinance commanded to be performed by all who would come into the communion of the Christian church. In the obligation so imposed we see nothing which is irksome. Careful readers of the Bible have become familiar with the idea of authority, without associating it with any slavish sacrifice of their own reason. The gentleman does not like it, but the more we familiarize ourselves with the Bible the more such terms as law and commandment become familiar to us.

He tells us that water baptism was observed as the Passover and circumcision were; because having been Jews the apostles did not come to such an understanding of the dispensation of Christ, as to see that the ritual law was not obligatory. I hope the gentleman will point out from the New Testament any commandment or semblance of a commandment to the disciples to observe the Passover and circumcision as well as baptism. Let us see how they came in the same category. I deny that it is so, and we can form an issue there. I do not know that we shall differ with regard to the immediate results of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, yet I cannot tell till the gentleman more fully explains himself.

He says the baptism of John was a type of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I would like the proof of it. We have only his assertion for it. Did John say so? Did Jesus say so? Where

is any such teaching in scripture? Let us come to the "law and the testimony," and not have mere assertion, for he must know that we are not very well prepared to receive his assertion as authority. It must be perceived by our own minds, you know, before it can be truth to us.

Now we have before us grave matters,—serious matters. No one will feel like laughing when we come to talking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Let us come to it, therefore, in that serious and earnest spirit which my friend professes to love, and treat it in a manner becoming the sacredness and dignity of the subject.

MR. TIFFANY.

It is always well enough, my friend, when you charge any one with teaching that which he now contradicts, to read far enough to prove whether what you charge is true. I will now read from the very next page of Tiffany's lectures, to that on which my friend's extract closed.

"Thus we see that Christianity is a system of discipline, designed to depress the animal nature, and develop the spiritual; designed to remove animal selfishness as a motive power to action in man, and substitute the interior delight of the spirit, love, pure and universal; and thus to lay the ax at the root of every evil, by destroying that from which it proceeds, and introducing the kingdom or government of heaven, by introducing the impulse into every heart which governs in that kingdom. As a system of discipline, it is valuable no further than it is practicable. As a means of salvation it cannot go beyond the fruits of obedience. *It adopts no ceremonial worship*, because such worship is fruitless and deceptive. *It lays no stress upon forms*, because its salvation consists in the substance. *It contains no types and shadows*, because Christ himself was the revealed reality."

You see that a little further reading would have set aside all the talk about contradiction. I have not found it necessary to change my faith since those lectures were delivered, but, on the contrary, have only been the more confirmed in my convictions, if that which was assurance before can be confirmed.

I affirmed at the outset that God is unchangeable both in the state of his mind, and in the laws by which his actions are produced. I declared that Jesus Christ taught this, and that it was necessary for you and me to come into such a state that friend and foe would be to us alike, and that we should pour equal blessings upon them both: that from the depth of our hearts we must forgive, and be reconciled to every enemy, before we can be like God. His love, I said, was like the sunshine and the rain, which

fall not because there is a plowed field or a fertile meadow for them to bless, but because it is the law of their existence to shed their blessings upon every thing within their plane. I said that in this, Jesus' religion is different from all others, that it makes God this immutable being. My friend makes God change as man changes: I leave you to judge between us.

I affirmed also that prayer could not move God, because he is more ready to bestow blessings upon us, than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children: that the effect of prayer must be upon the suppliant, and that Christ's intention in teaching prayer was to direct the suppliant's attention to his own soul.

The next question was concerning angels. I said that if God be infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, he has no need of angels to help him, or to inform him. He that could speak the earth and all the suns in the wide universe into being; that could clothe them with all their glories by the mere might of his will;—what need has *He* of angels? My friend must give some satisfactory answer to these questions. He must either kill off and send away the angelic host, or admit that they are here to no purpose, for no good, or grant that they are ministering spirits, and we the subjects of their ministrations. If my friend thinks that because he has shown that some spirits break dishes, and do mischief, he has introduced any new class which was not in the world when Christ was here, he is mistaken. There were those that threw men down and tore them; which sent men raving among the tombs.

The fact teaches that we must "try the spirits." What use of trying them, if they were all of one class?

If I affirm that there are demoniac spirits, I say nothing but what Christ taught. I grant that orthodoxy had begun to deny it, before Modern Spiritualism came, but Christ called them *devils*,—such devils as could go in and out of men and control them. Well, Spiritualism taught the same. Christ said he could pray the Father, and have legions of angels come to his assistance! Christ, on the Mount of Transfiguration, had the spirits of Moses and Elias come to meet him! These did not do away with spirits of less power, or of less good intention. We only say that these are facts of a like class, and that for both kinds of spirits there is space in God's universe, or they would not exist. Our business is to find their place and relation, and not to shut our eyes to the truth. My friend, therefore, cannot deny the existence of spirits which can exert an influence upon us, unless he also denies the existence of guardian angels. I did not say that all messengers were angels, but that all angels were messengers. Will my friend deny that they are messengers to men?

MR. EBBETT. And to sick cows?

MR. TIFFANY. My friend may add, "to cows," but in that simple fact, there is that which all his philosophy cannot explain.

When Spiritualism teaches that there are evil spirits, it teaches no more than Christ taught. When it teaches that there are those that take possession of men and control them, it teaches no more than Christ taught. When it teaches that there are those that deceive and tell lies, it teaches only what Christ taught. When it teaches that there are angels, ministering to us, it teaches no more than Christ taught. Here is sameness of teaching, so far at least. I propose to take a step further, and show that Spiritualism demonstrates every word he taught, to be true.

I shall in my next advance, investigate the powers of the mind, and to the propositions I have already given, I shall add an ELEVENTH, which is in itself a complex one, viz: That existence which is capable of conscious perception is called mind. That which can only perceive the externals of existence,—the mere facts and phenomena, is called the external or physical mind, because it perceives physical objects. That which perceives the relations of existences, and the conclusions following therefrom, is called the relational mind. That department of conscious being which perceives the essential and absolute existence, is called the absolute mind. Thus, the Divine mind is called the absolute, because it perceives not only relations, but essences. Now there are these three discrete degrees or classes of mind. The sensuous mind, which determines facts and phenomena by the physical senses,—and the physical senses are the authorized judges in that sphere to which they apply. Next, the intellectual mind, whose sphere is that of truth and law based upon relations. Its means of acquiring knowledge is intellectual and moral perception. The third is the absolute or divine mind, whose sphere is that of essence, and whose light is that of divine inspiration. These three discrete degrees of mind unite in man, and lay the foundation for the ability to perceive existences in their phenomena, their relations, and their essences. These are what make man a creature in the "image of God," and they lay the basis for bringing about a complete harmony between man and God, in every relation of character, and in every perfection.

TWELFTH. The most external mind perceives the facts and phenomena by which we are surrounded; the middle, perceives and discovers the laws and consequences which flow from the phenomena, and by this department of mind Newton discovered the law of gravitation, by means of the falling apple. It is the absolute mind that perceives the absolute and universal. Upon this we shall dwell by and by, when we come to dilate upon what is necessary to enable man to perceive God, and know him.

THIRTEENTH. The impulses of the first degree of mind are selfish and animal. Its highest desire is self-gratification; self-preservation. Hence it is said, the flesh lusteth against the spirit.

In acting under its impulses, the mind acts simply from a desire of gratification.

The middle or relational mind has its object in our neighbor, and its highest impulse is charity. Now these two conditions of mind belong to different characters, but every mind has a nature that fits it for being either selfish or charitable. Since man's character has reference to his spiritual condition, in order to determine his character, we must know what department of his mind he is living in, for, where his treasure is, there his heart will be also. Is he laboring to build up and elevate his character,—to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly before his neighbor and his God? Or is he seeking the gratification of mere appetite and lust? It makes a great difference in which of these two departments of his nature you find him. The nobler and higher of the two is his moral nature. Morality is not religion, however. Religion embraces morality, as the greater includes the less; but you may have good morality, and not have a particle of religion. Morality is a means of advancing, a step in the right direction, but it can never be a substitute for religion.

The impulse of the *third* department of mind is that of supreme love to God, and has reference to the absolute. You must not make God an object, like your neighbor. Your love must be a subjective love. It must flow forth from its own divine spontaneity, and its law will be made plain as we proceed.

FOURTEENTH. The first love is selfish love. The man who loves himself supremely, makes all contribute to self, and wants religion, if he wants it at all, that he himself may be saved. He wants wealth for his own luxury, and to elevate himself in the eyes of worldlings; not to use it as a "steward." He wants morality to make him respectable; not for the purpose of benefiting his neighbor.

The second love depends upon having an object to call it forth. A man can not love a neighbor, unless he has a neighbor: he can not love an enemy unless he has an enemy to love: a child, unless he has a child to love: a parent—a wife, unless he has parent or wife. Moral love, therefore, is not perfect in itself, and depends upon another object to call it forth.

There is no such necessity with the third love,—the divine. It is absolute and perfect. God's love was as great before the creation of man, as since. It requires no object. The sun could shine if the earth had never been, and God could love if you and I never had an existence. I think, then, you will see the difference between objective and subjective love. We must be careful, then, not to bring God down to us, but to elevate ourselves to him. The difficulty has always lain in this, that man has tried to bring God down.

FIFTEENTH. Now we need to understand that there are these three discrete and distinct natures in man, and that man's love may be ruled by the impulse of either of them, and that *according to the degree or plane of his love, will be his character.*

SIXTEENTH. The first degree of mind is not the subject of Divine government in its true sense. It can neither perceive nor be influenced by the things of the Divine.

MR. ERRETT.

There are still some matters lying back, which need a little "posting up," before we go further. I submitted to my friend, yesterday, the question, how I can know that there are seven spirit spheres if truth can not be received upon authority, and he replied that it could not be to any person a *truth* till he perceived it, but that it might be believed as a *fact*. Without further dispute, just now, with regard to *fact* and *truth*, it stands thus:—it is affirmed as a fact that there are seven spheres, and I am to believe it upon evidence, upon authority; but others say there are only three spheres, some again say four, and now, without saying a word as to the reliability of witnesses, how are we to know which of the *facts* to believe? Again, immortal life beyond the grave, is, for the same reason, a fact and not a truth, according to the gentleman's definition; and it must therefore be believed upon authority, and received upon testimony, as a fact. It is not and can not be a truth, till we are made *conscious* of it; that is, we must be carried beyond this life and introduced to the realities of that which is to come. All, therefore, that we believe of immortality, we have received upon authority; and in spite of the loud boastings of Spiritualism that it gives demonstration of a life to come, and has shattered infidelity on that subject in thousands of cases, it rests upon authority after all, and we are not a whit better off than we were before Spiritualism meddled with the matter.

Spiritual truths, the gentleman says, are only received by being impressed directly upon the consciousness. This also is affirmed as a *truth*, a *great truth*. I asked him to prove it. He could not do it. I asked him how he himself knew it. He told us, he knew it, as he knows the sun shines, it was matter of personal consciousness with him. I asked him to make that consciousness mine, for I have no idea of the impartation of truth from one mind to another without language of some sort. He has not given me this demonstration. How then are we asked to receive that truth! Simply and solely upon the gentleman's *authority*, and it is thereby reduced to a fact, and is no truth to us at all. And yet the gentleman presented it at first as a great and "almost axiomatic" *truth*!

The proposition, therefore, so far as this discussion is concerned is of no use, it is gone. To ask us to receive sweeping propositions upon his own authority, and then to draw from them his own conclusions, would be a most *convenient* mode of debating, certainly. I have challenged him to show, not only that the mode of conveying ideas by impression is possible, but, if it were actually done, how it could be shown to a third person without the use of language, and how we could know that the person impressed, understands the ideas denoted by the language. In this way I have shown that it comes back to language at last. I have it therefore, from himself, that his statement is not a truth, and that it cannot be reasoned out and proved.

The gentleman went so far as to say, that Jesus used language in such a way that the literal meaning, in some cases, was false and even devilish, but at the same time, in the spiritual sense, it was true, pure, holy, and divine. Well, how did he prove the existence of a spiritual meaning? How did he try to get it before our minds? He *quoted the language* of Jesus to prove it. But to make it any proof to us, we must be supposed to understand the language of the quotation. He must therefore prove that Jesus' language is to be spiritually interpreted, by using a *literal* interpretation *as the means of proof*, for his hypothesis is, that we can understand no other! This is beyond Swedenborg, with all his mystery; for in his theory of correspondences, he always allowed and claimed a regular deduction of the spiritual meaning from the literal, by means of an established key or rule of interpretation. My friend quotes the passage "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," and says it proves that Christ's words had a spiritual meaning. How do you know that, except as you assume that you have the true meaning of *these* words, and use them in the *literal sense* to prove that they cannot be understood literally! In like manner take another passage; that in which Elias is mentioned. We are told that "Elias" is used spiritually. How does my friend know that? Why! as in the other case, he takes all the other words in the passage in their *literal sense* to prove it! But that very word, which alone would seem to be used spiritually, is one which Jesus paused to explain; and this raises a very strong presumption, that he commonly used language in its ordinary or literal sense. Again, the Savior said, "beware of the leaven of the scribes and Pharisees," and the disciples, misunderstanding him, supposed that he referred to their bread, and Jesus, seeing that they did not catch the meaning of the figure, corrected them, and made them understand that it was the leaven of doctrine and not of bread that he referred to. But *how* did he give the interpretation? By the "impress of consciousness upon consciousness?" No,—but by the use of simple language *in its ordinary sense*. So in the case of the passage

concerning *hating* father and mother :—the gentleman says the literal sense is false and devilish. Now a large portion of those who heard Christ's sayings had no claim to inspiration to make them understand the "spiritual" sense, but must have taken the words in the literal and ordinary interpretation, and were therefore, by my friend's argument, left under false and devilish influences by the words of Christ himself ! Again I remark, that that must be a very strange system of correspondences which turns the literally false and devilish, into what is spiritually true and divine !

The summing up of this matter is, therefore, this : If the gentleman knows that the scriptures are to be understood in a hidden spiritual sense, he knows it either by a communication in words, or by inspiration. But if he knows it by words, those words may themselves have a spiritual meaning which he cannot be sure that he has got, and therefore he would lack proof in that case. If he knows it by inspiration, we who are not equally inspired cannot understand his inspired teachings, and it can do us no good, for "truth cannot be received upon authority ;" therefore, since in the nature of the case he cannot prove that the scriptures have a "spiritual sense" at all, nor that he is able to interpret them if they have, his whole argument upon the matter is baseless and falls to the ground.

We have seen that Christ did impart spiritual truth by the use of words, and that where it was not received, the fault was not in the language, but in opposing influences in the hearts of men or in society which hindered the good effects of the truth.

To resume the direct discussion of the question :—since the gentleman will not tell us what Spiritualism is, I will give a definition. I affirm that Modern Spiritualism is *Modern Necromancy*, and that the teachings of Modern Spiritualism are to be found in the professed communications of the spirits of the departed, and the phenomena are those unfolded and developed by these spirits. Will the gentleman meet me there ? We will have Spiritualism before us in some form, true or false. We can form some idea whether this be a correct or incorrect notion of Modern Spiritualism. I affirm that beyond this, there is nothing peculiar to it. That all their philosophy has been known long before, and been recognized in other systems. Most of it is quite as old as Plato and Aristotle. For many of their ideas they are indebted to Emanuel Swedenborg. These things are not peculiar to them. Their *own* peculiarities are, the so-called communications with the spirits of the dead, and the pretended wonders wrought by these spirits. It rests its claims to respect and attention, to sympathy of the heart and influence over the life, wholly upon the basis of its spiritual communications and wonders. This is *Spiritualism*. If, however, you take up any part of my friend's philosophy, and go into the learned world, asking whence it came, would any one

call it Spiritualism? No,—it can all be found in scores of authors. Take up next his moral teachings, concerning loving our neighbor, or concerning purity of heart; many of them are true and beautiful, but would any one dream of calling them Spiritualism? No, no, not one of them! Take the idea of immortality: ask the world where that came from, and is there a man who will make it rest upon Spiritualism, as peculiar to that? Have we anything new revealed as to the duties man owes to man or to God? Nothing whatever. Take even the ridicule of verbal prayer, the contempt for christian ordinances, the denunciation of our conceptions of Deity as idolatrous and wicked; and none even of these would be identified with Spiritualism. Voltaire and Tom Paine lived before Andrew Jackson Davis and my friend. The idea that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God:—ask the men who heard the mediums Finney and Lockwood lecture here last winter, whether *that* belongs to Spiritualism. Ask what they thought of book religion and authority, and you will find that nothing of that kind either, belongs to Spiritualism. Nothing whatever can be regarded as peculiar to it, but the communications of spirits, and the manifestations of their power. To these it has undisputed title, *and to these alone*. Yet when I read some of these, the gentleman sweeps them away as the mere notions of Davis and the rest! But if this were so, if these men have put forth their own notions, as instructions from high spheres of spiritual light, they must be either the most infamous of liars, or the most wretched of dupes. My friend puts his co-laborers in a strange dilemma, and were I, Davis,—I was going to say I would call my friend to an account,—but I remember that Davis has a convenient theory, that accountability and responsibility are only like that of a *strawberry* for its flavor.

Such, then, is my affirmation concerning Modern Spiritualism, and we shall see if the gentleman can be made to affirm or deny with regard to it. We shall see if Christianity is necromancy, and make such a comparison that it can be understood.

The gentleman complains of the laughing at the ridiculous phases of Spiritualism, but I can tell him, that the mass of men can understand the phenomena, grave or laughable, fearful ghosts that scare them, or merry ones that eat pancakes, much better than his “subjective” and “objective.” You cannot make them understand your transcendentalism, and I greatly doubt if you understand it yourself.

There is such a thing as Modern Spiritualism; that is acknowledged by the form of our question. It must have distinctive features somewhere, which can be made evident. It is also admitted that there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, although not every lecturer on Spiritualism grants as much as that. Our question implies also that we have a reliable historical record in

the Bible, of what he did and taught. These are admitted here, though often denied : although one of the lecturers I have named as being here last winter, said some of the most outrageous and bitter things concerning the Bible, that human tongue could speak. Nay, some of them say the gentleman himself is altogether too orthodox. Too much so to suit the spiritualists of Newton Falls, who have been used to another kind of doctrine.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend has complied with my request, and told me what ones of my propositions he has overthrown. I will attend to them a moment. As to our learning whether there are seven spheres, or three, or four, I told him he can not know what is the *truth* with regard to them, but only the *fact*. I admit the fact rests upon authority, and that the *truth* of it is not made known to him. So of immortality.

It makes no difference how many spheres there are. It is of more importance to know what constitutes a sphere. I will endeavor, after a little, to present some principles by which he may approximate to the idea of what constitutes a sphere. I don't see, therefore, that my propositions are overthrown. Of your own identity, you have each the proof in your own consciousness. Must I prove that consciousness to you? Have you not, within you, higher proof than I could offer? When I say to you that you can not receive a truth till you perceive it, it is that of which you are conscious. The trouble is that my friend is all the while mistaking truth for fact, and fact for truth. You may believe in the existence of God as a fact, but before that being becomes to you a "living God," he must be revealed to you. He is the life of your body, of your spirit, but I fear he is not the life of your affection; for if he were, you would know more of God than you now know. The gentleman argues that Spiritualism rests upon authority, like Christianity, and therefore there is no advance. We do not claim to advance by giving *new truth*. There is no new truth. It is not created, but only newly demonstrated, to those minds which did not perceive it before. The term "new" is used with reference to the individual that has newly obtained it, and not to truth itself.

My friend has "no idea of the impression of consciousness upon consciousness, without words." I really supposed that had been got along with. I called it a truth, that such an impression might be made, and laid it down as a proposition, but I did not call it an axiom. Truths are capable of proof; axioms are not. As a proof of the truth in question, I remember a case of mesmerism, in which an individual professed to produce this effect by

means of spiritual rapport. Words were written upon paper, and the mesmeric subject, being blindfolded, and not knowing any thing of the writing, was to tell what the idea was. It was done correctly, and in every instance we were told what was the image or object. Now my friend says, that before he could have the impression he must have the word, and so there could be no proof. But the only question is, how could the idea of a cat, for instance, come into the subject's mind, under such circumstances? Did the word convey the image, or was the impression of the object produced upon the mind, and the word suggested by that? In the same experiment, the idea was impressed upon the subject's mind in the same manner as before, that he was at the mouth of the Black River, and saw a steamboat on fire upon the Lake. The idea affected him so much that he was in great distress. Was it the word or the impressed image that produced the distress? Take another example: I may come into the presence of a person who has a pain in his side, and I suddenly feel it in my side, although he has not spoken of it. I, being conscious of it, turn to him and say, My friend, you have a pain in your side. He answers, I have. How, in such a case, do I come by the knowledge? So in the cases I referred to. The difficulty is, that my friend has troubled himself with that foolish idea of Alexander Campbell (I believe it was his), that if God had not talked to Adam, Adam could never have learned to talk. I repeat, the word is the sign of the idea, and not the reverse.

I am glad my friend has taken the position, that Spiritualism is Modern Necromancy. I meant that he should take that. I would have forced him to it, if he had not done so. We shall come to the examination of it by and by. He will have to show us what is contained in necromancy.

As to the naturalness of supposing that minds in this world are influenced by spirits in the spirit world, there is no such thing as economy in God's government if such be not the case. Wherever mind is, it must be influenced by other minds. I am speaking directly to your own consciousness. If we would take mind in such a sphere that it is not influenced by another, we must take it in the brute creation. There we find the type of man in his animal nature—I mean, in that department of his mind which belongs to mere sense. We see them all laboring to gratify themselves, to protect and defend themselves, or to protect and provide for their offspring, in obedience to their instinctive impulses, till it is able to provide for and protect itself. With man, that period of reaching self-dependence does not limit his regard for his children;—there are other relations than those of mere dependence, which continue the affection of parent and child throughout life.

This mere animal or physical order of mental perception

can not investigate principles and laws; it must be subject to the law of force and physical control. Mind can only govern mind, by means of that which can influence it as mind. You may crush or cripple its power by force, but you can not influence it except by motives which pertain to mind. Hence, when moral relations are not perceived, the rights pertaining to those relations are disregarded. If men would look into the philosophy of mind, they would see that the Jew could not be governed by any other system than one of force, like the Mosaic. If man is under the control of selfishness and force, he must be governed by such influences: in other words, he must be governed by the principle which is the controlling one in him, and that impulse must be so directed as to lead him forward to something better. From this principle came the old doctrine: Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, which was the only mode of government available, when the Mosaic system was established, for the men of that time lived in their animal nature.

The second discrete degree of mind, being itself relational, can investigate relations, can perceive the principles and laws incidental to relations, and can be governed by impulses springing from those relations. Hence in all intellectual investigations we have to analyze, compare, and judge. Analysis is the act of dividing into parts; comparison is the act of putting the parts in connection so as to judge of relations. All intellectual operations have to do with relations. The laws of mechanism, of society,—all law has only to do with relations. Hence the relational or intellectual mind, and it alone, is fitted for the investigation of laws; the brute mind can not do it. There are laws of our moral relations, as well as of our physical being. Unless I had a neighbor, I could have no duties respecting my neighbor. These duties all pertain to the middle or relational mind. This department of mind, therefore, is the subject of the perceptions of truths in the scientific world, or the laws which govern matter, and of truths in the moral world, or the laws which regulate mind. Science investigates the spirit of matter,—morals, the spirit of mind. Until man comes where he can feel and understand the social relations, and understand the rights and duties pertaining to them, he can not be the subject of moral government.

There is, however, something which lies beyond relations; the absolute itself. The intellect cannot investigate the absolute, and whenever we try to investigate God, intellectually, we bring him into the finite at once. The intellect must investigate objects, and therefore, to attempt an investigation of Deity, by means of the intellect, is to bring the subjective into the objective,—the infinite into the finite,—the absolute into the conditioned,—and we shall find nothing but contradictions on every side. This is what my friend attempts to do. The third discrete degree of mind perceives the absolute, independent of form, independent of relation,

independent of time, and of space. We think of things in time and space, because the intellectual faculties are in time and space; but when we contemplate the infinite and eternal,—that which is not in time and space, we must have that unfolded within us which is fitted to contemplate it, or we cannot do it. Nothing can receive but in accordance with its receptivity, and hence, the finite can not receive the infinite. I wish this to be observed. You cannot *reason* about God, if he is infinite and eternal. If you attempt it, you will make a finite image of him, and treat that as infinite. Hence, in the absolute mind, its perceptions must be within itself. They must be subjective, and not objective. Hence, as an infinite cannot become an object, we cannot perceive it as an object, and perceive it truly. It must be perceived subjectively, if at all: that is, as it is unfolded within the mind that perceives it. This may seem to be contradictory, but any other position will bring you to a greater contradiction. But look at it a moment:—I can perceive heaven and earth, only as they are unfolded within me, and the great question is, whether in a higher range of existences, we can not find in the unfolding of truth in our own mind, that which will lead the mind to see and perceive that which makes man the child of God, in a peculiar sense, and reveals God himself within us.

Since these three discrete degrees of mind with their peculiar perceptions, exist within man, he is qualified to investigate every department of truth, and, under proper circumstances, he can be unfolded and brought into communication with every department of nature,—with every grade of character in the universe, from lowest to highest, according to the mind's own character and affinities. They lay in man the basis for every degree of knowledge, from the false to the true, from the impure to the pure, from the mere phenomenal to the absolute and essential. Now it will be my business to show you that the elements are in us, by which we can be true or false, good or bad, wise or foolish, as we range ourselves in either of these departments of being.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend made a remark in his last speech to which I wish to call attention for a moment. It was in substance, that, if God be infinite, you cannot reason about him; he must be revealed in your consciousness. If this be so, I would like to ask, what becomes of all the reasonings about God, with which the gentleman has filled up these two or three days? He has been reasoning about His immutability, omniscience, omnipresence, and eternity,

and affirming, what must or must not be true of Him, and of His modes of thought and action.

The moment we begin to reason, we are in the objective department, he says, and if we reason about God, we fall into idolatry. He proves, therefore, that all this reasoning of his own is necessarily incorrect and fallacious. Whether he has been in any "discrete" department of mind is doubtful, but at any rate, for the sake of his own positions, his last assertion is not very *discreet*.

It has been charged upon me, that I make God a changeable being. The fact is that I have already shown that I make God no more changeable than he does, and I don't know that words can make it plainer than I have already done. Still, if he is not satisfied, I will take up his own positions once more, and scrutinize them. He gave an illustration in the case of God's answering the widow's prayer, and sending an angel or messenger to help her. Now, did God perform an action or not? Was he aware of the change in the widow's condition, and did he have knowledge of the succession of events in her case? Has God ever any purposes or plans, and does he consciously carry out those plans? Has God any *personality*, or *conscious identity*? Has he any *character*? Does he ever *think*? If the gentleman answers these questions in the negative, the difference between himself and an Atheist,—between his God and no God,—is none at all. If he answers them in the affirmative, I will demonstrate that by his own definitions he makes God a changeable, *objective*, and finite being, and is "idolatrous" in worshipping him. Let him meet the issue.

When I called his attention to his proposition respecting the imparting of one person's consciousness to another, he replied by asking me if I wanted him to *prove* to me, my consciousness of my own identity! Is *that*, then, an instance of the impression of consciousness upon consciousness! If I know anything of the matter, it is an entire evasion of the point in question.

But again, when he was going to show us that this thing of "impression" was a *truth*, as distinguished from a *fact*, he told us a mesmeric story, about their writing names of animals, such as "dog," or "cat," upon paper, and how the blindfolded "subject" told them off. In the first place I would ask the old question, whether, by his principles, he can establish a *truth*, in his sense of the word, by such *evidence*. Next, I will examine the story itself. How did they know the "subject" had the ideas denoted by the words written? *By his speaking the words out to them again*. How could they know that the words were not somehow communicated, and the idea thus awakened, as it is in ordinary communication by language? *Only by the testimony of the "subject" himself*. They *must*, therefore, have received my

friend's great "truth," that "consciousness impresses itself upon consciousness" by *testimony*, upon *authority*; and they did this, too, in the face of the very suspicious circumstance that in each experiment, *written words* were first used to fix upon paper, the thought which was afterward communicated! But, to go a step further, grant, for the sake of the argument, that the spectators were *legitimately* satisfied of that "truth;" how are we to learn it? How is my friend to prove it to us? Why, he comes here and tells the mesmeric story, and we are to believe it all, both the story and the "truth," upon his *testimony*, his *authority*! By his own principles, therefore, his great "truth" is reduced to a mere "fact," and his chain of propositions is utterly broken. As a connected chain of reasoning, his logic cannot stand, and any conclusions he may try to deduce from his ten or twenty propositions, will necessarily be fallacious. I think I have said enough upon that point and need not return to it.

I have shown that much of his philosophy has no claim to be called Spiritualism. There have been a great many fine metaphysical and psychological theories, and we might follow them along in their subtleties, year after year, and arrive at nothing very satisfactory in the end. So far as candid reasoning is concerned, an intelligent faith in Christianity, *orthodox* Christianity, does not interfere with such speculations; it does not war with science. But this science is not Spiritualism. It is metaphysics, to which Spiritualism has no peculiar claim.

I shall now proceed to give my ideas of Spiritualism itself, and as my friend professes to be giving his ideas of Christianity, we shall, perhaps, come together by and by, and compare notes. The discussion concerning angels, is the nearest he has come to the subject, as yet; but he has left one or two things in the dark which I would like to have made plainer. Are the angels all disembodied *human* spirits, or some of them of another race? Are the "devils" mentioned in the Bible, in the same category, and are they also angels? My friend promises to find a place for them all after a while, and we must be patient: I hope he will find some other place than people's kitchens for them. In place of *guessing* whether I am a Pharisee or a Sadducee, the gentleman might profitably have explained these things.

I asked how I could know whether there were three, four, or seven spheres, admitting this to be a question of *facts*, and leaving out of view the identity and credibility of witnesses. He replied that it was of no consequence how many there were: as much as to say, it is none of my business, it is sufficient to know that there *are* spheres. Definite and satisfactory answer, certainly.

Whilst the gentleman is going on to show what Christianity teaches of angels, it will, perhaps, be profitable for me to find out

what Spiritualism teaches on the same subject. I affirmed that Spiritualism is necromancy, and that its teachings are the communications of departed spirits. The gentleman meant to *force* me to that very definition, and as he would not force me to any thing but truth, we may take it that he agrees with me here. If so, Judge Edmunds and Mr. Dexter were not so far out of the way when they entitled their book "Spiritualism," and we will turn to the communications which they give, to ascertain what are the employments of angels in the upper spheres, the fourth or fifth I believe.

(On page 98 of their second volume, in a vision of heaven, the Judge is describing the scenery, and tells of majestic trees, under the dense foliage of one of which, "nestling snugly beneath its wide-spreading branches, was a *log hut*, like those I have seen among the backwoodsmen, on our frontiers." A *spiritual* hut, built of spiritual *logs*, in one of the upper spheres! "The man who built it had chosen that spot and all its surroundings, because it had brought back to his recollection, his early life. * * He can here enjoy every thing that is beautiful. He belonged to no church;"—so he went to a high sphere—"he was of no sect, but he looked from nature up to nature's god. * * An Indian lived with him,"—Mr. Davis puts the Indians and negroes into the lower sphere, you remember:—"how they loved one another! he was an old man, and the Indian was younger. * * I saw, much to my surprise, they had their *dogs* and *guns* with them. The old man was sitting on a bench, made of a *slab*, with four legs thrust rudely into holes bored at each end. Scattered upon the ground were the rude implements common in a frontier lodge." That is decidedly *angelic*.

(Again, here is something with regard to angels of the *softer* sex, they are *always* regarded as angels, you know (page 106). "Their dresses were all in the same fashion. They wore under garments of pure white, reaching to the ankles, and over them a loose frock, open in front, and fastened by a belt around the waist. Their sleeves were loose, flowing, and reached only a little below the elbows, leaving the hands and wrists, and about half of the forearm bare. The belt which bound my wife's garment was purple, the collar and cuffs, and two stripes down in front, were crimson." You see that you need no longer go to Paris for fashions, for here we have them, imported direct from heaven!

On the next page, we have "a magnificent prospect from the front portico," and among other things, "directly in front of the house was a jet of pure water, falling back into a large circular reservoir, which was some twenty feet in diameter, and some ten or twelve feet deep, and was filled with gold and silver, and blue fishes, and among them were *eels*, colored like gold fish. Around the reservoir was a smooth path six or eight feet wide, and covered

with small sea-shells. Outside this path, and extending round the circle, though with four openings in it, was a border, its sides of close shaven, fine, velvet-like grass, and its center, about a foot wide, filled with a singular plant. It was about two feet high, shaped like our Indian corn, and bearing very profusely a double-leaved flower, shaped like the tulip, large as the balsam, and beautifully variegated with pink and white. Outside of this border, were four triangular-shaped beds, to fill up the square. They, also, were full of flowers and shrubbery. In each corner of the triangular beds was a small tree like a dwarf cedar or *arbor vite*." You see they have palaces for the wealthy, as well as log cabins and slab benches. A little further on (page 109) we meet another "happy family." "Their dresses were fashioned like the others, but were ornamented with green, and they, too, were surrounded with that gauze-like atmosphere of blue. One of the daughters wore *pink sandals and no stockings*. Their complexions were very soft and brilliant. No child's more soft and pure. Their hair hung gracefully down their backs." On page 116, we have a picture of "two children, about six years old, at the vase; they stood on one of the projections of its base, and were playing with the water, spattering it with their hands, and sprinkling it into each other's faces with great glee. They had on no clothing but a scarf over the shoulder and around the waist, and every once in a while they would look to see if I observed them." Again (page 117) occurs a view of a garden with a very remarkable plant in it,—*"In the center of the bed, grew a plant four or five feet high, with only trunk and limbs; it had no leaves; it was ice, and its buds were flakes of snow, and the whole thing sparkled intensely in the light."* Of the "angels" in the next lower sphere, he says (page 118), "they thought, indeed, that they had ascended as high as they could, and their happiness consisted mainly in *contrasting their condition with that of those below them, and congratulating themselves that they were better off than them.*"—On page 126 we have an *equestrian cavalcade*. "I observed three persons on horseback approaching, two females and a male. All seemed young and were *superbly mounted*. The *horses* were beautifully formed, like coursers of the purest Arabian blood. One was white, one a chestnut, and the other a light bay. The females wore long graceful riding dresses of purple velvet; the male a short jacket and cap of crimson velvet, trimmed with gold cord. They had *two dogs* with them; one was a *shaggy poodle dog*, and the other, a small, delicate greyhound." On page 136, we have a *vegetable garden* described, with spiritual "*corn, potatoes, beets, and lettuce!*" There is also "*a large field of wheat growing very thrifty, and nearly ripe,*" so that the next time the spirits go on a buckwheat-cake expedition, they may take the flour along if they choose! On page 138, we have a farm with a *saw mill* on it *with*

four saws agoing!" and out-houses "for the *mules* which were used on the farm!" The owner was at work among his men, "dressed in shirt and trowsers, and his sleeves were rolled up," and "they were singing and laughing, *telling stories* and *cracking jokes upon each other!*" In a grove near by (page 139) are "turkeys, geese, ducks, and chickens." Again he returns to the farm-house (page 140) and saw "through the hall, out back of the house, a large *churn*, as large as a barrel, of white-wood, with brass hoops and very clean." On the "piazza" was a hanging table, where "she told me she *made her bread*," and "many *tin pans* hanging up against the wall." Around the house were "orange trees," with "*monkeys* playing in the branches," and a *cat* "chasing them up the trees!" Passing back through the house, he saw in the hall "an old-fashioned rag carpet," and "a pair of heavy wooden shoes, the *soles* at least *two inches thick*," which they "used to wear," and the woman compared them with the improved "light leather shoes" of *later times!* He "inquired (page 142) of the young woman if she had ever been *married?*" She answered, she supposed I would call it marriage. There was one to whom she was much attached, and they loved each other's society and they were a good deal together. He was now at work at the saw-mill. And she said he would come in from the saw-mill, not at all tired with his work, and would *kick up his heels* and go to dancing." Is not that heaven!!)

MR. TIFFANY.

I have been very much interested in the extracts my friend has given us, and think it quite likely we may find something in them that may make us wiser. It was all read for that purpose, no doubt. The gist of the matter is, that it represents in the spirit world the same scenes which take place in the natural world. That is, there are such *appearances* or *representations*. There is nothing very new in that. I remember that I have, before now, opened a book which is full of such representations and images. Black horses and white, spiritual beasts with spiritual horns, and the people a great deal more aristocratic, for they paved their streets with gold, and did not live in log houses! But every one to his taste. My friend thought, this morning, that it was low business for a spirit to come down from the spheres, and doctor a cow; but all the difference between the instance he gave, and one that happened in other times, is, that here they *cured* the cow, and in the other they *drowned* the *live hogs!* Now they bake slap-jacks; then they caught fish, to get a shilling to pay taxes. No matter who did it. It came from the spiritual source. If

you choose to make such things ridiculous, you can do so by being ridiculous yourselves. To the wise, all things are wise: to the foolish, all things are exceedingly silly. I don't intend to read about the fiery dragons, and the beasts with seven heads and ten horns. When we get far enough along so that we can understand what they mean, we will investigate them.

My friend said that I asserted that we could not reason about God. I believe I corrected my expression, and said that we could not reason *of* God. If he understands the difference between *about* and *of*, he will see that it makes a very different assertion.

He asks, Did the widow pray to an objective God? Very likely; for most prayer in this world has been of that kind. The going forth of our desire is prayer, and no matter how imperfect the expression, the good Giver loves to supply.

My proposition about the impression of consciousness upon consciousness, is a truth to all who can perceive it. As Christ said of those who could not perceive what he said, to them it was not truth, so I must say; and I must leave my friend there.

To his inquiries about angels, I will say that I suppose all spirits are angels; but some are God's angels, and some are the Devil's angels, I suppose.

We will now go on with the propositions preparatory to an understanding of the application of our standard, to the comparison of the two systems.

I agreed to lay in your minds a foundation for the perception of what constitutes a sphere. I have already described the mind as consisting of three distinct or discrete divisions; the sensational, the relational, and the absolute. The last is God's mind. Every thing which comes from God's mind must receive a place in the absolute. There are also three discrete impulses, corresponding to the degrees of the mind. Vices and crimes have their seat in self-love,—the selfish impulse. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your *lusts*, that war in your members?" (James iv: 1.) Here, then, is the impulse that governs all the lustful minds, whether in the body or out of it; the basis of classification applies to all.

The next is the moral love, or charity. It is the governing impulse corresponding to the second degree of mind. It comprises all scientific impulses, as having a tendency to elevate and redeem, as well as the impulse to do good to each other. Since the love which would do good to another, "seeks not its own," and binds minds together in love, it may be taken as another basis of classification, wherever mind is found. Go where you will, the world over, and *all* worlds over, all who sacrifice self for the sake of elevating and redeeming their neighbor, belong to this class.

There is still a higher love, that sanctifies the one who exercises it, and includes in its embrace the universe, loving all alike.

It is the absolute love. It loves as God loves; universally and perfectly. There is a basis for a third classification.

According to this principle of classification extended to the spirit world, you have Gehenna, or the first sphere, for the selfish and polluted souls; Paradise, or the middle sphere, for the intellectually and morally-cultivated souls; and the Paradise of God, or the third sphere, for the spirits who have "gone to their Father." All these spheres have their bases in the philosophy of the human mind, and your own consciousness can tell whether such a classification be not a just one.

We talk sometimes of the character of a society, or state, or nation, but it is evident that the only character they can have, is that of the individuals composing the society, state, or government. So of the spirit spheres. Their only character must be that of individuals making up the sphere. Such, then, is the division. The sphere of selfishness, of self-love, where the individual sacrifices every thing to himself, and "makes his belly his God," worshiping himself,—this must constitute one sphere in this world and out of this world, and in purity and elevation, it must be farthest removed from God,—from that "perfect love which casteth out all fear,"—which says "thy will be done," as its prayer and only desire.

Between the selfish on the one hand, and the self-oblivious or divine on the other, is the relational sphere. Here comes in the love of neighbor, which makes man try to do good to his fellow, and this is its basis in you and me.

If, while living here, I develop only selfishness, where shall I go when I leave the body, judging by my own delights and affinities? If I lived here striving to redeem my fellow-man,—to break the bonds of the oppressor,—to elevate and reform the inebriate,—to lift up the downcast in character as well as the downcast in body,—then, when I go into the spirit world, will I not carry that delight and love with me? Will not the same congenial labor elevate me there, and make me delight in the same work of benefiting my brother spirit or brother man?—make me impart "such as I have," as did Peter to the lame man at the Beautiful gate?

From this second sphere, the Paradise, come the angels of God, ministering to men and women, to "the heirs of salvation." They lead man out of the bondage to lust and sin, into the spiritual communion, where they may partake of the "milk and honey" of that happy land.

When they have become perfect in their loves, they rise to the place where Christ himself becomes subject to the Father, and God becomes all in all.

This is a short way of presenting the subject of the different spheres of man's existence. You see that I make them three in

number. Now, if we wish to determine to which of these spheres we belong, we have only to ask our souls the question, Where is thy God? Our God is where our treasure is, there our heart, and the object of our heart's worship will be found. That which most engages the soul, moves it to labor, and absorbs its attention, tells us in what direction to seek the soul itself. In other words, we have only to ascertain our own character. When we know that, we can tell our position. Here, then, the question of *affinity* comes up. The general principle is, that association, whether of matter or mind, is governed by the law of affinity,—sometimes called the law of attraction. The union of matter with matter, or mind with mind, can only take place under this law of attraction or affinity. Take an example. In this very audience, those having natural affinity, come and sit down together. You are not promiscuously assembled, but like is, to a very great extent, beside like. So in our every day life, those of similar tastes, morals, habits of mind or of body, seek each other's society. Change this affinity and they cease to associate together. Suppose I come into this town as a stranger,—you will soon ascertain something of my tastes and notions by ascertaining my associations. "A man is known by the company he keeps," as the old proverb has it. If you have places in this town where strong drink is sold, I should expect to find those there who like the excitement of intoxication. If there is a place where gambling is practiced, I should expect to find those there, who have acquired a thirst for getting gold by games of hazard. If you have a race-course, I should expect to find those there, who have learned to find pleasure in the sports of the turf. Science will attract those who have tasted of the sweet springs of knowledge, and they will congregate at the lecture room, or in the halls of learning. Those that think and feel alike in religious matters, will be found together in the prayer meeting. These are examples of affinity. Methodist would rather be with Methodists,—Presbyterians with Presbyterians,—Disciples with Disciples. This must be evident to every one. If I love self, that which will please me and give me most gratification, will be that which I shall be found seeking, and I shall form my associations accordingly. This is a law of our spirits, not of our bodies, and therefore it must continue when we pass into the spirit world. Those who think and love alike here, will be together there. Hence, you will find an almost infinite variety of bands there. Some are fond of music, painting, and art. Some would like to inspire the poet,—some, the painter,—and some, the artist; and they will seek to associate according to their loves, and their ruling impulse.

This then is the law, and all spiritual existences will be arranged under the three heads I have given, viz: those who love God, those who love their neighbor, and those who love self. You

can make no more spheres. You will be ruled by one of these love impulses. "You can not serve God and Mammon." You can not be elevated to Heaven, one moment, and be hurled to Hell the next. Remember, then, that by sphere, I do not mean a globe, a house, or a pen, but a state or condition.

Suppose, then, we are living in selfishness, and that we have communication with spirits, what kind of spirits will come to associate with us? Those, of course, which have the same loves, and delights, and can therefore use us as instruments to gratify their own lusts. So, if we are seeking the good of our neighbor, we shall have spirits from Paradise to associate with us. If a spirit from a higher sphere can descend to a lower to do good to those there, it will be done under the influence of some strong relational attachment. The spirit of a sainted mother may come down to weep bitter tears of sorrow and regret over a wandering son; may pray the prodigal to return to paths of virtue and goodness. In such a case, it is not affinity of character that draws the spirit down, but a natural affection, and enduring tie of love that binds them.

MR. ERRETT.

The gentleman has just been remarking with regard to the affinities of different spirits, and the associations which they seek, and as it is my business to reveal the teachings of Spiritualism, I will read from the "Astounding Facts," some corroboration of the gentleman's statements (page 26).

"Is it possible that a man who loves rum in this world carries that love with him into the next?' 'Yes, it is certainly true.' But there can be nothing there by which to gratify it, I said, inquiringly? 'No, not in ours; but you must not forget that our world, and especially with low, wicked spirits, is not far from yours.' But you do not mean to say that such an appetite in a disembodied spirit can be gratified? *Ans.* I do not know of any disembodied spirits; but spirits who have left the rudimental body can gratify a drunken appetite ten times as easy as those in that body. But how can that be, I asked in wonder. 'Joshua (a spirit) can enter the body of any drunken brute in human form, and partake of the *exhilarating influence of his cups* with the greatest ease imaginable: or, he can enter any man's cellar and *lay his face through the staves* of a hogshead of rum, and inhale its fumes until he is intoxicated and literally insane, like a man in delirium tremens.' He stated, too, that spirits were *guilty of licentious acts*, and that *quarreling and licentiousness* were as inseparable in their world as in ours."

It appears therefore, that those who are fond of liquor here

may console themselves that hereafter they may have an *everlasting spree*, and even come back to lie around the grog shops, and suck their fill!

The gentleman does not deign any serious reply to my argument upon the "impression of consciousness upon consciousness." He only says it is not a truth to me unless I perceive it. I claim to have shown that it is a truth neither to me nor to any one else, and am content to leave it there.

So with the argument upon the widow's prayer. You may judge what answer to my reasoning can be found in my friend's remarks. One word, however, upon this matter. If the gentleman would be understood as saying that a prayer to a God who can hear and answer us, is necessarily made to an objective God, how can he consistently talk of prayer at all. Who could be guilty of the folly of praying to a God whom he believed was unconscious of his petition? Such a belief would entirely hinder any reflex good influence upon one's self. Pray to those who can hear you! Pray to spirits who can help! Revive the Catholic calendar of saints, and pray to them! for by my friend's doctrine God can not know your wants, nor that you petition for their supply. If such a doctrine does not tend to revive all the superstition of the dark ages, whither is it tending?

As an offset to my readings concerning the spirit world, the gentleman refers to the imagery of the Bible. I have no objection to this, if it is kept distinctly in mind, that the descriptions which I read claim to be *literal* descriptions of things in heaven as they *really* are, and they are not figurative: the gentleman himself will not risk his argument upon that issue. Let him show then that the Bible imagery is equally literal, and I will yield the point. To fasten the matter, so far as Spiritualism is concerned, I will read from the 811th page of the second volume of Edmonds.

"My wife called my attention to the country below our elevation, and which at my last visit I had seen lighting up, as if improving spiritually, and which I had supposed was intended as an *allegorical* representation of our Earth's condition. She, *having noticed my error*, now said to me, 'No! that is an *actual reality* in the spirit world, and shows you how intimate is the connection between yours and ours.'"

There was another offset, in the case of the swine destroyed by the legion of devils, which my friend thought would balance some of the "trifles" narrated of modern spirits. I wish the gentleman would say plainly whether he makes a serious statement that the performances of wicked spirits in the days of Christ were anything that could be classed under "the phenomena of Jesus of Nazareth." The question is his own choice and wording, and he should know what it means. I deny that they are any more con-

nected with Jesus' ministry than any other coincident events; but I assert that those which I narrated are acknowledged on all hands to be the "phenomena of Spiritualism." Will the gentleman meet me on this point?

(I shall now read a little further from the spiritual developments with regard to angels. It is better to finish the matter while the gentleman's speeches on the subject are fresh. On page 144 of Edmonds' and Dexter's second volume, we find the "matron" spirit of the farm-house we have already had described to us, offering her guest a "drink of *buttermilk*" if he would call again. On page 168, we have a dashing turn-out. "A carriage and four horses drove up; they immediately attracted my attention, for one of my youthful follies had been a great *penchant* for driving tandem and four-in-hand; and she, who in girlhood had been accustomed to the quiet, sober driving of her quaker father, had soon learned to dash 'fast and furiously' through the country with me. It was a beautiful turn-out. The carriage was light and tasty, with a high seat for the driver, and one seat behind for two persons. It was painted yellow, and on its pannels was my seal! The harness was light and airy, and the horses were superb animals of the *true Arabian breed*, with long, sleek bodies, clean limbs, and a springing motion to every step. They were *well groomed*, high spirited, and well broke, and of different colors, being matched rather for quality than looks." The Judge drove the spirit steeds so boldly that he frightened the gentleman who sat beside his wife, but she "reassured him, and told him that she was used to it, and that he might rely upon it, that I was at home where I was, and *knew what I was about*." It seems then that there was such a thing *possible* as an upset, and getting a spiritual arm or leg broke. Such things do happen there sometimes. On page 51 of the "Astounding Facts," already quoted, we have a remarkable instance of spiritual suffering. "A neighbor of mine, a very uncommonly strong and healthy man, was caught before the engine of a railroad, and driven before it some twenty rods, his head striking from sleeper to sleeper, till he was taken up for dead. It is said he spoke once, breathed about twenty minutes, and expired. * * He told us that he suffered altogether more than he should, to have died of a fever; that his spirit was *ten hours* in separating from his body; that the physical and spiritual heads *were so smashed into each other*, as he expressed it, that the *separation* was exceedingly long, difficult, and painful. He stated, that though it was now about five years since the injury, *his head had ever been and was still tender*," and probably would ever be, I might add. On the same page it tells of another who "recently died of a dysentery. He says his *bowels are still tender*; and friend Bryant (a spirit) informs us that it will probably be half a year, before he will fully outgrow)

his disease." So much for their physical fears and ailments. The gentleman seemed to think the angels did not sing any, but that again is a mistake. On the 311th page of Edmonds' and Dexter's second volume, we have an account of the Judge's wife calling him to a spiritual window to hear the angels sing "John Anderson, my Joe!" accompanied with "musical instruments."

The Christian seer tells us of the saints in heaven "that had gotten the victory over the beast," singing "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints! Who shall not fear thee, O Lord! and glorify thy name! For thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest!" (Rev. xv. 3, 4.)

But *Spiritualism* makes its saints sing:—

"John Anderson, my Jo, John,
When we were first acquaint,
Your locks were like the raven,
Your bonnie brow was brent:
But now your brow is beld, John!
Your looks are like the snaw!
But blessings on your frosty pow,
John Anderson, my Jo!"

Mr. Moderator! the world is in great danger of sinking down into utter materialism! All the effort of the religious world fail to save man from continued tendency to gross materialism! All the developments of Christian life in the churches seem to be in vain! but surely it is a most blessed thing that *Spiritualism* has come to the rescue, and since men will not be charmed to see any glory and beauty in the song of Moses and the Lamb, it offers them in its place, the redeeming beauties and glories of the song of "John Anderson, my Jo!" Is not that a cheering hope! when our bodies are laid upon the bed of death, we may feel that there is no gloom gathering about us, but as a foretaste of the bliss to which our spirits are hastening, we may call about us the dancers and singers, and let them perform.

"John Anderson, my Jo, John!
John Anderson, my Jo!"

Is not this enough to make the world safe, sir? What fear of materialism any longer? These are the sober teachings of spirits sent to give the world instruction concerning their employments, their joys, their desires, and the fruition of their hopes in those happy spheres!

But, seriously, sir! let any one make the comparison between

the systems as they represent themselves, in this particular, and I have no fear that Christianity will suffer from the gentleman's sneer at the "singing" in heaven. I think, also, that the further we proceed, the better chance we have for judging of the *identity* of the systems.

I read, in the early part of the discussion, extracts from Davis, from the Spiritual Teacher, and from Mr. Courtney, to show that they disclaimed all identity. They declare that the spirit manifestations are *new* phenomena, never known before, and that no connection can be traced between them, and the teachings or phenomena of former times. You remember my quotation from Courtney, in which he says the teachings of the Bible might suit the childish people of the earlier ages, and were like ginger-bread and knick-knacks from some "good old grand-papa" who exhorts the "dear children" to be "good boys and girls!" but in the *manhood* of the race we need SPIRITUALISM for our full development! The same doctrine which these books proclaim, was asserted here last winter by the spiritual lecturers I have already referred to, and I doubt whether there has been any change in the spiritualists here, except by authority. The mediums Finney and Lockwood were paid to keep the matter before the people, and our spiritual neighbors scouted all "book religion." So stood the matter till my friend Mr. Tiffany came, when a few lectures brought them all over to a deep respect for "the Book" again. It suddenly became their Bible as much as ours! Yet all the while, close by us, at Newton Falls, the spiritual lecturers openly oppose the Bible, as a book unworthy of any confidence whatever. They have all, so far as I know, denied all similarity between their theories and the Bible. I showed, also, that the whole religious world scouted the idea of any similarity, and having shown from the spirits themselves, the utter incongruity existing between their teachings and those of Jesus of Nazareth, I conclude, and *rightly* conclude, that there is no identity, Mr. Tiffany to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Scriptures have been studied by men of mightiest mind, who have been life-long students, fearing God, studying with prayers and tears, upon their bended knees; yet all these are now written down fools and idiots, and the faith and learning of eighteen hundred years coolly ignored! The assertion of identity in the system is as arrogant an assumption as could be made. It is amazingly arrogant. Both parties deny his position; yet he stands here with spiritualists and Christians alike in opposition to him, and, to say the least, the presumptions are very strong against him.

I showed, in the next place, that Jesus claimed that the phenomena of his ministry were miraculous; but Spiritualism claims for itself no such thing. Here is another point to be met.

Other points have come up. We saw, from their own writers, and even from the admissions of the gentleman himself, that a large part of their phenomena are entirely unworthy of reliance. You will recall my quotations from Davis' "Present Age," in which he declares that "the spirit manifestations will come to a crisis," and admits that only *forty per cent.* of them come from spirits at all, and that these even are a mixture of all sorts, good, bad, and indifferent; and, by my friend's admission, are full of contradictions, absurdities, and puerilities.

I declared that no such affirmation could be made of the phenomena peculiar to the ministrations of Jesus of Nazareth. Has the gentleman taken issue there? Can he coolly pass by all these points and hope to make a case of *identity*? The word identity is a strong one. Analogies, or similarities, would not meet the case. The gentleman framed his own questions, and he must abide by them. He must show that no such discrepancies exist, as those I have pointed out, or he fails, utterly fails, to establish his proposition.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend seems to be somewhat impatient, because I have not taken up in detail the things he has stated. I have conceived a plan which is regular and straightforward, and I promise that he has raised no objection, and can raise none, which I will not meet before I get through. I must take that course which I regard as orderly, and give such propositions and rules of classification as will enable us to understand what we say, when we are talking of devils, angels, and spirits.

My friend seems horrified that I should have the arrogance to contradict the good and learned of all past ages, and perhaps he has cause; but I have one proposition to submit, and he can dispose of it as he sees fit. Christianity came into the world, whilst an angelic host hailed its advent, singing, "Peace on earth, and good will to men." That doctrine was to become the redeeming principle of the world. Eighteen hundred years have passed, and where is Christianity to-day? What national sin has it eradicated? What government is administered in accordance with its principles? We have had Christian churches enough, with "watchmen upon the walls of Zion," who have directed the education of the children, and ought to have raised up nations of redeemed men. It is not for lack of such things that Christianity has not made its impression upon the world. How stands it to-day with England, which, with this country, professes to stand foremost in civilization and enlightenment? Tell me of one Christian principle which is not repudiated by her Christian

Queen, her Christian Lords, her Christian Commons! Where are the Christian ministers to stand up and rebuke those that take the sword, telling them they shall perish by the sword! What is the difficulty? Eighteen hundred years, and Christianity, where is it now? Why has it not wrought its work? You have churches, you have Divinity schools, and professors in them, with well-learned creeds in their heads,—yet where is your Christianity? Tell me! how far above the standard of morality in this town is the morality of your churches and your clergymen? Surely, there is “something rotten in Denmark.” These facts make us ask, Where is the defect? Is it in your Christianity, or in your practice? I formerly thought it was in Christianity, and I became an atheist. But I saw my mistake. I saw that it was in your inconsistent practice, and your misunderstanding of Christianity, and I corrected my error. Unless you can show that I have taken a false position here, don’t throw books in my face. Meet my positions, and meet them fairly. I have been guilty of no pettifoggery. I will defend my propositions, every one of them, and meet your objections when they can be best understood.

I am asked whether demoniacal possessions were a part of the “phenomena of Jesus of Nazareth.” I answer, that they were a part of the phenomena which attended his ministry, and he was a spiritual teacher. I say, also, that the church had begun to deny the reality of the fact, and learned men were calling such possessions mere diseases, epileptic fits,—till now comes this new demonstration of the truth which no man can deny.

The apostle said, Try all spirits. Why did he say this, if there was but one kind of teaching, and one kind of spirits? I have not brought in the Apocryphal Testament, and the obsolete views of the spiritualists of Christ’s age, for I should see no fairness in that; and I claim to be tried with the same fairness; not by the books of spiritualists of this day, but by the facts themselves.

I said I would read no books, but I will read a passage from the *Millennial Harbinger*, by Alexander Campbell. (*Millennial Harbinger*, vol. 5, new series, page 476.)

“That we are susceptible of impressions and suggestions from invisible agents sometimes affecting our passions and actions, it were foolish and infidel to deny. How many thousands of well-authenticated facts are found in the volumes of human experience, of singular, anomalous, and inexplicable impulses and impressions, wholly beyond all human associations of ideas, yet leading to actions evidently essential to the salvation of the subjects of them, or of others under their care, from imminent perils and disasters; to which, but for such kind offices, they must inevitably have fallen victims. And how many, in the midst of a wicked and foolish career, have, by some malign agency, been suddenly

and unexpectedly led into the most fatal coincidences and suddenly precipitated to ruin, when such unprecedented exigences and exceptions to all the known laws of cause and effect, and inexplicable to all their wonted courses of action! To assign to these any other than a spiritual cause, it seems to me, were to assign a *non causa pro causa*; for on no theory of mind or body can they be so satisfactorily explained, and so much in harmony with the Bible way of representing such incidents. * * Will it not be perceived and admitted, that if evil demons can enter into men's bodies, and even take away reason, as well as excite to various preternatural actions, and if in legions they may crowd their influences upon one unhappy victim, *spirits, either good or bad, may make milder and more delicate approaches to the fountains of human action, and stir men up to efforts and enterprises for weal or woe, according to their respective characters and ruling passions.*"

These are no new ideas. They were published in 1841, before these manifestations took place, to be sure, but his investigations of the Bible led him to the conclusion that the Bible and Jesus of Nazareth taught these things.

My friend said the difference between the Bible imagery and the spiritual manifestations, was, that the Bible manifestations were not claimed to be genuine.

MR. ERRETT. I said nothing about "Bible manifestations:" I said that the *descriptions* in the spiritual communications were *literal* and not allegorical.

MR. TIFFANY. I will take you as you say. The Bible visions were, then, special spiritual creations, made up for the occasion. I think my friend's philosophy would help him to a better interpretation than that, if he studied his Bible carefully.

I was upon the subject of affinity when I left off in my last argument. I said that nations have their affinities as individuals have. By this means I shall explain the Mosaic dispensation.

The application of the principle is plain. If I attempt to govern a mental being, I must govern him by an influence which he can perceive. Now, if he is so absorbed in the animal life as not to perceive moral truths, he can not be governed by moral influences, but must be subjected to force. He is then like a brute, in being purely animal, and as a brute can not be governed by moral relations, neither can he. Hence the laws applicable to man in a savage condition, have their penalties, and appeal to his selfish nature.

Hence, the first dispensation to which man comes, is one of force, because he is living in a selfish and animal plane. Moses represents man in his animal nature, and you have, in his dispensation, the highest idea that the animal mind can form of God, his character, and government. You have the highest type of

man that can be made under such a system. Take David for an example. Look at his lust, his crimes, his dying act,—commanding his son to bring down the gray hairs of his enemies in blood to their graves! That is not a Christ-like character. It is a specimen of a lustful character. Look at Solomon, with his army of wives and concubines! These are the best specimens of humanity that such a dispensation can produce. It was a dispensation of force for an animal nature, and as such we must look at it. With all its faults, its descriptions of Deity, of God's dealings with man, it was a means of instruction, pointing out the truth that something better and higher was to save man. It gives you a portrait of man in his animal nature, as an individual; a husband, a neighbor, a priest, a worshiper,—he is drawn in every phase of his character, to show the lusts and self-love of an animal nature. With this view of the case, there is not a word too much about war, bloodshed, and slavery; not a word too much about lust and licentiousness; not a wife or concubine too many, to represent man in his selfishness. Unless these things had followed, the impulses of selfish human nature would not have been perfectly portrayed; as it is, the dispensation is the perfect incarnation of animalism.

The fact that man was thus imperfect,—the fact that his heart was not purified and cleansed under that dispensation and covenant,—proclaimed the necessity of a new dispensation. The first was a literal covenant and law. It said, Eye for eye, and it meant, Eye for eye. It said Life for life, and it meant Life for life. When it spoke of a victim, it meant what it said. It addressed man naturally, under his natural impulses. When they passed into the spirit world, they remained under such impulses. The spirits which would be in *rapport* with them, were of the same kind with themselves, and hence there was a natural affinity and conjunction between the spirits of Gehenna and the men of the old dispensation. Now bear in mind that an individual who is controlled by self-love, and lives in selfishness, lust, and sin, is under the old dispensation, although he may live in this age and in this land. This is the basis of the Mosaic dispensation, government and institutions. Such were its results,—such were its saints,—such its Deities. Its saints would not be received in my friend's church to-day. The standard of the world is far above that now. But in that day, they were the proof of what their system could do. They have gone out of sight now, as the moon and the stars go out of sight when the sun rises in its glory. We don't need to go back to them now.

The means by which spirits influence men, are easily understood, and you and I, if we do not fortify our hearts against their influence by raising our souls into love with all that is just and lovely and good, may be taken captive by evil spirits, which even

now are seeking to control men's minds. When Christ came to put an end to the old, forceful system of Moses, he declared that his doctrine was different from that, which had been handed down from "them in olden time." He said the cleansing must be commenced within, in the heart; the evil must be lopped at the root; the ax must be laid at the root of the tree. He came to purify man within,—to teach him not merely to love his neighbor,—he came to teach him to love his enemy also,—to teach him concerning the spirit world, and the things of that world. He came to open a communication, a higher and better communication with the spirit world than that opened by the old dispensation; one between Earth and Paradise, and to close all communication, as far as possible, with the spiritual Gehenna. Had his followers been careful to keep open the way into the spirit world, long, long ere this the world would have been redeemed, Gehenna would have been shut out, and dark and lustful spirits would have ceased to manifest themselves here. But after Christ was gone, somehow the story got afloat, that the whole object of these manifestations was to prove the Divine mission of Christ, and then they were done with and must be laid aside, and his truths and teachings be received upon authority. As soon as this opinion became prevalent, progress ceased, orthodoxy began to form its creeds and dogmas, and men were called upon to exercise a blind faith in the tenets their priests taught them.

MR. ERRETT.

The great difference between Christ's mode of dealing with devils and that of modern spiritualists, is, that Christ cast them out, whilst our spiritualists take them in, and are taken in by them. The two modes are not altogether "identical."

The gentleman read from Mr. Campbell's article upon Demonology: I am very familiar with it, and should have no possible objection to his reading it all. I wish the audience to remember, however, that Mr. Campbell does not admit that either the angels of light like the one who released the Apostles from prison, are *disembodied human beings*, nor that the spirits of "just men made perfect" return to earth after death, but only that the "demons" of the New Testament are the spirits of wicked men, and upon the first of these points, the whole of the gentleman's argument with regard to angels, turns. That lecture Mr. Campbell delivered at Nashville, Tenn., long before Modern Spiritualism was heard of, and so far is he from taking any thing of it back, that he has, since the rise of Spiritualism, gone to the very place to lecture upon it, and I am told that the spirit of *Doctor Channing* communicated to the leader in Spiritualism at that place, that he

had better keep away and not meddle with Mr. Campbell,—and he did not meddle. So far was Mr. Campbell from being afraid to face his former teachings on that subject.

My friend seems to think that the light of Christianity is utterly extinguished,—there is no Christian upon earth: that for eighteen hundred years' existence it has nothing to show. Well, suppose for the moment, that it were so. If Spiritualism in its phenomena and teachings be identical with original Christianity, what hope is there for the world in the next eighteen hundred years? To him we say, "watchman, what of the night!" According to his own positions, we should commence again with a system which has brought forth no fruit, and with the disadvantage of having the gentleman himself as the new founder of it, in the place of our Lord Jesus Christ! Mr. Davis and Mr. Courtney claim that there is reason for hope in the future, because they have a *better* system, not an identical one: but if my friend is right, if the systems are identical, and Jesus Christ could do nothing for the world by Christianity, when he himself was its head, what hope is there, I ask, if it is to be revived in these days, with Joel Tiffany for its head?

But can the gentleman seriously mean to say that the world is really no further advanced, morally and religiously, than it was when Jesus found it? No advancement, no less selfishness, no more righteousness, no more purity, no more light, no more dignity in our ideas of human nature, no more clear recognition of Christian principles in government, no less opposition to slavery and immorality than then? none? Are we just where we were eighteen centuries ago? Who of this age would put himself there; would have the Roman Empire revived, and Roman war and Roman licentiousness, with all the pagan darkness and misery, and all its revolting crimes? No! The world is better off; governments are more liberal; there is more human liberty, more social elevation; human nature is progressing! And in what lands do we find the most advancement? Is it in Mahomedan lands or among pagan nations? The gentleman, in his lectures, does say that Mahomedanism would be as good as our Christianity: if so, our women might pack off into harems, and our domestic institutions put upon a Turkish footing, and our morality be none the worse for it! He asks how far above the morality of the world our churches are? I answer, take the churches, imperfect as all Christians admit, with sorrow of heart, that they are; and separate them from those who do not profess Christianity, and upon which side will the drunkard, the openly licentious, and the notoriously wicked be found? He tells us we would not receive David among us now; that no church would receive him. Suppose that were so, would not my friend himself prove by this very example that the world had progressed? His estimate of

David, false as it is, only answers his own argument. But let him say, who dares, that there is no moral and religious influence coming forth from our Sunday schools, and our churches! I know how the moral men of our community feel—those who are not members of our churches. I have often talked freely with them. They know how to cherish the influences which were around them in their early life, and they recognize their indebtedness to the *church* and Christian influences in childhood, for the moral standing they now have before the world. They remember their pious fathers and mothers, and the influence of their teachers, and know full well what they would have been without these.

It is not true to say that Christianity has accomplished nothing. There have been ten thousand opposing influences which have hindered the realization of the cherished hopes of the early Christians; we suffer nothing by this admission; but when the gentleman says *no* progress has been made, he has the common sense and intelligence of the entire world against him. But, to turn again to his own position:—if you can try a thing eighteen centuries, and get no good out of it, it is certainly not worth while to try it again, under no more favorable auspices, and with no additional security.

Again, the gentleman insists upon speaking of the wicked spirits which possessed men in the days of Jesus, as a part of the phenomena under Jesus' teachings, which are therefore to be compared with those of Spiritualism. That they were *coincident* phenomena, I have already declared; but so were deafness, dumbness, leprosy and death, and were these, too, phenomena *under* the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth? The phenomena of Jesus' teaching were the *casting out* of demons, the cleansing of lepers, causing the blind to see, and the dead to burst their cerements and come to life! The devils and the leprosy were no part of Christianity! But not so with Spiritualism. The phenomena which I have narrated form a *part of the system*. The difference in the relations of the systems is too clear for argument.

The gentleman thinks he might as well bring in the Apocryphal Testament, as for me to bring in such phenomena as I have done. When I bring Apocryphal *cases* he is at perfect liberty to prove that they are false; as I shall do if he attempts to bring in an Apocryphal Testament as a part of Christianity. I know what books of that kind there are, as well as he does. The cases which I have adduced, are universally admitted by spiritualists to be real, and my friend knows better than to attack them, and where, I ask, is to be our hope and confidence, if such manifestations as I have mentioned are to be a part of this new and glorious dispensation?

The dispensation of Moses is spoken of as an "incarnation of

animalism!" What was animalism before it was incarnated? Had it never been embodied before the advent of Moses? Had the world been so pure and holy before that, that God found it necessary to make an incarnation of animalism to show what sin was? Were the nations of Canaan spiritualists who, with their higher light, opposed the animalism of Moses? Indeed, they seem to have been, for they consulted the dead, and Moses drove them out!

That the dispensation of Moses was not perfect, that it was preparatory; that it was established with reference to another and a perfect one that was to follow, no careful reader of Scripture is ignorant; but that it was established to show what would be the result of uncurbed wickedness and lust, and selfishness, is false. If such a monstrous assumption were true, who would not say the world might better have been spared such a dispensation and its experiences; that we had better be back where Moses commenced.

The gentleman attempted to avoid my remarks upon the *reality* of the heaven seen by Edmonds, in his visions, by coolly assuming that I denied the *fact* of John's vision as recorded in the Apocalypse. I think you will not misapprehend my meaning in saying that the one claimed to be a description of *realities*, and the other simply an *allegorical representation*, and I shall do nothing more than call your attention to the language I used.

We are now drawing to the close of another day. My friend has, as yet, attempted to give no definition of Spiritualism, and I have been obliged to give one myself, and go on with the examination of Spiritualism in its phenomena and teachings, without any help from him. We will try, however, to take hope for another day, and wait for him to reach that part of the subject. I wish to say, in conclusion, that many of the gentleman's remarks upon morality are admirable. They are things which I have been trying to teach, in my poor way, for years. The morality which would raise the world to a higher conception of spiritual truth and life, to more complete benevolence, and a warmer love from man to man, is not the peculiar property of my friend's system of ethics. We have claimed it, also, as a part of Christianity. Neither is it a strange doctrine to us that men mingle with each other according to their affinities; these things have been known and understood for a great many years. We knew that drunkards love each other's society, and so do those who are pure and holy. There is no harm in referring to these facts; it is all very well, but if the gentleman imagines that they are either new or peculiar to Modern Spiritualism, he is greatly mistaken. We learned many things of this kind from that good old book, the Bible, without any special inspiration on our part, and without going away from the common meaning of language to find it.

There are men here to-day, who are going down to the grave covered with white locks, who never in all their lives dreamed that it was necessary that absurdities, and puerilities, and foolishness of every imaginable hue and kind, should be called up from Hades, Gehenna, and Tartarus, to prove what they never doubted, and what was the common theme of their study in childhood, in Bible classes and Sabbath schools. How thick would have been our darkness with regard to these things, if friend Tiffany had not come here to enlighten us! How much firmer must be our faith and hope, now that spirits have descended to make such revelations, and perform such astounding wonders as those which I have narrated.

FOURTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—It is desirable that when disputants take positions before the audience, they shall make themselves understood. When I attempt to reply to my friend Errett, it is better that I should understand him. I will therefore restate a couple of my propositions. One of them was, that no one can understand a truth unless it is perceived by the mind: another was, that man can not perceive any existence further than it has a representation in himself—or, in other words, than he has an idea of it. I would like to know if he denies these propositions?

MR. ERRETT. No, sir. I admit that the mind is what perceives, and that perception is by means of ideas. Those are harmless propositions if you do not twist a false meaning out of them.

MR. TIFFANY. Well, I am glad to hear that he does not deny them; for he seemed to be quibbling about them. These are fixed propositions, and I hope they will not trouble us again. Your ideas of every thing are the ideas of your understanding of your propositions, and although you may transfer them to a book, they are still your ideas. Therefore, from whomsoever an author may profess to obtain his perception, they must still remain *his perceptions, his ideas*, and I was right in treating the books quoted here, as the opinions of the men who wrote them, and not Spiritualism.

There is also another proposition which he seems to be talking about unnecessarily. I said I could convey to a blind man the idea of color, but he says I can not, except by the use of words. Carry out his position a little further, then. You do not perceive God, yet you speak of him in words. What, then, does the word represent, when you use it? What idea will it communicate? You have the word, but you have never seen God, and how can it convey any meaning to your mind? If you can not have ideas without words, I should like to know how, upon the first hearing of that word "God," any idea was conveyed to the mind. Just so of the word "spirit."

I asked the gentleman to tell us what Christianity has accomplished in the world. He has made some attempt at it, but my assertions remain undisputed. I said there has been no Christian government on earth,—none but what repudiated every principle of Christianity. I did not say there was no Christian on earth, but I am going to do so. A Christian is an individual who has

put on Christ, in the sense of having the spirit of Christ. Now I want my friend to show me a man that has put on Christ in such a sense. Show me one who offends not in any point! for he that offends in one point is guilty of all. Show me a Christian by such a standard! Morality is not Christianity. The man who has been baptized into Christ, with the Holy Ghost and fire, he only is a Christian.

He says, if Christianity has failed, why do I advocate a return to the system. Represent me fairly, my friend. I said that the Christianity which has failed is *not* Christianity. I say return to *Christ*,—to his doctrines in spirit and in truth: keep his commandments in every particular. When you show me a man who does that, I will show you a man that is a Christian; and till then, I shall believe that there are none.

If a truth has not been proclaimed and believed in by certain classes of mind, is it therefore no truth? If Spiritualism slumbered for eighteen hundred years, was not Discipleism slumbering as long, till Alexander Campbell came? No, sir; a truth, although not recognized, may still be a truth.

I am asked what there is in Christianity like Roman slavery, and Roman licentiousness. If you can find slavery worse than Christian slavery, or licentiousness worse than that existing in the bosom of Christian communities, so-called, I should like to know it. You talk of Christian morality! Although, in my opinion, the Mahomedans have an immoral religion, I really believe their practical morality is greater than you can find in your Christian community. In Persia, a missionary tells us, the merchants can go out, leaving their stores unguarded, with the prices of their goods marked upon them, leaving it for purchasers to measure off what they bought, and put the money in the place of the stuff purchased. It is said that the same things are done in China, and that a Chinaman when asked how he could venture to do so, replied with great simplicity, "Why, bless you, there is not a Christian within five hundred miles of here!" I said in my book, that you might as well have Mohammedanism, *so far as* working any reformation in the community was concerned. I did not say that Mohammedanism in itself is better than Christianity. Of course, there is, in the church, a certain outward morality; it turns its *shop* into the world. I remember a story of a church disciplining a man, and turning him out, but "the world" had a meeting and declared that they would not receive the man till the church reformed him, and made him, at least, as good as he was when he went into it. If the commandments of Christ are carefully ascertained, and then every individual is taught "if ye love me, ye will keep my commandments," and that a man must really *love* his neighbor and his *enemy*; that he must not lay up "treasure on earth," it will be found that these commandments go

down into the soul, and lay the foundation for becoming a Christian. It is not the outward command, but the inward, that needs most carefully to be impressed; and the source and root of evil must be attacked in man's desires and thoughts.

My friend says we "take in devils, and are taken in by them." Christ said, "If I, by Beelzebub, cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges." (Luke x: 19.) Devil can not cast out devil. That is, he is not likely to do it.

My friend thinks that the church is very well off, for it has "the Word:" but has that Word taught your church that slavery is a sin? You have the Word, indeed; any amount of it, and men to read and preach it, and it may have taught *you* the criminality of slavery, but how has it taught *your* brother? Is not he, the leader of your sect, found defending slavery from that very Word? Does not this show the truth of what I say, that the Bible is to you according to your understanding and your perception of it?

He says I evaded him! I don't know any thing about evading. I will dodge nothing. If I forget to reply, that is not evasion. Ask me and see if I will evade.

A VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE. I would like to ask what *Spiritualism* is?

MR. TIFFANY. Well, let us come to that. My friend says I agree with him that *Spiritualism* is *Necromancy*,—holding communication with spirits of the dead. Christ and John and the Apostles were necromancers by this definition. The true meaning of *Necromancy*, is, the art of foretelling future events by converse with the dead, but I will take my friend's explanation of the term.

Is Christianity the teaching of every man who holds the Bible to be true? If not, how can my friend be right in saying that *Spiritualism* is what is taught by all who call themselves spiritualists? If you should receive, as Christianity, all that a man teaches, provided only that he receives the Bible, you cannot prove any thing to be Christianity; for all things are denied—the church is divided against itself—sect against sect. Some say all mankind will be saved; others, that a part will be damned; yet both profess to believe in the Bible! Are both Christians? Shall I bring forward the doctrine of those who say that hell is paved with infant skulls a span long, and call *that* Christianity? I give my friend and you notice, that time spent in reading from spiritualists will be of no use to him when we come to examine *Spiritualism* as distinguished from spiritualists.

Now, I ask, how much is it necessary for a man to know or believe, in order to be called a spiritualist? It is said that those who believe that spirits can and do hold converse with people in the body, are spiritualists; but are the opinions of all these to be

quoted as Spiritualism? Would you take the opinion of all who believe that Jesus is the Christ to prove what Christianity is? From the very books which have been read you can see that the opinions of their writers differ, and, of course, from them you can not prove what Spiritualism is, any more than Christianity.

There must be something that enters into the elements of Christianity and Spiritualism, so that you may distinguish each from the expositions and opinions of the different sectarian preachers and teachers on the subjects. The definition must cover the whole, and not be made up of contradictions. A man's judgment may be of little real value as truth, but I may yet learn a great deal from it. Hence, when a man gives me that which he believes, he gives me a means of judging of him, because he is to be judged according to the principles he has enounced. Therefore the phenomena given by all these writers, may be of service to me, and yet in attempting to find what Spiritualism is, I must combine them as a whole, and look for a fundamental principle, the essence of Spiritualism, and not accept the dogmas of each individual believer. Every one can see, if he will open his eyes, that otherwise, no philosophy can be fairly tried. You cannot try Christianity in that way. Philosophy must have a basis founded upon universal laws. If men entertain different opinions, there must be a reason for it. Now, all the spiritualists that I have ever read, agree in this, that there are false and lying spirits. Jesus Christ said so; the apostles said so; Mr. Campbell says so; Modern Spiritualism says the same, and we may lay it down as *one* principle pertaining to Spiritualism. Another principle is, that every individual who leaves this world and enters the other, takes his character with him. The phenomena and teachings all show that. Individuals may dogmatize differently, but the principle remains fixed. I beg pardon, sir (to the Moderator), I had not noticed your rap.

MR. ERRETT.

It is not to be wondered at, Mr. Moderator, that the gentleman should not hear you; he has got far beyond the *raps* in his Spiritualism.

He has spent full half his speech in attempting an answer to Brother Bosworth's question—what is Spiritualism? but I am dubious whether the audience is any the wiser on the subject. He does not, in terms, repudiate his former position, for he said that my definition of Spiritualism was a right one, the very one he meant to drive me to; but I confess that I do not altogether appreciate the consistency of his remarks. He insists that I have

no right to quote the dogmatizings of spiritualists as Spiritualism, but it is hard for some of us to see what rule would exclude the dogmatizings of Davis and Edmonds, that would not also exclude those of Mr. Tiffany. He has not yet freed himself wholly from his humanity, and established a claim to be solely regarded as pure truth itself, and reason itself.

I have showed that Judge Edmonds and Dr. Dexter proclaimed that their book was "Spiritualism," and that if it was not, a *lie* was emblazoned upon it, and reiterated on each of its pages from beginning to end: and *this very book* my friend declares was no more ridiculous in its contents than the Christian Scriptures; the words of Christ and his apostles!

In reply to what I said upon their being taken in by devils, and not casting them out, the gentleman read Christ's saying with regard to Satan's casting out Satan. Upon that principle, their lack of power is satisfactorily explained. The gentleman is still unsatisfied with what I said of the state of Christianity in the world. I am content to take the natural conclusions of his own argument. Christianity has so exalted the purity and morality of society that *David* would not be tolerated in the world, to say nothing of the church! I apprehend, if you will go back and study with candid attention the great, earnest soul of David, you will conclude that if there is no man in the world as corrupt as he, with all his sins upon him, we are getting to have a pretty good sort of world. If the world would not receive David even as the "slop," which the gentleman says the church casts out upon the world, we are certainly making some progress! He tells us that every Christian is baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and defies me to show one such;—says there are none. Well, one thing, then, is settled by that argument, and that is, that there is no baptism of the Holy Ghost in the world. I shall hold him to this assertion, and wish it to be kept in remembrance. Mr. Tiffany has not that baptism, *no one* has it, and the claims of *Spiritualism* in this matter, which have been set up, are *entirely abandoned*, with all the gentleman's own pretensions to that inspiration of the Holy Ghost which would enable *him* to explain the "spiritual sense" of Christ's teachings. This is an important point.

I asked, what have we to hope for the eighteen centuries to come, if the very Christianity which my friend pretends to inaugurate anew, has not, for the ages past, with Christ himself for its founder, succeeded in accomplishing any thing. Is there any more security against error than before? I gave you the testimony of Andrew Jackson Davis, that the wild follies of mediums were such already that the manifestations were on the point of being rejected *in toto*, unless there was more *sense* infused into them. The tendency already is to rest satisfied with mere exter-

nal phenomena so contemptibly trifling, that the very devils, in the days of Jesus, would have been ashamed of them. Others of their leaders beside Davis speak contemptuously of them, and this too, whilst Spiritualism is so young that our school children can remember the whole history of its rise and progress. Yet the gentleman tells us that it is going to do for the world what Christianity has utterly failed to do! The great work to be accomplished is to introduce the kingdom of heaven into the *hearts* of men; to cleanse them inwardly, and draw away their attention from externals; and although Christ himself could do nothing, the gentleman tells us, and the world is as bad off as ever, Spiritualism is able to accomplish the whole! and this is asserted in the face of the gross sensuality it manifests in all its tendencies, at this early day!

If the gentleman believes, as he says, that the Mohammedanism of Persia, and the idolatry of China, is so much better in its "practical morality" than Christianity, would it not be better for him to commence his labors among them, as being already more advanced in the "relational and moral plane," and, therefore, better subjects of such influences as might raise them still higher? Such a course would show some faith in his own statements. But he should have gone a step further. Not only are Mohammedans and pagans better than Christians, but my friend finds much to contrast with them, even in the brute creation. I will read from the 257th page of "*Tiffany's Lectures*."

"The animal eats only to supply the demands of a healthy appetite, and not for the purpose of deriving pleasure from eating; and eats those things which are best suited to supply that demand. Hence their appetites never become depraved, and they never destroy themselves by gluttony. They drink to quench a healthy thirst, and only for that purpose. Hence they seek not to tickle the palate with mixed or unnatural drinks, and you have no dissipated or drunken animals. They gratify their sexual desires for the purpose of propagating their species, and not for supplying themselves with an unnatural source of gratification and enjoyment. Hence they run not to any excess of lust, and thereby enervate, disease, and destroy themselves. Hence you find no libertines or debauchees among mere animals. In supplying their wants, they seek to appropriate no more than their wants demand. They are no monopolists. The swine will share his slough with his brother swine; and the horse, and ox, and sheep, their pasture and their shade."

Had we not better unman ourselves, then, and become beasts rather than Mohammedans even? for my friend admits that they have vices.

But no such argument can prove that such a condition as he has drawn, is superior to man's. There is something in the very

crimes of man that attests his dignity, wicked though he be. They prove a higher nature, though perverted and depraved. A pagan nation does not possess the energy of a Christian one, and the inferior nature may not, in its perversion, sin so outrageously as a higher one, but the very energy in crime shows the inherent power of a superior class of souls, which may yet be more criminal in their vices. A fallen angel may sin more fearfully than man, but the angelic nature may be superior to the human, nevertheless.

My friend says that "Discipleism" has not taught all of us the wickedness of slavery. It is sufficient for my argument here, to return to the question. Has Spiritualism taught the South any better? I have a book published by a spiritualist in Nashville, Tenn., professing to have many communications from *Dr. Channing*, and if the noble soul could "rap," I should expect him to rap loud with indignation at the simpletons who could believe that such balderdash ever emanated from him. I shall read some of these communications before I am through, and I affirm that there is not to be found a single condemnation of slavery in the whole of them. The man who stirred the whole religious and moral world with the most earnest appeals to conscience, against slavery, clothing his dignified thoughts in most pure and eloquent language, can, they believe, come down to Nashville, and pour out torrents of contemptible triflings upon nearly every other subject but this!

The gentleman says that Mr. Campbell defended American slavery from the Bible. I deny that he does any thing of the kind. I am not here as the special defender of Mr Campbell—he can speak for himself, but that much I say. He says that slavery is not a thing necessarily wrong in itself; and it is not for you, sir, to attack that doctrine, for you go further, and say that nothing is wrong *in itself*. My own opinions on that subject are well enough known here and elsewhere, and I have no need to go into them. Spiritualists, of all men, should keep still on that subject, so long as they can place in the lowest, and literally the most infernal sphere, among whoremongers, and murderers, and all who are vile and polluted, and only for the crime of being a *negro*, the pure spirit of such a one as Uncle Tom, who could meet all the sufferings, and wrongs, and cruel insults, that a fiendish nature could inflict, and forgiving his enemies, breathes out his life, singing, "I'll be home to heaven in the morning."

The gentleman spoke of the licentiousness of Christian lands. Why, sir, I should be ashamed to read before this audience the communications published in their books, concerning the intercourse of spirits, a sexual intercourse, if I must use plain words, which could be expected on earth only in the vilest brothels. All that is vile, abominable, and polluted, is made common in these higher spheres, and they tell us that promiscuous cohabitation

will soon become prevalent here also. I am unwillingly forced to notice such things, but that I may not be charged with speaking unadvisedly, I refer, for my authority, to the "Astounding Facts from the Spirit World," page 172. The gentleman will be wise to provoke no discussion on that subject.

We were told, at first, that you could not tell the difference between the church and the world, but this is all taken back now, and in the place of it we have the apologetic assertion, that the church may be better, but it is because it pours all the "slop" out into the world! That charm is destroyed, then. The church and the world no longer stand upon a level; the "slop" is poured out, and the only fault is, that we did not pour it out faster, so as to be entirely rid of it.

I am asked, again, if the opinions of every man who professes to be a Christian, are Christianity, and the number of Christian sects is harped upon. In treating of the relative value of the systems, it is enough to say, if the gentleman acknowledges that Spiritualism has, in the first two or three years of its existence, split up into as many sects as Christianity has in eighteen hundred years, that its *future* promises but little to the world. I have already said that we give a standard of Christianity, found in the New Testament, and by any fair interpretation of it, we are willing and anxious to be judged. When he will give us some equally fixed standard of Spiritualism, so that we may know schism from orthodoxy, we will admit any censure for going beyond that standard to judge the system.

If the gentleman is prepared to go into the matter with earnestness and compare the teachings of Spiritualism with Christianity, I sincerely wish he would get at it. I cannot but complain that these attacks upon Christianity have nothing to do with the real question before us. We are certainly not learning much about Spiritualism.

I shall conclude with presenting a few points for the gentleman's philosophic consideration.

He speaks of three "discrete degrees" of mind; the physical, the relational or intellectual, and the absolute. There is no God in the first or second, if I understand him. That is, those in the first sphere know nothing of him, those in the second have no correct knowledge of him, and only in the third can we become acquainted with him, and even then, only in *our own consciousness*. But there is not on earth a man who has the spirit of Christ, according to his statement; and consequently none have reached the third discrete degree. None know God, and all are "without hope in the world;" all are idolaters, the gentleman himself included, and we are forced to the conclusion that there is, practically, *no God on earth!*

Another point is,—but my time is up.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend said that my dogmatizings upon Spiritualism are not Spiritualism itself, any more than those of other men. I admit it. I said at the start, you must not take *one thing* upon my "say so." My own principles, therefore, forbid that any thing should be received, because it is my dogma.

He says we do not cast out devils, because we are devils ourselves, or something to that effect. Does he cast out devils? The believers were to cast them out—has he that power? That was to be the sign of his apostleship; I would like to see him work under his commission.

I do not say that no man is as bad as David was. I have only said that his character was so low that he would not be received into my friend's church; and I say so still. I said he would not be received into respectable society, and I appeal to you if the man who kept scores of wives and concubines, would be. If he would, your morality is not as high as I think it is. In like manner, all that I said by way of comparing Persian morality with that current among you, was founded upon the narrations of Christian missionaries. If a member of your churches maintains a standard of morality, such that the world considers him respectable, do you require of him to maintain a higher one? Do you turn him out if he is not better? This is what I mean in saying that the morality of the world is as high as that of the church.

The gentleman read a passage from my lectures and put his construction upon it. I will read a little more and let you judge if his construction was a fair one. He read a passage which only shows that I asserted, that, as elsewhere in God's universe, so in the animal creation, all things move on smoothly. Is that saying it is better to be an animal than man? I showed that it is man's higher activity that stimulates him to vice and wickedness. The lecture comes to the same conclusion as my friend, viz: that it is because man has a higher nature that he is capable of vice. It says (page 258),

"Were man an animal merely, he would be guilty of none of those excesses and vices. These excesses are *the result of the aspirations and desires of his immortal nature* misdirected. The spirit gives the impulse, the animal gives the direction."

When my friend speaks of a thing as good or evil, he speaks of it as such, from its state or condition,—its relation to other things, and hence the thing is good or evil according to those relations, and not *in itself*. He can not differ from me on this point.

The proposition that truth can not be received upon authority gets its full share of attention from my friend, but he constantly mistakes fact for truth. You can receive facts upon authority, but you are to deduce the truth yourselves, independent of author-

ity. You are to search out the principles manifested, and in that way you will find the truth. You will learn the necessity of coming under the influence of a higher and holier impulse, to enable you to receive higher and holier truth. You must find the truth of all this for yourselves; it is only the facts that you can receive upon authority. You will also see that the evils in man are not of God's creation: that they come from man's failure to turn his mind in the direction of the pure and good. Spiritualism teaches this in all its doctrines and all its phenomena. Jesus taught the same. Was ever any thing more fully demonstrated than this,—that those who die, carry their character with them into the next world? Has not my friend proved from the quotations he has read, that in the next world, he that is holy is holy still, he that is filthy is filthy still, and the drunkard a drunkard still?

We must ask in this manner what *all* the phenomena of Spiritualism teach, and what all the phenomena of Christianity teach, and then by comparing them, see what they both agree in. When treated thus, Spiritualism teaches what I have just set forth,—and does not Christianity do the same?

My friend will call every individual in Warren a spiritualist, who believes that spirits can hold intercourse with them; that their fathers and mothers can come back and sympathize with them, and dry up the mourner's tear. But Jesus taught the same things. He taught that both evil and good spirits may come back; and that each will show out his character when he comes. The moment you receive spirits' communications upon authority, you are open to deceit; but if you will apply the principles I have given you, you will be able to test their teachings, and find for yourselves what is truth. For myself, I can say that for four or five years past, the spirits I have been familiar with, have taught me to "try all things, and hold fast that which is good." I am not responsible when evil spirits come back and deceive men. They come by the same law as the good. They can come to tempt, but the holy and good spirits can come by the same law to sympathize with the holy and good. Here the phenomena reveal what the government of God is, and as Mr. Campbell said in the quotation I read, whilst evil spirits can thus control us, good spirits may do the same; and were it not for this power in good spirits there would be little hope for Earth. On page 479, of the "Millennial Harbinger" (same volume as before), he says—"with this awful group of exasperated and malicious demons in our horizon, it is some relief to remember that there are many good spirits of our race, allied with ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of angels of light, all of whom are angels of mercy and sentinels of defence around the dwellings of the righteous, the true *élite* of our race." Spiritualism teaches

the same, and that we are to cultivate such a disposition and character as to enable high and holy spirits to come in accordance with their affinities, and communicate with us; thus raising us up still higher. This my friend says is Diabolism!

Christ said, "If ye love me keep my commandments," and those commandments were intended to lift them above selfishness, lust, and wickedness of every kind. If this were done, he and the Father were to come and take up their abode with us. It was when the disciples were lifted up by the impulses of a pure and holy love that this intercourse with God and Christ was to come about. Now, I affirm that Spiritualism teaches the same thing. To the world Christ could not manifest himself, for its children were not pure, they were not fitted to receive him. I ask my friend why it was that Christ could not manifest himself in bodily form to the world after his resurrection? It was because pure spirits can come unto those who are impure and lustful. Spiritualism, in all its teachings, demonstrates this; and yet my friend says, because there are evil and false spirits, that we are to turn our back upon *all*, and not receive the communications of our best friends! No! Spiritualism is not so narrow as to receive one class of dogmas and call them its doctrine. You must take all the phenomena and all the teachings, and deduce the truth for yourself. What is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity? It is that the "carnal heart" is at enmity with God,—can not see God. Does not Spiritualism affirm the same doctrine, the same principle; that if you would come into communication with good spirits, you must become good and true yourself? I say, then, that every thing that Spiritualism teaches, harmonizes with the views of Jesus of Nazareth. For this reason, that this might plainly appear, I have been laboring part of the time here, to show what were Jesus' doctrines, and I shall spend some time upon that subject still.

I did not like that remark of my friend, that Alexander Campbell does not sustain American slavery from the Bible. What is he writing to the American churches upon this subject for? I know that my friend differs from him on that matter, but I know also that Mr. Campbell makes *slavery* an institution of God himself: such slavery as makes a man a chattel, money, property of another man! I only mention this to show that those who profess to believe in the Word alone, and call the Word the only truth, do not always get the truth.

He says the world owes its standard of morality to the church. Clergymen often make this remark, but it is not sustained by facts. No science of any prominence which has started within the last fifteen hundred years, but has found the church its first enemy. Astronomy, Geology, Phrenology, have all had to meet the church as their foe. Science has risen with the church upon

its back ! You learned no science from the Bible, for it does not pretend to teach it ; nor from your clergymen, for they were its steady opponents. Still more to the point :—there has not been a moral enterprise which has not been carried on outside of the church. The church has been the first to oppose and denounce all such. It opposed the agitation of the slavery question—it opposes, to-day, the abolition of capital punishment. When I began working in the anti-slavery enterprise, I could get into a town-hall to speak, but the churches were closed against me, and even now slavery finds its strongest advocates and defenders in the church. I commenced early in the Temperance Reform, and I know well who were our first opposers. I know who said that all the creatures of God were good, and that intoxicating liquors were good as a beverage. I know, also, that when the movement became popular, the church came up to the standard of the world, and adopted it. I say, again, that in the effort to raise up the abandoned and lost Magdalens, there are none who are more bitter sneerers than the church. It is in the church that the opposition is greatest against raising up her that “was a sinner.” I am not slandering the church, but saying what is notoriously true. How stands the church, to-day, on the question whether war can be tolerated in a civilized community ? How stand they in reference to the peace movement ? Will they not allow their members to be captains and colonels ? Do they not send their chaplains out with the army and navy ? I grant that the church tries to keep up with the world, but it is not *ahead*, and does not try to get ahead. I appeal to you, members of the church ! Look at your own souls, your own lives and thoughts, and see how far Christ’s work has been carried forward in you ! I stand not here to condemn ; but it is time for us to understand that to keep the commandments of Christ means more than to be tolerably decent in society, and not offend outrageously against the moral sense of the world.

MR. ERRETT.

I should judge, Mr. Moderator, from the gentleman’s last remarks, that he has rather changed his judgment, and that he is now inclined to the opinion that the church is the place where the world has been pouring its “slop.” We thought we had got the “slop” out of the church into the world, but it seems the process is reversed ! My friend said, when he was here last winter, that “he would not take a shingle off the churches,”—

MR. TIFFANY.—I say so now.

MR. ERRETT. He says so now, but if they are so far behind, such drags upon the advancement of society, I should wish, it

seems to me, to have them torn down and out of the way. When reference is so confidently made to the temperance movement, I should like to ask the gentleman, where stood Lyman Beecher, where was Wm. Lloyd Garrison, when the cause started. Mr. Garrison was a Christian at that time, and a member of the church, giving his influence to the church.

MR. TIFFANY. But he was obliged to leave it.

MR. ERRETT. No, sir! not for his temperance principles. He left it when he avowed infidel opinions, and not till then. His energy in moral movements never drove him from the church. But I shall not delay upon these things: My defence of Christian morality is not needed, when we are discussing such a question as the one before us.

The gentleman takes the position that whatever he can prove to the satisfaction of your understanding, that is Spiritualism! He should have extended his definition. Not only what he can prove, but what he and Mr. Davis and every body else teach so as to convince any body, is Spiritualism, by his principle. To each class or sect the teachings of the other classes are mere dogmatism, in fact, and the gentleman's reasoning does not obviate my objection against his claim to teach pure Spiritualism.

I do not claim the power of casting out devils as the apostles did, although I am vain enough to attempt to exorcise such as manifest themselves in these latter days. In speaking of this "sign of apostleship," however, the gentleman marvelously narrows his ground, for he has before taken the position that all believers were to have the power of doing these wonders; now, it is only the apostles who have it.

In regard to my statement that the gentleman teaches in his lectures that things are not good or evil in themselves, I will read the passage, that there may be no dispute on that point. (Tiffany's Lectures, page 188.)

"A thing can only be said to be good, in reference to the end to be accomplished by it, and its adaptedness to the accomplishment of that end. Nor can it be said to be evil, except in relation to its end and use. A thing is to be judged of in the light of its fruits. Thus said Christ, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' Thus, good and evil, are in their nature, like harmony and discord, both conditions depending on relation, and *not principles or entities of themselves.*"

Now, this is the very position Mr. Campbell takes in regard to slavery; that it is from its resulting good or evil that its goodness or wickedness is to be judged. The audience know very well my own position on the subject, and so does Mr. Campbell. My only object in making the quotation is to show that Mr. Campbell is not fairly dealt with, and not to defend his position. I simply show that the gentleman himself is in the same category.

When he has been complaining that I have exhibited spiritual phenomena as I have done, he was certainly inconsistent with the assertion he has since made, that *all* the phenomena and teachings must be taken into account, and, *taken altogether*, they must be harmonized with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. This is the very thing I have been claiming. It will not do to show some separate points of similarity; his task is to show that they are *identical throughout*—the phenomena and teachings which I have read, together with the rest. He can not deny, he does not deny, that they are a part of the phenomena and teachings of Spiritualism. This is not an abstruse point: it can be got distinctly before the audience. Let him, therefore, take these phenomena and show that they are identical with those of Christ.

He says I would have you receive the teachings of the spirits upon their authority. God forbid! I beg of you, in the name of God, of religion, of *decency*, that you will not receive their teachings upon any authority whatever. The gentleman was entirely mistaken in that declaration.

I have already denied that disembodied human spirits are angels, but the gentleman assumes that my position is the contrary one. That the matter may be settled, I here distinctly take issue upon it.

When I closed my last speech, I was about to state another philosophical point for the gentleman's consideration. When he talks of three "discrete degrees" of mind, he either means to declare that man possesses all these degrees at once or he does not. If the former position be his, then his talk about man's living in the animal or relational sphere is nonsense. If the latter is the one he occupies, I must remind him that he has taught in his lectures that the idea of God is *innate*. On the 43rd page, he says, "*In every age of the world, the existence of a great first cause, invisible and incomprehensible in its mode of existence and action, has been impressed upon the human mind. The idea of the existence of a great central power, self-existent in being, spontaneous in action, omnipotent in power, and universal in presence, seems to be innate in the human constitution.*" But if that perception of the Divine and Absolute be "*innate in the human constitution,*" the "*elements of spiritual truth*" must be in the soul, and every man is prepared to receive such truth *without* inspiration. I leave the gentleman to "*harmonize*" his own teachings.

I wish in the next place to close up my present readings from the teachings of Spiritualism respecting angels, by reading an extract, not from the "*dogmatizings of spiritualists,*" but from the words of the spirits themselves (Judge Edmonds' 2nd volume, page 249). "What I first saw was a comet careering through space with wonderful velocity. It was that velocity which created

its light and heat. It was nebulous, composed of many distinct particles attracted to each other, but not yet united. * * * The destiny of this nebulous mass is, in time, and by the sure and gradual operation of immutable laws, to form a dense globe, and in it are all the elements of such a world as this. * * * The process of its progress, I saw, was watched over, controlled, and directed by an innumerable host of spirits that attended it in its course, and *whose business it was to correct and restrain all aberrations of that matter from the laws constituted for its government.*(!) * * * I saw the spirits performing this duty, some of them floating along outside the nucleus, watching, and others *inside*, exceedingly busy. I saw some in the very center of it, very active, *as if something was out of order*, and they were engaged in the task of putting it right."

Again on page 329, of the same volume, the Judge continues the narration of angelic world-making. "Some, more venturous, were far down among the burning masses; and, as I observed them, I saw one spot in the center unlike the burning masses which I had seen thrown off. It was of a red, flame-like color, and was continually moving up and down, like the pieces of dirt which a swiftly-moving carriage-wheel will throw off from its rim. But the center was a bright white light, and did not partake of the confusion which pervaded the outer masses, though it was revolving on its axis with inconceivable velocity. * * * I saw each spirit acting in his sphere, having a portion of the task to perform, some daringly penetrating even to the burning center, seeking there, at the very seat of the disorder, to overcome its destructive action; others at the extremity of the nebulous matter seeking there *to prevent its being thrown beyond the redeeming power of the central attraction.* * * * They surrounded that immense mass of nebulous matter in vast numbers, and, *at an appointed signal, with one accord pressed in toward the center.* And I soon saw that it was rapidly decreasing in size, and its material was becoming condensed. * * * And all this under the influence of the united pressure of that host of disembodied spirits, who had once tenanted mortal forms as we do."

Is not this a magnificent contribution to *science*? There need be no difficulty now, in fixing the nebular hypothesis upon an immutable basis! The Judge has reason to be proud of being favored with such a revelation!

I have a right to read the admissions of spiritualists in regard to the phenomena and teachings, and I shall give you the history of a little case occurring at the house of Dr. Phelps, Stratford, Conn., that has excited much attention, and has been a good deal relied upon in proving the manifestations to be really the work of spirits. I read it from Rogers' "Philosophy of Spirit Rappings," page 48, as it is there given in a condensed form.

"The phenomena consisted in the moving of articles of furniture in a manner that could not be accounted for. Knives, forks, spoons, nails, blocks of wood, &c., were thrown in different directions about the house. They were seen to move from places and in directions which made it certain that no visible power existed by which the motion could be produced. * * The contents of the pantry were emptied into the kitchen, and bags of salt, tin ware, and heavier culinary articles, were thrown in a promiscuous heap upon the floor, with a loud and startling noise. Loaves of delicious cake were scattered about the house. * * Chairs would deliberately move across the room, unimpelled by any visible agency. Heavy marble tables would poise themselves upon two legs, and then fall with their contents to the floor, no human being within six feet of them."

Pretty much like the pan-cake story, you see. This is a very brief statement, but still quite a definite one. I will now read from Andrew Jackson Davis' "Spiritual Intercourse," page 50, upon the same occurrence.

"I proceed to state, that the two individuals already mentioned as members of the family I visited in Stratford, Conn., the young girl and her brother, were *both exceedingly surcharged*, alternately, at the time the manifestations were being developed, *with vital magnetism, and vital electricity*. * * I was one day ascending, with the boy, a flight of stairs, when suddenly there came a quick loud *rap* under his left foot, which frightened him exceedingly, because he supposed the sound was made by a spirit, and which he was educated to believe to be an evil spirit. But I instantly perceived that *his system, like the torpedo eel*, had discharged a small volume or current of *vital electricity* from the sole of the foot, which electricity, by its coming in sudden contact with the electricity of the atmosphere, *produced the quick concussion which we heard*. When *magnetism* preponderated in the systems of these individuals, then nails, keys, books, &c., would fly toward them; and when *electricity* preponderated, then these various articles would move in an opposite direction. * * And here let me remark, that I have heard instances of mischief cited, as occurring in this house, in evidence of Satanic agency, which I now discover to have been sometimes *accomplished by the youth in his sport*, sometimes by electrical discharges and magnetic attractions, and sometimes by the almost unpardonable *mischievousness* of persons unknown to the family." Observe, these are the statements and admissions of A. J. Davis—they are not his "dogmatizings" either; he perceived them when in that superior state in which only "one in seventy-five millions" can be. It would not do for my friend to deny any of this, for he can not claim to be in that exalted state. He received these things by *rapport* with spirits of a very high order; not before he was a spiritualist, but since.

I can therefore make use of these admissions legitimately, as coming from that side of the house. It is just such things as these that have been gathered up, and declared to be identical with the phenomena peculiar to the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and to afford proof positive of the workings of spirits.

My friend says there are evil spirits; Mr. Davis denies that there are any such. On page 210 of his "Present Age," he quotes the words of Mr. Gridley, "we have heard these spirits *lie*, a score of times," and says, "this is assumed. He may have heard the *medium* utter a great many contradictory things, but how does he *know* that spirits provoked the utterance?" He declares on the same page that it is "an eternal truth," that no beings "exist divorced from good." But if you can not tell what to attribute to the spirits, and what to the medium, in case of evident *lies*, how can you know any more of the communications of so called *good* spirits? The contortions which have been supposed to be the writhings of spirits in torments, he says are "self-induced psychologically, in consequence of the mind's unacquaintance with the condition. Yet an observer is wrought up to a high point of sympathetic suffering, solely from the *apparent* agony of the subject or medium." Again on page 240, he says, "It will be found that all the 'devils' of the universe are living in the symbols of the mind. * * What are called *evil spirits*, originate in the *conflict of the nervous system*, when one state of mentality is indulged at the expense of the blessings which the other may contribute or confer;" and still again, on page 242—"Let no medium, therefore, believe in evil spirits *upon evidence personally received*; because the imperfections of human brains are yet a disqualification, preventing the development of good judgment upon a question so momentous." Finally, on page 243, it is summed up—"This law explains all: that *mental discord*, and the symbols of such discord, develop *all the conceptions of hells and of demons* that ever obtained a footing in this rudimental existence."

Remember that these are not "dogmatizings" of Mr. Davis, but communications from spirits themselves. That is certain, if any thing is, in regard to Spiritualism.

MR. TIFFANY.

I will briefly notice the positions taken by my friend, and then proceed with my own argument. He says that I have changed my position with reference to the church and the world. I have changed no position. I have simply said that the standard of morality is no higher in the church than out of it. I have said before, and say now, that the church is necessary to a certain

class, just as our penitentiaries are necessary. Some men must have a fear of punishment either in prison here, or in hell hereafter, to keep them in check.

It appears that the gentleman does not belong to the class of believers who were to have signs and wonders follow their belief. He does not occupy such a position! Well, he may tell what sort of a position he does occupy.

He denies that disembodied human spirits are angels, and he denies it upon Bible ground; but it is only his own authority, for the Bible calls the same spirits at one time angels, and at another, spirits of men, and uses the terms synonymously.

MR. ERRETT. I should like to have the proof, from the Bible, of that use of terms.

MR. TIFFANY. I have not a Bible with me, but can bring one in at another session, and give the proof. But do you affirm that the Bible distinctly teaches that angels are *not* disembodied human spirits?

MR. ERRETT. You may not find an express statement of that kind, but the plain inferential teachings are as I have stated.

Since then the Bible does not tell us that angels are *not* human spirits, and inasmuch as the terms are used as I have stated, I must demand some other reason or authority than that which he has given. From the facts alone, I am justified in letting the matter stand as I at first put it, till some philosophy or authority is brought forward on the contrary side.

He attempts, also, to draw from my exposition of the three degrees of mind in man, the conclusion that he must have all the elements of a spiritual truth. Let us see. Man has the elements of a physical mind, and hence has all the elements of physical existence in him: therefore, of course, he needs only a word to make him understand any and every physical existence whatever! My friend will find that this will not hold good. A mind may have a susceptibility for receiving impressions from without, but the impressions may not come for some time after the mind is fit to receive them. It only requires a little thought and philosophy for an individual to see the truth of that position. There is no use of denying it. It stands forth as a truth to every one who will put his mind in a position to perceive it.

I return to my propositions. We are agreed, my friend, myself, and the Bible, that spirits undeveloped in the pure affections, in knowledge and in wisdom, do or can manifest themselves upon earth, by taking possession of the bodies of men, and exerting an influence upon their minds. He admits that this lower class of spirits has communication with the earth, that Jesus teaches the same thing, and this should be noted as one point of agreement. Now, he certainly would not affirm, that, because Jesus declared the existence of spirits which spoke lies, he therefore taught the

same doctrines as those lying spirits. Jesus only taught that *they were lying spirits*; there is a manifest difference here;—the difference between the mere phenomena and the lesson to be drawn from them. When therefore I say that Spiritualism, and all these phenomena, demonstrate certain truths, and among them, that evil minds, those undeveloped in truth and pure affection, exist, and have communication with earth, and that we can be informed of their character and position in the spirit world;—that is, that their phenomena demonstrate their character and position,—demonstrate that they are not subject to a high and holy love;—when I say this, I am not fairly chargeable with endorsing all the things these evil spirits may utter. Such I assert is the fact and the truth, and although individuals may dogmatically teach this, that, or the other doctrine, the phenomena remain unchanged, and your own minds will affirm that the truth I draw from them is indeed a truth. You can demonstrate it by the very principles which prove that mind acts at all. The idea has been prevalent among many, that when our bodies leave this world, all that is dark and impure will cease; but it is an erroneous one, and the error flows from an over-estimate of the influence of the body upon the mind. The body owes the spirit certain rights and duties, and the spirit, in turn, owes the body, so to speak. The body must be protected and fed, and, I may say, the body has a right that the spirit should observe these needs. Hence I have a sensation of hunger, of thirst, admonishing me of the necessities of the body, and I shall have to suffer the consequences if I neglect it. So long as I gratify these desires simply for the sake of nourishing the body, I do right; but if I take food or drink for the sake of enjoyment, I go out into the department of lust. I must nourish the body as a duty, not as a means of enjoyment. Now, when the body and spirit are separated, this kind of hunger and thirst can not be felt. *Lusts*, however, are desires after gratification; they have their origin in the spirit, and use the body as a means of gratification. The lust, therefore, does not leave the spirit when the spirit leaves the body. There is but one way of overcoming lust within us, and that is by developing a higher nature,—one that shall crucify these lusts and destroy them. This work of crucifixion must be wrought in the spirit, in the love, in the heart. When the spirit leaves the body and goes into the spirit world, has it left behind the *character* it had here? No,—it takes it with it, and seeks, as earnestly as ever, the means of gratification. If there is any principle in philosophy by which it can make use of another's body for the purpose of securing its gratification, it will do so. Any mind that can put two thoughts together, will see that this must be so. It is precisely what Christ and his apostles taught,—“He that is filthy, let him be filthy still.” Since, therefore, Christianity teaches this,—and it may be carried

out to almost any extent,—since Spiritualism teaches it, not only in the fact but in the philosophy, in this phase of Spiritualism, it and Christianity are identical. Jesus Christ taught that unless we were made pure and holy we could not enter into the kingdom of heaven, could not understand the things which he taught, nor receive them. He affirmed that the world could not receive them because they saw them not, and knew them not: just so have I affirmed that perception was necessary to the reception of truth. Here then is another point of identity between Christianity and Spiritualism, in the principle that all our darkness, all our evil, suffering, and crime, have their origin in ourselves. We are invited, the table is spread, all things are ready; but we have our excuses; one has his farm, another his merchandise, another his wife, and we are held by our desires, appetites and lusts, and therefore will not come. Christ and Spiritualism alike teach the truth of these things.

Government must be suited to the condition of the governed. There must be three distinct kinds of government, because there are three discrete degrees of mind. Those who are in the physical or animal and selfish sphere, must be ruled by force. There is another sphere of government for those in the second sphere. They must be governed by love. I have not come to take away government, but to raise man up from a government of force, into that of love. This is the spiritual government, and the teachings of Christ were intended to bring man up into that highest, that absolute sphere, where perfect love casteth out all fear. It was the consummation of Christ's mission to lead man into the spirit sphere, the moral and relational, and to perfect man in his social character, under the influence of the love impulse. He was to put down all rule, authority, and power; and then cometh the end. Then Christ himself is to be subject to the Father, and God to be all in all. It was at the consummation and filling up of all this, that the millennium was to come. That perfect day can only come when Christ's mission has wrought its perfect work. I am not obliged to wait for it to work its perfect work in *you*; but when that perfect work is wrought in *me*, the millennium will come to me! As you progress from one step of that course to another, you are hastening the time of Christ's appearing to you. When the work is perfectly done, then it is that you will be washed white and made clean in the blood of Christ. Not in his literal blood, but in the blood, the life of his soul. This plain enunciation of truth should stop all cavil.

There is another great truth;—that “the kingdom of heaven is within you;”—not among you, but within you. It cometh not by observation, but must be unfolded in the heart and exist within you if it ever comes to you. In other words, the Christian dispensation teaches ~~men~~ to look for the things of God and heaven

in his own soul. Now my friend will ask, are you going to pray to the God within you? Can the infinite God be within you? But, let me ask, what did Christ mean by saying, "thou in me, and I in thee?" I mean by my expression what he meant by his. You can perceive only so much of the Divine as is unfolded in your own consciousness, and the individual who is not so unfolded that the things of the spirit, of the Divine, can be perceived within him, is not in such a condition that he can perceive God, or the things of God.

I purpose next, to take up and compare the first dispensation with the second, that we may all see where we stand, and have some standard of criticism, by which we may find the department of mind to which each belongs.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

After veering about a great many ways, my friend tells us finally that churches may be of some use, like penitentiaries, for certain classes of persons, and therefore, they had better be left standing. Well, it is a good thing to be of some use, if it is only a little. Since he so kindly spares the churches, I will read his charitable opinions upon a doctrine of the church which he has promised to examine when he gets so far. On page 360 of "Tiffany's Lectures," we read, that to men in the "animal sphere," "a faith involving a belief in a *future and eternal hell* seems indispensable. It is perhaps the only thing which can protect society from their excesses and vices. Such men are sometimes found in the churches. I have not unfrequently heard ministers say, if they knew the doctrine of universal salvation to be true, they would cut loose from all restraint, they would be infidel to every truth and virtue; they would indulge in the gratification of their appetites, passions, and lusts; thereby confessing they do not love God. * * Men, thus infidel at heart, act very foolishly to quarrel with the doctrines of universal salvation; for they are the only doctrines that can save them from hell. This kind of infidelity is seen in the dram shop, at the gaming table, and in the brothel." For such men, he thinks the church, mean and low as it is, may possibly do something. I will say no more on that subject. Men who have wives, and women who have husbands in the churches here, will dispose of all such argumentation without further remark from me.

He tells us that *Jesus* thought that *devils* said and did certain things, and these things have some analogy to some manifestations of Modern Spiritualism, and *therefore*, Christianity and

Modern Spiritualism are identical! Surely, my friend is hard pressed to make out his case. When the devils uttered their abominable, evil, and hateful sentiments, did Jesus suffer it to go forth to the world as Christianity? *This* is the case with Spiritualism; such things belong to it. I do not charge it alone, but the gentleman has admitted that the lowest of the phenomena must have a recognized place in the system, and are an essential part of it. They go forth in all their vileness and filthiness without rebuke, as communications from a very lofty sphere.

The gentleman's philosophy appears unstable in many particulars. Yesterday we were taught that the flesh, the animal nature, lusteth against the spirit; to-day it is the spirit that lusteth. To-morrow we may have something else.

I have shown that Spiritualism denies responsibility. The gentleman says that Christianity affirms responsibility, and here is another point where there can be no identity between the systems.

Again, when he reads "the kingdom of God is within you," how does he know that he gets the true meaning of the passage? He has, in this case, given the literal meaning, because it suits him. At other times it has a horrible import, and he will go a long way round to avoid it.

He says again, that I give only my own authority for what I say about angels. The fact is, I simply took issue with him, upon the question of the Bible's teaching that disembodied human spirits were angels. How there was any authority of my own asserted, I cannot see.

I proceed now to some further remarks concerning the communications of spirits. My next position is, that *the teachings are not derived from the same source*. Jesus brought his knowledge from the Father. He says, "No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Matt. xi: 27.) Spiritualism derives its teachings, professedly, from human disembodied spirits. Davis admits that Jesus did not learn from the spirits. On page 158 of the first volume of the "Harmonia," he ranks Jesus with Plato, Swedenborg, and Jacob Boehmen, among those "intuitive minds," who have had "their spiritual perceptions sufficiently opened and expanded to behold some of the laws and universal tendencies of nature." Intuition is world-wide in its difference from mental communication from spirits in the body or out of it, and therefore Jesus could have got his knowledge in no such way as spiritualists do. Davis goes so far as to deny that any spirits in heaven, as high as Paul is, communicate with the earth at all. He does not discover "upon the most critical interior retrospection, a *single* communication from the veritable apostle Paul, nor from any one of his glorious compeers." (Philosophy of Spiritual Intercourse, page

85.) On the next page, he says, "The apostles do not themselves, personally, come into electrical relations with *any earthly circle*; they do not seek to converse with mankind in a so material and imperfect manner; but, clothed with ambassadorial authority, they visit subordinate societies in the second sphere, and instruct *the spirits* there" how they may communicate with earth. In the source of the teachings, therefore, we find another point where the proof of identity in the system irremediably fails.

Again, passing by Davis' assertion that there are no lying spirits, and taking the more popular and wide-spread opinions of spiritualists, and it will be easily proven that a great portion of their communications and teachings must be from lying spirits. Of such, Judge Edmonds says (vol. 2, page 42), that "having in common with others the power of reaching mankind through this newly-developed instrumentality, they use it for the gratification of their predominant propensities, with even less regard than they had on earth, for the suffering which they may inflict on others." He declares that they will adroitly veil their wickedness "under the cover of good intentions," and that their "influence displays itself in various forms, but scarcely ever without tending to *impair confidence* "in the manifestations." Can any thing of that kind be truly said of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth? It will not do to bring up the doings of demons, for I have denied that they formed any part of the primitive *Christian* phenomena, and that issue has not been met.

Again, we are told that this means of communication is newly opened, and if so, it cannot be identical with that of Christ. The discovery of the mode of communication is, by most of the spirits, credited to Dr. Franklin, and the angels are said to rejoice over the new invention, as a means of inestimable good. The mode, therefore, could not have been known in the days of Christ, but belongs, confessedly, to the present age and people. Mr. Davis asserts (Spiritual Intercourse, page 18) "that the miracles and spiritual disclosures of this era flow, *naturally and consequently*, from the state of mental and moral development to which the *Anglo-Saxon portion* of the human race has generally attained." Probably, the Turks and Chinese, since they are so much more moral than our race, have passed through these communications long ago, and we, the Anglo-Saxon race, have just come up to them. But, at all events, since these things are peculiar to the present development of the race, the conclusion can not be avoided, that neither the communications, the phenomena, nor the doctrines are *identical* with those of Jesus of Nazareth.

Another point which I make is, that *whilst the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth are reliable, these are not.*

I believe there is no controversy on this point. I have already given some extracts from their books, admitting it, but for the

sake of greater satisfaction, I shall refer to one or two more. Mr. Ballou says, in his work on "Spirit Manifestations" (pages 8 and 9), "*Implicit reliance can not be placed on the mere uncorroborated pretensions or communications of spirits, as absolutely veritable.*" For this opinion he gives three reasons, which are, 1st, the low nature of multitudes of the spirits; 2nd, the liability of mediums to mistake their phantasies for communications; and 3rd, the lack of ability in most men to understand the communications. "Hence," he says, "the strange mixtures of truth and error, reality and phantasy, consistency and contradiction, gravity and levity, sober probability and wild extravagance, rational thought and fallacious imagination, presented in dreams, clairvoyant visions, spirit-trances, and the whole family of mental and spiritual phenomena. Hence also the abuses and mischiefs often attendant on such marvelous developments." Take this singular admission, and apply it if you can to the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and tell me if it is possible to declare the systems identical in character. But hear Mr. Ballou further: "Our all-wise and benignant Father in heaven has left no essential *truth* or righteousness dependent on the mere pretension, or uncorroborated testimony, either of departed or undeveloped spirits. He has addressed his revealments of *essential truth* and duty to the moral reason of mankind, and *authenticated them by every necessary attestation.* Any attempt, therefore, to build up a religion or moral philosophy, radically contradictory to that of the genuine Christian Testament, on what is being disclosed to the world through dreamers, spirit media, &c., is irrational and must prove mischievous, rather than beneficial to the human race." To such doubts and distrust of their communications are the most intellectual spiritualists forced! But this is not all; not only are they not *always* reliable, but the fact is they are *never* reliable. Judge Edmonds says (vol. 2, page 39), "I know of *no mode* of spiritual intercourse that is *exempt from a mortal taint* — no kind of mediumship where the communication may not be affected by the mind of the instrument," and on the next page, that "it will never do to receive them (the communications) *as absolute authority*, however agreeable they may be, or *however consonant to other teachings.*" He declares that the physical or mental condition of the medium, the state of the atmosphere, the locality of the place, or the condition of persons present, are fruitful causes of influence upon the communications. If the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth were, for their truth and reliability, dependent upon such conditions, who would have any confidence in them, or hold them up to the world as entitled to any respect whatever? Spiritualists admit that the communications of spirits have to be "carefully revised," that they may go forth to the world in something like decent shape.

It is admitted, also, that moral and religious truth is not to be

expected from these communications. Davis tells us (Spiritual Intercourse, page 76), that it is not reasonable to suppose that the great *moral* students of the universe, such as Moses, Isaiah, or John, reveal themselves to the earth, or convey their thoughts by "raps" or otherwise. That only *scientific* minds, such as Galen, communicate in this way, and we are sure only of *scientific truth* from them. It would seem that Moses is too high for such converse, although one might think the "incarnation of animalism" would not be very high either. Yet these communications, *scientific* mostly, are *identical* with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth! I say that Jesus taught moral truth, religious truth, and spiritual truth; but Spiritualism does not give us even high moral truth!

I will close with reading some advice which Mr. Ballou gives to those who seek these communications. (Spirit Manifestations, page 154.) "You are in danger of desiring, reaching after, and expecting too much in these manifestations. You would be a medium; you would see and converse with spirits; you would have extraordinary revelations; you would behold miracles. Are you sure all this would be best for you? Are you in a fit state of body, mind, or morals, to receive all this, and to make a wise use of it? Not one of you in a hundred. You ask for more responsibility than you can bear. * * Consider how liable you are to be misled by your own imagination; to mistake influences from spirits in the flesh for those out of it; and to be imposed upon by low spirits," &c. Such warnings might be applicable to dark dealings with unclean spirits, but can any one imagine that they would be applicable to a soul desiring to drink deeply at the fountain of Jesus' instruction?

MR. TIFFANY.

The doctrine of guardian spirits and their office in the great work of redemption, as ministering spirits who wait upon the heirs of salvation, is beautifully set forth in the "Epic of the Starry Heavens," dictated by Thomas L. Harris, in some twenty-six hours only, while he was in a spiritual trance, and containing some of the most glorious poetry to be found any where. (Epic, page 99.)

" This doctrine to
The dark earth seemeth strange, and yet 'tis true.
Angels their endless perfectness renew
Only in laboring for the world below.
Their added labors, added loves bestow;
Each impartation of celestial bliss
Confers a joy, that, like a lover's kiss,
Thrills on the lips and stirs the bosom-angel
With new-born joy. Each soul is an *Evangel*

To kindred spirits of inferior grade.
 Each angel-friend, in blessedness arrayed,
 Is an immortal gospel, ever teaching,
 And wisdom-spheres of blessedness outreaching,
 And lifting up the lowly by degrees,
 Till they ascend into the ecstasies
 Of a divine existence.

I am told
 That could a high archangel's heart grow cold,
 His wisdom would avail him not, but he
 Would sink into a dark vacuity—
 A hollow shell of being, and no more
 Be visible on Love's illustrious shore.

Heart thrills to heart, through all the wide domain
 Of heavenly life. All angels form a chain
 That in God's burning throne begins and winds
 Down to the lowest plane of earthly minds;
 And only as each lifts the lower friend
 Can each into superior joy ascend:
 Heaven is the poetry of Love. To bless,
 To act for others in forgetfulness
 Of separate self, is every angel's bliss:
 Angelic life in heaven, consists in this.

I see it realized in this bright scene.
 Angels of lofty and benignant mien,
 Ten thousand thousand, all as one, divine
 Employment find, in outer space and time.
 Their lofty inspirations they infuse
 In man below: outshaping into use
 Each precious gift of wisdom they bestow.
 Immortal germs, the angel-sowers sow,
 Scattering in every mind and heart the seeds
 Of truth and love, that ripen into deeds.

Celestial inspirations here prevail.
 Their pure and grand interiors never fail
 To flow as quickening powers
 Through men below; all these bright morning hours
 The angel-watchers visit their sweet charge—
 The mind, the heart, the faculties enlarge,
 Strengthen the powers, refine the outer form,
 And all the inner intellect inform."

My friend asks how I know that the kingdom of heaven is within, and that that language means *within*. I will give him some intimation how I know it, and how he might find it out. I believe he has agreed, and I guess all of you have agreed by this time, that nothing exists to us, except as it exists within us, as conscious beings; and therefore, if there be any kingdom of heaven for me and for you, it must be found within me and you. If God is ever revealed to my soul, he must be revealed within the conscious perceptions of my soul. Although I stand in this world, and the world is around me, I know nothing of it all, except as it is transferred and exists in my conscious perception. It is there, within me, that God must write his law, and in my heart

of love that God must write his love, or I can not know any thing of his law or his love. From this law and love impulse must come, that which shall control and direct me, if I am ever to be drawn into the bosom of God. The kingdom of heaven, therefore, can not exist, to me, only as it exists within me, and hence it is, that "except a man be born of the spirit, he can not see the kingdom of God."

A VOICE. The good Book says, "of water and of the spirit."

MR. TIFFANY. Well, "of water and of the spirit," then; and my friend will say that that means being *baptized*. Christ said, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit:" (John iii: 6). We will take care of water baptism when we come to it.

The kingdom of heaven can only be brought into you by the breath of the spirit. This brings accidentally to my mind a remark of my friend yesterday, that some spiritualists teach that the Holy Ghost is God's wife. I have no wish to trifle with the subject, but whilst I was arguing with Mr. Moss, some time since, he said Christ was called God, because *his father* was called God; just as his son was called Moss, because *his own name* was Moss! I do not mean to excite a laugh, but you will see that the ideas of the disciple world are some of them as ridiculous as any of the spirit world.

Government must be addressed to that department of mind in which persons live. A law which is intended for selfish man, has its penalties appealing to selfish natures and selfish motives. The law under the selfish dispensation, said, "kill your neighbor and we will kill you." Thus man's selfishness was appealed to, so that if he did not commit the deed it would be because he was restrained out of love for his own well-being. His selfishness and lust led him to commit crimes, and the law took hold of this selfishness and used it in order to prevent him from the commission. It did not make him better; it only protected his neighbor. So our statutes say: If you commit certain crimes, you shall go to the penitentiary: but this does not make man better, it can not "make the comer thereunto, perfect." If a man, who is only governed by such a law, can wrong his neighbor without becoming obnoxious to its penalties, he will do it. Now, we need a law which will address man in another way, and which *will* "make the comer thereunto perfect," if possible.

Had I time, and were this the place, I would undertake to show that there is more crime produced by our governmental laws than is restrained by them, and that, too, for the simple reason that they exercise a control over men, upon a false and selfish basis.

The next sphere of government is internal, in the heart, where man is to be governed by charity and love. I am to love my

neighbor, and therefore respect his rights, not because I fear to do wrong, but because I love to do right. In this lies the difference between the first and second dispensations. The first only looks to protecting society; the second attempts to make the individual himself better. The first only appealed to man's hopes and fears, and did not require a given course of action, because it was just and pure and right. You see, then, the difference between the two, and can judge whether we belong to the first or second. We are taught by the first to look to heaven as an objective place, and to God as an objective being. God was not to appear in the inmost soul of the individual man, but in the face of nations and the assembled universe. This was necessarily so, for man lived in his objective nature, and hence, if he loved God at all, it was only objectively, as a being of some present or prospective use or benefit to him. Even man's religion, such as it is, in this sphere, only makes him more intensely selfish. If you exercise my selfishness, either by hope or fear, you make me more selfish, and the strong appeal made by the choice of an eternal paradise of sensuous and objective enjoyment, or an eternal hell of inconceivable external torment, is the most powerful means of developing intense selfishness. In Connecticut, it used to be a by-word, that a man was "as selfish as a Presbyterian deacon;" for even in their religion, men kept their eye upon selfish gain. This spirit makes them also uncharitable and exclusive. I remember the time when a Presbyterian thought that no one but a true "dyed-in-the-wool" Saybrook platform Presbyterian could get to heaven. All experience demonstrates the truth of the assertion, that when we appeal by our religion to man's selfishness, we make him more intensely selfish; and those who have not had their selfishness exercised by such feelings, have been the best men among you, even if they have been called infidel.

It is only as men purify themselves, that they can escape the consequences of sin. Man can not come into harmony with the Divine government, except by becoming like God in character, in love, in mind; thus becoming a Christain under the second sphere of government. The most that can be said of the first is that it exercises a faith *toward* God, not *in* him. There is a great difference in these two. My friend talks of worshiping a being of whom he has no conception. The most he can say is, that his love and faith is toward God, not in him. If man is not unfolded so that he can have a true perception of the Divine and perfect Father, his faith can go no further than his perception; and it is only when he is so far unfolded that he can see no difference between a subjective and objective love, that he can have faith *in* God. The second dispensation of government no longer adheres to forms and ceremonies of divine service, but bids us leave the principle, the rudiments, with which we began, and go on unto

perfection, not trusting to a foundation of dead works. We are no longer to waste our time with shadows, and types, and figures. Shadows and types are no further significant than they manifest an idea of truth, and wherever the idea can be obtained without a shadow, the shadow is of no use and worse than useless. To adhere to it, is to spend time foolishly, the world is made no wiser, and you are not pleasing God, objectively or subjectively. Types, shadows, figures and parables, are only useful as they are necessary, and when they no longer represent an idea more perfectly than it can be represented without them, they should be put away. Take, for example, the ordinance of baptism. I believe the church does not consider the baptism of water in itself a saving ordinance. They believe it is only valuable as it typifies or represents a spiritual condition. It is not valuable for the purpose of pleasing God,—God does not care whether you get under the water or not, except as it makes you better. I understand the use of it that Christ made previous to his death, previous to the introduction of the Christian dispensation, was simply to typify and represent to the mind the difference between the old dispensation and the new. It represented the putting off the old man and his deeds, and the putting on the new man in righteousness.

Here I must notice an error my friend has fallen into, in supposing that I meant the body, when I said the flesh lusteth against the spirit. I simply meant the physical nature. Now the difference between lusting and warring is very wide. The spirit *wars* against the flesh, and the flesh *lusts* against the spirit.

MR. ERRETT. The Bible uses the same term "lusteth" in both cases.

MR. TIFFANY. I think my friend can not find any place where the spirit is said to lust against the flesh. He says he can. If it is there, it is an improper translation, and I will warrant that in the original he will find a better word. Lusting is seeking to perform an act for the gratification it affords me. Lust is a generic name, and applies to a whole family of desires, and not to the particular class to which it is ordinarily attached. Whoever will devote his time to the purposes of self-gratification, is under the dominion of lust. This is what I mean by the lusts of the carnal nature, the carnal heart. There is no vice that has not its origin in the lusts of the animal nature.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend promised this morning, as he had no Bible with him, to bring one in this afternoon, and read something about his theory of Angels. He has not given us the Bible proof, but he reads a long extract from the "Epic of the Starry Heavens" on

the subject. I do not know that that is his Bible, but he has brought no other.

MR. TIFFANY. I supposed the point was yielded.

MR. ERRETT. That was a great mistake; there was no yielding at all. I called for the Bible proof.

It is common for spiritualists to grow proud over the "Epic," and they seem to imagine there is no poetry on earth like it. I shall have a few criticisms to offer upon it by and by, and in the meantime shall content myself with letting you compare it with an extract from Milton's Hymn of the Lord's Nativity, portraying the rout of pagan God and witch before the power of Christ, and the blaze of his revelation.

XIX.

"The oracles are dumb,
No voice or hideous hum
Runs thro' the arch'd roof in words deceiving.
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine,
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving.
No nightly trance, or breathed spell
Inspires the pale-eyed priest from the prophetic cell.

XX.

"The lonely mountains o'er
And the resounding shore,
A voice of weeping heard, and loud lament;
From haunted spring, and dale
Edged with poplar pale,
The parting genius is with sighing sent;
With flower-inwoven tresses torn,
The Nymphs in twilight shade of tangled thickets mourn.

XXI.

"Peor and Baalim
Forsake their temples dim,
With that twice-battered God of Palestine;
And mooned Ashtaroth,
Heaven's queen and mother both,
Now sits not girt with tapers' holy shrine;
The Lybic Hammon shrinks his horn,
In vain the Tyrian maids their wounded Thammuz mourn."

I cannot help thinking this *pretty nearly* as good poetry as that which came from the spirit land, but "there's no accounting for tastes."

My friend went on to give us some of his reasons for believing that the kingdom of heaven is within. I did not ask that, but how he knew that that was the true meaning of the passage. He tells us we only know what is within; all we know of the world about us, is the "conscious perception" of it, *within*. But by that

reasoning, the Mosaic dispensation, with all its "animalism," is as truly *within* as the kingdom of God, and so are the teachings of devils; for every thing that is known is within, in the sense of being a mental perception.

My friend made also a very witty remark about Mr. Moss' explanation of the Godhead of Christ. If Mr. Moss were debating with the gentleman, the quotation might possibly be apposite and call for explanation; but until we send forth Mr. Moss, attended by miracles as solemn as those which attest the spiritual apostles' mission, we shall not feel the point of it.

The gentleman mingles some good things with what he says about the Mosaic dispensation; things with which I should not quarrel, but I must call his attention to what Mr. Davis says of self-love. (*Harmonia* 2, 139.) "Self-love is the *germ of all the Divine elements* of the human soul; it is the great central spring or angel of love which unfolds, protects, defines, and characterizes the individual. Self-love is the germ of the soul, because it not only contains every other and higher element and attribute undeveloped, but gives life and force to all the minute and various modifications of feeling, and sentiment, and selfish propensities, by which *every spirit* is more or less characterized and individually distinguished." Whether he will make his philosophy *harmonize* with Mr. Davis' is at least doubtful.

He tells us that some horrid sect holds the doctrine that "hell is paved with infants' skulls a span long;" but I confess I have never heard of any one whose *phrenology* gave infants such long skulls. I can show him, however, that Spiritualism puts infants in hell, although I know nothing of the size of their skulls.

We are told, again, that God does not care about our getting under the water. To carry out his principles, my friend should say that God does not care about any thing else, good or bad, physical, moral or religious. His argument would prove too much, if it proves any thing.

He admits that Jesus taught baptism whilst preparing the way for the new covenant and dispensation. I insist that the gentleman needs it also in *his* system, for he has not got so far as to find a man, as yet, who is baptized with the Holy Ghost. Baptism, therefore, stands unharmed by his assault, and if it stands till my friend finds man perfected according to his system, I think it is in a fair way to stand a good while yet.

To return to my argument; the next point I wish to make, in my criticisms upon the teachings of Spiritualism, is, that *according to their own books the best of their teachers are deceivers*.

I will read some testimony on this point, from Mr. Ballou (*Spirit Manifestations*, 159), who says, "Not Gabriel himself should be revered enough to make us swerve from this rule. Should one bearing his exalted name undertake to teach us that

darkness is light, that *matter is spirit*, that twice ten make five, that *murder is sometimes justifiable*, that *adultery is purity*, that *lying in a good cause is excusable*, that revenge is God-like, that injury is the dictate of holy love, that *notoriously indecent and ridiculous conduct is proper*, &c., then may we know *he is a deceiver.*" I intend to prove the charges I have emphasized, against the principle leading minds advocating Spiritualism in this country.

FIRST, then, that *matter is spirit.*

On this point I refer you to the Harmonia, vol. 1, page 67. "Solids are ultimately converted into fluids; fluids into ether or vital electricity; and vital electricity is refined into vital magnetism; and vital magnetism is ultimately changed into that pure and divine substance, by which we *reason, love, will, decide, and act.* Again, on the 49th page of Davis' 'Spiritual Intercourse,' we find the following passage: "A spirit is no immaterial substance; on the contrary, *the spiritual organization is composed of matter*, such as we *see, feel, eat, smell and inhale*, in a very high state of refinement and attenuation."

I can multiply such quotations to any extent, and they prove A. J. Davis to be a deceiver, by Mr. Ballou's test.

SECOND; that *murder is sometimes justifiable.*

This I can prove from Mr. Gridley's "Astounding Facts," where a case is narrated, in which spirits, deliberately, and with persistent effort, *kill a woman*, in order that her husband may marry another, previously impressing it upon the minds of the man and his future wife, that they were destined for each other! The whole scope of the doctrine is, that if it is justifiable for spirits out of the body, it is also for those that are *in it*; and *he* is therefore proved a deceiver by the same test.

THIRD; that *adultery is purity.*

I referred to this, this morning, and shall not say any thing more about it.

FOURTH; that *lying, in a good cause, is excusable.*

On this point, I need only refer to a quotation I have already made from a book, whose author's name is somewhat distinguished in Spiritualism. It says (Tiffany's Lectures, page 360), for a certain class of men, faith in the doctrine of eternal hell seems indispensable. But the same writer declares that doctrine a lie, and makes it therefore, "seem indispensable" to *lie* to men for their own good and that of the world.

FIFTH; that *notoriously indecent conduct is proper.*

This teaching is given in Davis' "Spiritual Intercourse," page 63, where the "spirits" interrupt family worship and prayer, by throwing books about the room and at the heads of worshipers; make effigies of persons praying, to ridicule the solemn service, &c.; all of which conduct is justified by Mr. Davis, on the

ground that the worship was *idolatry*. By the same test, therefore, he is again proved a deceiver. I have already quoted Mr. Davis' assertion that there are no "evil spirits," and that no evidence can prove it (Present Age, 242); yet the existence of such spirits and their actions, enter largely into all the phenomena of Spiritualism. On every side, therefore, we find ourselves surrounded by false teachings, and all the marks of deceit which Mr. Ballou has mentioned in his *test*, and we are right in regarding their leading minds as convicted of being deceivers and unworthy of credit or confidence.

By way of contrast with this, look at the teachings of Jesus, and what can we say of them but that they are true, *all* true, and He himself is *the truth*, "the way, the truth, and the life;"—"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." (John xviii: 37.) He brought truth fresh and pure from the mind of God! It was not the ten thousandth echo of the voice of truth, broken by its reverberations through the universe, and reaching us mingled with the ravings of lying spirits! The systems certainly are not identical in this phase. Jesus taught *purity*; the system of Spiritualism abounds in impurity, and in apologies for it. There is not a rake or debauchee in all the land, that may not find comfort, and countenance in his sins, from Spiritualism. The teachings of Jesus were *dignified*; a divine dignity runs through them all: but the teachings of Spiritualism are silly and trifling. The "Epic of the Starry Heavens," from which my friend has read, is probably the best of their publications in that respect.

The men who, when here on earth, were intellectual princes among us—what deterioration has come upon them that they now give forth such oracles from the spirit world? Every body who respects Swedenborg, feels insulted by the things imputed to him. He was a great mind, despite all the prejudices against him in the Christian world. And Bacon! Heaven help him, if indeed it be Bacon that drivels about spirits keeping matter from disobeying the laws of the physical universe, and packing down comets to make solid worlds! *That* Bacon associated with the author of the *Novum Organon*,—think of it! Compare such developments with the dignified teachings of Jesus, and do you find any identity?

The teachings of Jesus were *spiritual*, let the gentleman dispute it as much as he will. He taught not how to make money, he avoided reasons and arguments referring only to time, to this perishing life; but he raised man above these, and ever admonished men to labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life. Spiritualism, on the other hand, teaches how to *cure corns*; to make the beard soft and silky; to cure cows of the croup; breaks crockery; bakes buckwheat cakes!

Spirits descant at length upon the beauties of long, silky beards, and the evils of stiff, grizzly ones!

Christ spoke "with authority." "I say unto you," were his words. He came as the authoritative and divine messenger of *the* truth; but Spiritualism glories in being utterly without authority. The teachings of Christ are matchless in their severe simplicity and freedom from affectation;—those of Spiritualism are ridiculously stilted, and full of all absurdities and puerilities!

I will also mention some matters in regard to Christ's teachings, which the gentleman denies. Christ taught verbal prayer: Spiritualism does not. He taught prayer to a deity who is *objective*, upon my friend's principles: Spiritualism does not. He taught and practised water baptism by my friend's admission: Spiritualism does not. He taught that he was the foundation upon which the church was to be built: Spiritualism, as taught by most spiritualists, denies it. They deny that the truth contained in Peter's confession that Jesus was the Christ, the son of the living God, was the "rock" upon which the church was to be built. Jesus wrought miracles: Spiritualism denies them altogether. Jesus taught that God is spirit (not a spirit): Spiritualism teaches that God is matter. Jesus taught forgiveness: Spiritualism teaches that there is no forgiveness. Jesus taught that what are called "spiritual manifestations" were infernal, and set himself at war with them: Spiritualism rejoices in them, and rests upon them its claims to confidence and acceptance in the human heart.

MR. TIFFANY.

I will go along as fast as I can with the gentleman, and I wish also to accommodate myself, as far as possible, to the desires of the audience. But I think I shall do this most effectually in the end, by following out the plan I have laid down for myself, and giving comparatively little time to my friend's particular course. But I must say, with all kindness and sincerity, it seems to me that the gentleman does pettifog terribly. For instance, he makes me say that for a certain class of persons, a belief in an endless hell is indispensable. Indispensable for what? Not for their own good, but to *control* such persons and hinder them from hurting others. To say that I declared it necessary to tell people *lies* to keep them straight, is pettifogging: it is not stating my argument as it is.

It is not true that my reasoning makes the kingdom of God, and the Mosaic dispensation equally within, or makes them in any way co-existent in the individual. Self-love does not die out of our knowledge when we overcome it; we have a knowledge of *what it is*, though it, itself, is not present. It is so represented in

our consciousness that we may say we have a knowledge of it, though we may have passed on to a higher plane. Had my friend remembered this, he would not have argued on this point as he did.

Self-love, he says, is, according to Davis, the great germ of the human soul. Why, bless my soul! my friend would never have had a being, had it not been for self-love: that is true enough. But there is to be a new work wrought in him, to bring him out of bondage to that love. God saw fit to develop the animal kingdom, before he did the human. The highest love in the animal is self-love, and the lowest love in man is self-love. In all this, Davis' doctrine does not conflict with mine.

My friend says we must have, by my doctrines, water baptism before we can have the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I deny it, and so far from holding it to be Bible doctrine, I give you an example against it: for it was not till the Gentiles had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, that Peter saw that it was proper to baptize them with water. The baptism of the Holy Ghost came first, and I argue hence that the ceremonial water baptism is not in any sense a necessary thing.

Davis, he says, is a deceiver, because he says spirit is material. My friend lays great stress upon words; they precede ideas with him. Davis only used the word "material" as "substantial." My friend makes spirits substantial also, giving them form, and he is as much a materialist as Mr. Davis. This is not worth pettifoggery about.

He has been reading extracts to show that spiritual writers say you must "try the spirits." Is there any dispute about that? Have not I said the same thing? The apostle John found it just so in his day. Now, when we try the spirits, knowing that they can come near to men, and associate according to their affinities of character, we must not be surprised to find some that are low and unworthy of confidence. The very passages my friend has read, prove that spiritualists caution you not to rely upon them; they tell you they may deceive you. And now, after we tell you we reject and repudiate their lies, the gentleman says we are responsible for them! He says Christ did not talk with spirits; I say, if the account is true, and I believe it is, he did talk with Moses and Elias, and one of the spirits of the prophets that was an *angel*, talked to John, and held conversation with him as an angel, warning him not to fall down and worship him. Because some spirits caused swine to "run down a steep place into the sea," must we never talk with spirits? No! we have only to be pure, and truthful, and holy ourselves, and then we may safely try all spirits and prove all things, holding fast that which is good. Now, with what face can my friend stand up here, reading that which spiritualists have said they could not believe, and could not depend upon, and which they warn others not to believe, and take

their very honesty, their very truth, as an evidence against them, on the charge that they are teaching that which is false? The phenomena have taught every one who investigates, that there are false spirits. It has taught me that; and shall we be held responsible for the teachings of those whom we and *all* declare to be false? I call that pettifogging. Spiritualism teaches that if we would have pure and good spirits near us, we must be pure and holy ourselves. If we are so, they will come to warn, and guard, and encourage us; to direct our path, and lift our minds above earthly things. The frivolities and foolish manifestations lead us to reflect that it becomes us to purify our desires, to cleanse ourselves, and lay in us a foundation for purer, higher, and holier associations, making ourselves better men and women. Does not all he has read teach this? Can you, can he come to any other conclusion than that? What! Does my friend deny that demons will associate with those whom they can most sympathise with, and through whom they can get most gratification? and that the only way to be free from their influence is to be pure? When this is demonstrated in ten thousand ways, and no chance is left for quibbling and doubting, is it not right to give warning and tell that it is dangerous to rest contented in idleness, selfishness, and impurity? It seconds the admonition of him who "spake as never man spake," telling you to be pure and just and truthful and good. Why then all this fault-finding? The spirits are upon you, whether you will or no! Your only safety is in self-purification. Let not this admonition be unheeded. Here I stand, and what is the use of reading book after book, showing the foolishness and nonsense of some manifestations? We are agreed beforehand as to that. You are told not to take it as authority, but to try it, and demonstrate what is truth. You will act according to your own choice, but the warning voice comes, that unless you purify yourselves, you can not have the companionship of pure and holy spirits.

My friend said I was to give him a passage from Scripture, which calls angels, "men." Luke says (xxiv: 4) that there were *two men* at the tomb of Christ. Mark says the same (xvi: 5). Matthew and John call them angels. (Matt. xxviii: 5, and John, xx: 12). I have already mentioned another who appeared to John as related in the Apocalypse.

What does all this show? What lesson are we to learn of our relations to the departed? We, here in this world, are united to those who are the objects of our love and affection, as father and mother, brother and sister, parent and child, and for some cause, when death takes any of these from us, we can not forget them, but our love follows them still. As a parent, my heart yearns after the three little ones I have laid in the tomb. Why is it that the feeling exists? My relation to them as a physical being has

ceased; I can not any longer influence them, and they can not any longer influence me. Why then does not the love-impulse die out, if the relation has ceased? No, no! I tell you it is *not* finished: I still sustain a relation to them, and that feeling, that impulse, that love, tells me that the bond between us is not severed. If then there are any to watch over me in my devious wanderings, and to prompt me to choose the upward course to true holiness and purity, who is there so fit to lead me and watch over me as my mother, who guided me in my youth, and upon whose bosom I pressed my head in childhood! Now that she is a spirit, can she come down to earth and pour a little more of that maternal counsel into my ear? If she can, who in all God's wide universe, is better fitted to be my guardian angel? If she, and my departed brothers and sisters have a warm love that brings them near and links them to my heart, who are better suited than they for such a work? To them we should look, if we had no other teachings than the promptings of our own hearts. Tell me not that bad spirits can come down. What of it? Shall we therefore drive away the rest and believe they also can not come? that we are left friendless, exposed to the buffetings of the evil ones, and no aid to come from the good? What apology for the divine government can my friend make in such a case? Surely it would be a bad order of things; judging after the manner of men, it would hardly become the wisdom of the Divine Father. The principle is, therefore, that we have guardian spirits who are angels, messengers to us, to come and take us by the hand and elevate us, as we are prepared to ascend into the higher mansions of our Father's house. Where, in God's name, is the conflict, the antagonism, between this doctrine and that of Jesus of Nazareth? I have heard enough of this quibbling, trying to fasten upon us the doctrines taught by those whom we have called, and he has called false and wicked spirits. It is a demonstration to every one that has an ear to hear, and an eye to see, that it becomes him to cleanse his own bosom, and send forth his aspirations after all that is high, and holy, and pure, and good.

I shall not have time to take up all the gentleman's points in order, but I am happy he has presented them in that form. I shall take them up and show that Jesus of Nazareth teaches the same thing with Spiritualism on each of them.

I had intended to reach the topic of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, but have not been able to do so as yet. My position in brief is, that Jesus Christ never taught water baptism, and never practised it. His baptism was the baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire, and he taught and practiced no other. When the disciples practiced water baptism, it was John the Baptist's baptism, not Christ's, and it had no possible connection, other than preparatory, with the kingdom of heaven which he came to establish.

The apostles, during their lifetimes, while they kept the ceremonies of the law of the Jews, were acting upon the same principle, and what applies to one of these cases applies to the other. The inspiration upon the day of Pentecost was not the inspiration of the Divine Father, but of spirits. The Holy Ghost, the Comforter, was in Christ, not God. It was the good Spirit without which the Christian dispensation could not be taught. These things I shall show, both from fact and philosophy.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend complains that I am pettifogging. He knows from experience what that is; I know nothing about it. It was formerly a part of his business, and if habit has any thing to do in the matter, he would be more likely to err in that way than I. I shall not stop to defend myself from such a charge, for you can judge which of us most fairly comes to the question, and faces the issue before us, and I shall not be coaxed or driven from my course by such means.

The gentleman denies that water baptism prepares the way for the baptism of the Holy Ghost. He eats his own words, then, but perhaps he himself knows which side he is on, and may possibly make us think his contradictions reconciled by and by.

He wants to know why I kept talking about spirit manifestations, when I myself have read from these books, warnings against lying spirits. I brought it up to show that they are not identical with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, because in his teachings you find neither the warnings nor the occasion for them. He had no inspiration from such spirits. My friend has utterly defeated himself by admitting that there are in Spiritualism, lying communications and teachings, such as can not for a moment be pretended were a part of the phenomena or teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. The mixture of truth with my friend's philosophy is, not his Spiritualism. Philosophy would have been as much taught if Spiritualism never had existed.

We are told, if we would have pure spirits associate with us, we must be pure ourselves, and that it is important to be guarded against impure spirits. I would beg him and the audience to remember, that every person coming into communication with spirits must be perfectly passive; must present himself, like a blank, to be written upon. He must have no choice, no will, and he must be thus passive, whether the impressions come from a good spirit or a bad one. Now I ask, in a plain, common-sense way, do you ever send out your children, saying there are a great many bad children in the streets where you are going, but do right and be pure yourselves, and you will be in no danger. Yet, you say, you

must give yourselves up in entire passiveness; don't watch, don't take any precautions,—the bad will never come near you, and the good only will communicate with you, so that you may give yourselves up without restraint. Alas! how many, how many, who once gladdened a mother's heart, and were their father's pride, year after year watched over, prayed for, and surrounded with all the influences of a pious family, do we see coming out into the world with all these safeguards about them, and yet being dragged down into hell by the delusions and temptations which seize upon them! How many a mother's heart has been broken by a daughter's course, who in her lovely youth was seduced by some of the foul spirits which, even in this world and in this body, lie in wait for the weak! and shall we believe that those spirits of subtler power and higher intelligence are not to be feared?—that we may be safely passive, and give them full scope to influence us?

My friend quotes the passage concerning the young men at the sepulcher, but what does it prove? Taking the literal sense, and throwing out of view the plain *figurative* use of words, which would make them simply the *appearances* of young men, it must prove either that young men are angels, or that angels are young men. It does not say a word about their being *disembodied* spirits; and strange enough, this absurdly literal interpretation comes from my friend who has so much to say about the "letter" bringing death! He does not succeed any better with the passage from the 22nd chapter of Revelations: "Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God!" The angel was John's fellow-servant, and a fellow-servant of the prophets and of those obedient to the commands of the book. He does not say he had ever been a prophet or a human being, and no grammatical construction of the English or the original can make such a meaning of it. Such an interpretation shows a very careless reading of the passage. I also deny that Moses and Elias are spoken of as angels. Will the gentleman pretend to prove that Christ received communications from them as from "spirit mediums?" No, no! They had no instruction, no intelligence to convey; they came to lay their crowns at his feet, to cast their honors before him, and the voice from heaven was, This is my beloved Son, HEAR HIM!

When my friend found it difficult to bring forward arguments, he attempted an appeal to your sympathies, and drew a moving picture of a mother's love for her child, bereaved of her guardian watchfulness by death. There are times when such an appeal is proper, and even needful. When death invades the family-circle and strikes down a parent, it is proper to remind the afflicted ones of the life beyond the grave, and to comfort their sorrowing

hearts by a view of a happy re-union beyond the tomb. For

There is no flock, however watched and tended,
But one dead lamb is there;
There is no household, howsoe'er defended,
But hath one vacant chair.

These words of comfort, therefore, are sorely needed at times, and at the grave of a loved one they would be well enough. Here, however, in a sober and serious debate, it may well be doubted whether the use of such appeals does not betray a want of confidence in argument, and reveal a weak point in the gentleman's case. If we ask how much advantage Spiritualism can claim from such a source, we are forced to remember, that the gentleman makes the whole matter of immortality depend as a *fact*, upon the *authority* of the spirits. There can not be any advantage gained over Christianity, for there is nothing demonstrated. The thing is not "translated to your own consciousness." If my friend slightly speaks of the *authority* of the Bible, we cannot feel that spirits who conduct as theirs do, are worthy of *more* respect. If a strong faith which takes away the terrors of the grave, be an argument in favor of a system, Christianity has nothing to lose by comparison with any other. Peace, joy, and even rapture has been experienced by saints when death was sundering the closest ties of relationship, and holy men and women have seen the portals of Paradise opening to them, long, long before the gentleman came to bring comfort to mourners by means of the *dignified* manifestations of Modern Spiritualism. Christian death-beds can bear witness to manifestations of triumphant faith, stronger than Spiritualism ever dreamt of. But even amongst spiritualists there is no union on the question of immortality. Some of them rest it upon authority, some upon intuition, some upon philosophical reasonings. Our faith rests on no such basis.

But, taking my friend's view of human nature in its "discrete degrees," it was surely an unworthy conception, to make appeals to merely fleshly relationships. These do not belong to the spiritual part of human nature—they are much lower down. We may have these impulses, but we have them in common with lower orders of beings, and one who strives peculiarly to elevate the race, should not indulge in appeals to such a department of the soul. Again, it is admitted that the communications are not reliable, and in that view of the subject, I must pronounce it an outrageous violation of the holiest sentiments of the human heart, to trifle and tamper with such sacred relationships, and vainly to excite the hope of communicating with those who bore the hallowed name of father or mother, husband or wife: to pretend to bring them up, and have them tapping out disgusting and con-

temptible messages upon some table, around which are collected thoughtless and curious crowds, to whom the scene is a mere show, but never coming near the homes they loved, to converse in retirement and stillness with the loved ones! Tell me not that a loving wife, the wounds of whose bereavement are still but slightly healed, will find any consolation in such communications! No! If appeals to the sympathies of our hearts were needed, Christianity will never yield to another system, in power to move us. Jesus was full of love for his friends: his relatives were not overlooked by him. Yet, when the people came rushing into his presence saying, "Behold thy mother and brethren without seek for thee," he looked around upon that little tattered band of his followers, who had none of the glories of this world, but whose minds were tied to his by affinities sacred and pure—who did the will of his heavenly Father—to *them* he pointed and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren!" On such an occasion, when he was seeking to impress solemn truth upon their minds, he could overlook the earthly relationships, and made no appeal to their sympathies for the sake of momentary effect. If, however, we need to reflect what hope the Christian has of a watchful friendship and love, guarding his steps day by day, the Christian has not only the assurance of the care of his Father, who thinks him of "more value than many sparrows"—of the ministering angels, stronger than earth-born souls, but there is a peculiar closeness of relationship between him and his risen Redeemer. It is a blessedness to think of the Undying One, who loves so well poor worms of the dust, and bears upon the palms of his hands, and written in his heart, the names even of poor mortals, if we will do his will! Though ten thousand angels wait for his word, and eternity re-echoes with his praises, yet his heart beats in holy sympathy with us, his hand is outstretched to save us, and we *know* that when father and mother forsake us, HE will take us up. The word of his promise will speak peace to our souls: in times of storm and darkness, when our frail bark is tossed upon the surges, and all hope is failing, HE will come walking upon the waters, and bringing Divine comfort to our breasts! That is the Christian's joy, that his consolation! His heart is in unison with all pure souls, not because they are bound to him by earthly ties, but because they have pure hearts, because they are attracted by the charms of moral and religious character and are one with God. *This* Spiritualism is taught us by the pure doctrines of Jesus Christ, our Lord and our Redeemer, and we feel that it is degrading to turn from such doctrines to those miserable oracles which have come in these modern times, attended by such unutterably low manifestations.

Let every one who loves what is holy and divine, judge which is the nobler and more elevating association, and which offers the

most satisfying comfort to a broken heart. For myself, the ties of earthly relationship seem weak beside the power which binds the true Christian heart to him who said "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." (Matt. xii: 50.)

FIFTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—I wish to notice, in commencing this morning, one or two things mentioned by my friend last evening. One is, that mediums must be passive. There is a mistaken notion on that point, in the minds of enemies, and of some friends also. There is a marked difference between the passivity of the affections, and that of the physical nature. In *desire*, the individual must be active, but in the external nature, that resists spiritual influences, he must be passive. He must retire into the closet and shut to the door—shut out all worldly influences. That is the condition necessary for prayer, and for true mediumship. If you are true, and holy, and pure, in your affections and desires, there will be no trouble from devils. This kind of passivity is what Christ himself recommended.

My friend objected to the appeal he says I made to your sympathies. I intended no such appeal. I was only speaking of the language of the affections, for they have a language of their own, and convey lessons by it. The natural affections of the soul always speak truth. This love, in the bosom of another being, has its origin in the relation the soul sustains toward that being. It is so with every other impulse, for every impulse is owing to some existing relation. The brute mother nourishes her young until they are able to take care of themselves. Until that time her care and affection are constant; but the moment they can provide for themselves, the object of the impulse is accomplished, and it ceases. The young are turned out to shift as they can, and the mother regards them no longer with partiality. The unity and harmony of God's government is beautifully illustrated in this. Wherever you see an impulse, there is a cause for it, and relations which sustain and call it forth. When the mother brings forth her child, her maternal impulse is the voice of God in her soul, prompting her to take care of the infant that must pillow its head upon her breast and draw its nourishment therefrom. When the relation ceases in its full extent, the impulse will cease; but the relation in the human race does not entirely cease in this life, and the impulse continues. The relation is a spiritual one, and its natural effect in producing the impulse is a demonstration of the continuance of the relation itself, so long as this impulse is felt. That impulse is a voice of God in the soul, asserting that there is a cause for the affection in the still existing relation; and its continuance after one of the parties to it has been removed to the

spirit world, is good proof that even there the connection has not wholly been sundered. In all the universe you can show no impulse which does not depend upon relations. *Law* has reference to relation, and outside of relation there is no law. Therefore, when I find in my bosom an affection and regard for the children that have left me, that love proclaims that my relation to my child has not yet ceased. In my remarks, therefore, which my friend has called an appeal to your sympathies, I was only referring to your own affections as an argument, and affirming that they can not lie in this matter. I appeal to your *judgment* and *understanding*: if you have spirit friends that watch over you, who would they most likely be? Those between whom and yourself there is the strongest natural affinity and love, they would be the ones who would most naturally watch over you and feel an interest in your progress and development. The facts of spirit manifestation and history alike prove this. Now, I believe it is agreed that spirits have power to speak and make manifestations; to enter into and control human beings, and I claim that the same philosophy which permits bad spirits thus to come, must permit good spirits to come likewise. When, therefore, we ask who these spirits which guard us are, reason, our affections and facts alike show that it is those who have been our friends, and sustained relations of love to us in this world, whom we may naturally expect to be our protectors. If this be the language of the phenomena, the position is fully and abundantly sustained, that in this respect, Spiritualism, taken in its whole length and breadth, harmonizes with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Its facts proclaim the same truth which Jesus proclaimed, and it is impossible to make discord between them. There I stand with reference to that point, and I trust you will see that the course I have taken is one of legitimate argument from the nature and language of the affections. So that unless my friend can show it not to be true that these two loves and affections have their origin in the relations of individuals, and that the love ceases when the relation ceases, he must admit that the continuation of the love proves the continuation of the relation. I shall show that these things admonish us that we have power for good and evil, not only over those who are in the body, but those that have left the body, and that our responsibility stretches even into the spirit world. I only allude to this now, as this is not the place at which I intend to go fully into it. The weight of this responsibility will keep us from sin, and have a purifying influence over us. My proposition, then, was this; that the first dispensation was a natural one, governing man through the impulse of self-love, by force and fear alone. The second was to be *within* man, not over him. The ruling power was to come from his own heart, and love was to cast out fear. This was to characterize the dispensation of Christ as distinguished from the Mosaic. The first

addressed our natural minds, natural eye, ear, and understanding, and was to be understood in its natural, not its spiritual sense. But when we come to the establishment of a spiritual government, when the carnal love was to be cast out and man brought into a higher and purer love, and his heart made clean so that it might be a temple for the living God, then we pass from the natural into the spiritual. Hence the language of the second dispensation must be spiritual, and in addressing men who have not their spiritual nature unfolded, natural language must be used, it is true, but it is used spiritually, figuratively, in parables. The letter belongs to the earth, it is earthy; the spirit is from the Lord from heaven, and he who learns the spiritual significance of the word, has his instruction from heaven. Hence, one of the absolutely essential attendants of the new dispensation must have been the gift of the spirit to make known unto the natural man the meaning of the teachings from heaven. That "spirit of truth" must abide with man forever. The idea that we can get spiritual truth from natural language is a false one. Take as an illustration this globe of Bohemian glass which I have brought in. I ask the name of it. One says he does not know; another says it is called Bohemian glass. Now, suppose I use the name only, and that you have never seen the thing itself, do you have any distinct idea conveyed to your mind when I use the term "Bohemian glass?" Suppose, again, that I use a term which means something. Here is glass and here are flowers beautifully and singularly imbedded in it, and I will call it *vitri-flora*. Do you even then know what is meant unless you have first learned the meaning of the words? So I may describe it by its form and color, but unless you know the meaning of the words, you are none the wiser, no matter how many of them I use. I must make my description out of ideas in you. If you have the elements all in your mind, I can make you understand all about it, but if you have not, my words will be mere jargon to you. So in spiritual things there are matters lying deeper than any thing in the natural world. Nothing there can represent it. What, then, must be done? Evidently you must have the inspiration of the spirit of truth, and it must come from the Divine Jehovah himself or you can not get it. If, then, there is any thing in the spiritual world, any spiritual life or truth of which I can find no representation in the natural world, I can not by language convey to you an idea of that truth. External language is worth nothing, except as it can find its representative in you. Here is where I stand. Here is a new order of truths to come in, — a higher life and higher wisdom and light. In order, therefore, that it may come in, I need a higher agency than any which poor, ignorant man possesses, a higher language than he has, and a higher teacher than he can be. I must have the internal and spiritual represented in me, and the external can not

do it. Here, then, arises the question, What is the spirit of truth which Christ says he will ask the Father to send in his name: that Spirit which is to abide forever with Christ's humble follower? What is this spirit of truth? What its nature, its office, whence did it come?

My position in regard to it is, that the spirit of truth is not the person of Jesus Christ; nor the individual spirit of Jesus Christ; nor the individual spirit of God, as distinguished from other spirits; neither is a separate God from the Divine Father. I take, at least, these negative positions, to show what the spirit of truth is not; yet I also affirm of the spirit of truth, that it is a spirit, and that there are many spirits involved in the ministration known as that of the spirit of truth. They all have their light from the Divine Father; they perform their work in the place where it needs to be performed in order best to enlighten man and lead him up into higher truth. Christ said, the Comforter could not come while he remained with the disciples; that is, the Holy Ghost could not come while he remained with them. Now, there is a reason for this. The difficulty was in the disciple and in the disciple alone; not in the Holy Ghost, nor in Christ, nor in any one but the disciple. The agency necessary to bring the Holy Ghost could not be brought to bear, except at Christ's departure from them. That agency was used, when by influences upon the disciples' hearts they were ready for its action. The disciple was not ready to receive into his perception the influences of the conscious spirit, and hence it was necessary for Christ to go away, in order that there might be a proper operation of the spirit influences upon the disciple. I believe I have now stated my position so that you can understand it. In brief, it is that the spirit of truth includes all spiritual beings under God, that can in any way convey truth to the human mind, in its absolute and spiritual form.

MR. ERRETT.

I have been asked a great many times during the last day or two, how long the discussion will continue. I will say here, to avoid further questioning, that I know nothing about it. I must refer you to my friend here. He has the affirmative, and can control the length of the debate much better than I. The matter I have prepared as an expose of Spiritualism would last a month, should the debate be so long continued.

MR. TIFFANY. I have matter enough to last a year, if the people wish to stay and hear.

MR. ERRETT. I can stay as long as the gentleman can, and shall not be found raising any personal objection to continuing on to any length. So far as I am concerned, the longer the better,

for I shall have the better opportunity to make a full presentation of the truth on this subject.

I spoke last night of the danger of passivity under spirit influences. The gentleman says it is merely *external* passivity that is taught, and I must therefore read a little with regard to that point. S. B. BRITTAN, the editor of the *Spiritual Telegraph*, says, "A state of *mental passivity* and physical repose seems to be even *more indispensable than either intelligence or virtue*" to constitute one a medium. "When the mind is most vigorously exercised, it is, of course, least inclined to yield to any power foreign to itself, as the nerves of motion will not readily obey an external agent when they are acted upon by the individual will, and made to vibrate to their utmost tension. *The strong repel foreign influences of every name and kind. Passive or negative natures yield*, while the positive man opposes an effectual resistance." (*Spiritual Telegraph*, June 19, 1852.) The passivity intended is therefore a *surrender of the will*. The negative nature yields, and the action of spirits turns out to be a diseased action of the physical system in many instances, as spiritualists themselves have confessed, and there is nothing impossible in the statement of Dr. Richmond in his discussion with Mr. Brittan, that he had *cast them out with tartar emetic*.

This, then, is the first requisite of the person who would be a medium. He must sustain a "passive or negative relation to the intelligences who seek to impress us." I repeat my former question, therefore:—Would any father or mother be willing to send a child abroad, telling him to be passive to every influence that may attack him?

Again, we read; "When you meet in a circle, you should be calm, and, as much as possible, *dispossessed of thought*. *A passive state is the only one we can operate in*. Please remember this."

Still again: "In order to prepare a medium, the person to be prepared must give up *all self-control, all resistance*." These are from a high class of spiritual writers, quoted in Rogers' "Philosophy of Mysterious Rappings," page 174.

My friend has recurred again to a matter I thought he had given up some time since. He brought in this glass paper-weight to illustrate the impossibility of conveying ideas by words unless you understand the words. It is singular that he should spend so much time upon that which has never been disputed. The point for him to establish, if he would support the position he at first assumed, is to give some positive proof of his "impress of consciousness upon consciousness." He should have kept the bit of Bohemian glass in his pocket, and "impressed" the idea upon us without words. When he does that we shall yield. His proposition was that consciousness can impress consciousness without words or signs. He called it a "truth" not to be received upon

authority or testimony, but I have shown that it is only authority which he has supported it by from first to last. My former argument upon this subject was not met at all, and I see no new force in this morning's illustration.

I come now to another point: viz., to examine whether there is any thing in the Bible inconsistent with such communications with spirits (admitting them to be such), as are known to Modern Spiritualism, and as I have read about from day to day. I shall refer you in rapid succession to quite a number of passages of Scripture. Leviticus xix: 31—"Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God." Levit. xx: 6—"And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people." Same chapter, verse 27—"A man also, or a woman, that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death." The gentleman must not say any thing about the cruelty of these requirements, for you will recollect that he has affirmed that they were all needed under the dispensation which was an "incarnation of animalism." It seems that there were a great many persons in those old times who were *spiritualists*, and had communications very much as they do now. God abhorred the nations whom he cast out, for these very things, and I would not like to read all that is said concerning the character of these ancient spiritualists;—you can read it at home (Leviticus, 20th chapter: see especially the 23rd verse), and see what *necessity* there was for an "incarnation of animalism" in the laws against them, for the overthrow of all this system of spiritual communication, and the evils growing out of it. Read again in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy, 10th and 11th verses.—"There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer," and the passage continues on to the 15th verse, where God's mode of conveying truth is made known: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto HIM shall ye hearken." This last passage is referred by the apostle Peter to CHRIST, the Messiah, and the instruction contained in the whole is thus made to extend forward into all future time: so that it still remains true that the necromancers are an abomination to God, and placed in direct contrast to the Messiah's revelation of truth. In the 28th chapter of 1st Samuel, we have the familiar account of Saul's interview with the Witch of Endor. Saul was not able to make an impression from his consciousness upon her's that he was the king of Israel, and the spirit of Samuel was

called up, much to her dismay and alarm. It was because *God had departed from him*, as he said, that he sought such information, and "disquieted" the spirit of the prophet. I apprehend that such is the condition of persons generally when they go to such sources for information. Again—8th Isaiah, 19th and 20th verses—"And when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter : should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead?"

MR. TIFFANY. Those that peep and mutter are not our kind.

MR. ERRETT. They have not done much else but peep and mutter in this vicinity. I will now refer you to the account of the Transfiguration on the Mount, in the 17th chapter of Matthew. You will notice that the voice came out of the cloud, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased ; hear ye *him*." Although Moses and Elias were there in their immortal glories, the attention of the disciples was turned away from their spirits to *Christ* : "Hear ye him," is the divine direction.

I pass on to the spiritualists of the New Testament. In the 8th chapter of The Acts, we have the story of Simon Magus, whom Mr. Brittan claims for a spiritualist, but with whom the apostles would have nothing to do but to convert him, and they found him hard timber to work upon, even after that. In the 13th chapter, we find the account of Elymas the sorcerer, to whom Saul's salutation, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, was, "O, full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" That was Paul's "communication" with them. Again, in the 16th chapter, we have the case of the "damsel possessed with a spirit of divination," who "brought her masters much gain by soothsaying." To her spirit, although it confessed that "these men are the servants of the most high God," Paul said, "I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her." Was that an admission, on Paul's part, of *identity* in phenomena and teachings? It at least brought upon the apostles the hatred of her masters, who found that "the hope of their gains was gone," and a mob, scourging, and the jail, was the consequence. In the 4th chapter of 1st Timothy, we are told that the Holy Spirit expressly predicts, that some in latter times shall "give heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisies, having their conscience seared with a hot iron." These are certainly examples enough from both Testaments, to show how far the Scriptures recognize and endorse such communications. I will make a single reference more. When Jesus tells of the rich man and Lazarus, it is said that the rich man could not come back himself to warn his brethren, nor could he get the privilege of sending Lazarus. There was no

hope given that any pure human spirit could come back for such a purpose as his. He was told, "they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them;" and when he cried, "Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent:" the reply was, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Are the teachings of Modern Spiritualism the same as those of Jesus on *that* point? This Spiritualism does not like to say much about the impassable gulf, the fire, the torment. Some of the most influential among them try to prove that there are no evil and unhappy spirits, as I have already shown. One person writes to Mr. Davis, "I have read two thousand four hundred and ninety-three pages of astounding thoughts from your pen. * Your utterances from the spirit world re-echo the opinions of Universalists;" and Mr. Davis does not deny it very stoutly, or take a very definite position in the matter.

So much for the teachings of Scripture upon the communication of spirits: and no one can fail to see that if there be an admission of the *possibility* of their communicating with persons here, it is most solemnly and distinctly placed under ban, and the mark of the Almighty's displeasure fixed upon it. Jesus despised such sources of communication and would have nothing to do with them, but to cast out the devils, and drive them back to the darkness whence they came. He offered to them no thanks for their testimony, and arrayed the whole power, authority, and majesty of his name and nature, against them and their influence. The grand miracles and signs which attested his divinity, were many of them wrought in casting out the spirits from their usurped power over men. It was the downfall of the empire of darkness which was portrayed when it was said, "I beheld Satan as lightning, fall from heaven." He said, "Rejoice not, that the spirits are subject to you; but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven." (Luke x: 20.) I challenge the gentleman to show any such array of Spiritualism against the powers of darkness. The principal sources of spiritual influence strive to break down the teachings of Christ altogether, and talk of his words and maxims as "ginger-bread and knick-knacks," and the garrulous talk of an old "grandpapa!" We have no condemnation of these things from any spirit. The vilest things I have read, and the viler things which I could not read aloud, are not condemned throughout the whole mass of spiritual teaching. A. J. Davis has reviewed the "Astounding Facts," to some extent, but there is no word of condemnation of that spiritual brothel to which I referred, as existing in the fifth sphere.

MR. TIFFANY.

I must say a word with regard to my friend Courtney, and his opinion of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. I suppose he has made the same error I did once, when I took what the sects say Christ taught for what he really taught. In that view of it, one might well say it was "ginger-bread."

In the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, I suppose my friend will admit that truth of some kind is taught. He did not tell us whether he meant the figurative expression should go on two legs or all fours. Upon reflection, it will be seen that the parable had reference to the character of persons and not to their physical condition. The rich man lived in his animal nature, and the spirit of Lazarus could not communicate with Dives himself or the animal nature of his brothers. Nothing but the physical law of Moses would do for them. I do not propose at present to take up all the passages of Scripture quoted by my friend, because they will come up in order, as we pass on to the more full examination of the first and second dispensations. As to the appropriateness of my illustration drawn from the Bohemian glass, I think I shall have to say as Corwin once said in a stump speech to a man in the crowd, "you must get God Almighty to give you some brains, and go to Sunday school for two or three weeks, and perhaps you may understand it." The point to be impressed upon the mind was that by natural means, no ideas can be imparted to the mind by words alone, before the things represented by the words are known. I believe it is now confessed to be true, that unless there are other means to convey spiritual truth to the understanding, besides words and signs, it cannot be got. I have remarked that Christ himself said it was necessary for the spirit of truth to come to enlighten them. My friend seems to consider the spirit of truth, the sense of the word tried by the highest standard of reasoning, but I suppose he could hardly have meant to argue this, and I have not pressed the point.

Under the Mosaic dispensation, when, as they say, God had such close and intimate connection with his people, how happened it that the Christian dispensation was not given? Did not God himself understand it at that time? Upon the common hypothesis, this cannot be accounted for; but the fact was that the then state of development of the human mind was so low, that these higher truths could not be received. Therefore they were obliged to continue under the law, and be governed by the law, and in all their civil, moral, and religious acts, have reference to external things, to external forms, types, and ceremonies. The Spirit of truth, the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, could not flow into their understanding. There was nothing within them by which Divine love could be represented to their understanding, and hence it was necessary that, between the law and Christ, there should in-

tervene the mission of John the Baptist. Hence, also, came the remark that of all born of woman, none was greater than John the Baptist, but that the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he. John had not received the spirit of truth. He could baptize with water as a ceremonial type, but he could not baptize with the spirit. He could teach the doctrine involved in the baptism of water; but when it was necessary to teach the things taught by the spirit of truth, a new and higher baptism was indispensable. This was not because Jesus could not understand, and did not have the highest truth, but because natural language could not represent spiritual truth. Hence, when he would tell them of the kingdom of heaven being a spiritual kingdom, they looked for all the pomp, and ceremony, and display of the temporal kingdom of their father David, with all the regal paraphernalia of government. He told them the kingdom of heaven came not by observation, but they could not understand him. He told them it was like a little leaven hid in *three* measures of meal; he did not say two measures, or one measure. He said also that first comes the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. They understood not what he meant: how that first must come the Mosaic dispensation, the dispensation of force, then the moral dispensation, that of John the Baptist, and last of all the true spiritual dispensation, in all its divine significance and absoluteness. It was characteristic of the new dispensation, that its baptism was to be a baptism of the Holy Ghost. That Holy Ghost was also called the Comforter, and the Spirit of truth, and was to enlighten the mind. The baptism of fire was to cleanse the nature of its lusts and passions. The fire represented the love principle, and the light, the wisdom principle. It is love that warms and vivifies the heart; it is wisdom that sheds light upon the mind, hence Paul said it was to put the law in men's hearts and write it in their minds. Under the old dispensation they had the law upon tables of stone, books, outward forms and symbols; but under the new covenant the law was to be put into the understanding and written in the affections of the man. The first was natural, the second was spiritual. The race needed an instructor which could lay hold on the affections, and by a government within man. The old law was outward, formal; the other was inward, spiritual, divine. It is written by the finger of God, through all the agencies of his works, upon man's heart and affections. Hence it was, the mission of the Spirit of truth to become the medium of conveying this spiritual truth to his understanding and heart. When you were required under the old dispensation not to have communion with spirits, the communications forbidden were those between spirits of the lowest, the animal sphere, and man in his lowest nature on earth. Every system of Spiritualism would condemn that. The Spirit of truth was not

then in rapport with earth, for earth was not in a condition to receive the influence of that spirit. I do not wonder that there was a ban upon the spirits that peeped and muttered. But when Jesus of Nazareth came, preceded and heralded by John the Baptist, the time was at hand when the demons might be put under foot, and the doctrine was taught that the communication between earth and them can only be interrupted by elevating man above them. Christ did not come to shut away angels and guardian spirits from earth; he only came to change the character of the communications—to open up the way between earth and the paradise to which he and the thief went on the day of his crucifixion, from which holy spiritual influences might descend upon man. It was to be an evidence that a man had received of the Spirit of truth, if he performed the outward signs of that spirit's power: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. And these *signs* shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." (Mark xvi: 16—18.) These were the gifts of the spirit, and they were to follow them that believe. They were not given to show off spiritual phenomena, but to raise men to a higher spiritual sphere; to open up a way of communication into the Paradise—not into the Heaven of Heavens, the *third* Heaven, the Paradise of God. The existence of the three heavens must be admitted, and I shall make my friend admit that there must be just so many and no more. I have already described them, and will only say that the Mosaic dispensation corresponds to the first; Christ in his first mission, to the second; and Christ in his last office to the third, and in that will come the reign of the Millennium. The last shall bring *every* knee to bow, and *every* tongue to confess. You may begin to think I am a Universalist, and you will not be astray. I shall prove it true, before I am done, that every soul of man shall ultimately be saved through Christ's dispensation. In so doing, I shall not overlook man's responsibility, nor throw all off upon God's responsibility. It shall rest where alone it belongs—upon you and me. I shall make it also appear that we had better "agree with our adversary quickly while we are in the way with him, lest he deliver us to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and we be cast into prison, whence we shall by no means come out till we have paid the uttermost farthing." (Matt. v: 25, 26.) This is true in the strictest sense, as well as the other, and if we have no rational, truthful, and consistent way of showing how the "last farthing" may be paid, the full penalty will surely come.

My friend says I preach pretty well in some of my speeches, and I will preach a little now. My text is, "Nevertheless, I tell

you the truth : it is expedient for you that I go away ; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." I think I have quoted the text right : you will find it in the 16th chapter of John, and 7th verse. It was said by Jesus to his disciples, at or near the close of his ministry with them on earth, after he had been some three years with them, and instructed them as far as he could, with reference to the government he was about to establish. He had told them, a little while and they should not see him, and although the communication might naturally be a mournful one to them, he said they would rejoice, did they understand what he meant. As it was, sorrow was to come upon them for a time, but it should afterward be turned into joy. Their hopes of him as a temporal prince and Saviour were about to be destroyed, yet, he said, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." Why was it that the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, could not come till Jesus should depart, if it was the meaning of the literal language of Jesus that was the spirit of truth ? He had been talking to them for a long time, and trying to make them understand him, but they did not. Why then was it ? I repeat the question, and will solve it myself if my friend does not answer it,—Why was it the Spirit of truth could not come till Jesus should go away, especially if it was any thing that could be communicated by word to the disciples,—if it was any thing that Jesus while in the body could impart ? The only *orthodox* answer I have heard, is one sometimes used, and which, in short, is, that all of the Triune family could not leave home at once. But, we are told, the Holy Ghost descended upon Jesus in his baptism. Where, then, lay the difficulty in imparting it to his disciples ? Was it in Jesus, in the Comforter, or in the disciple ? It must have been in one of them.

Again, when Jesus was crucified, the thief upon the cross beside him is said to have turned and asked to be remembered. Jesus replied, To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise. That was not in hell, or the lower sphere : where, then, was it ? On the third day, when the women went to pay their last respects to the body of their Friend, they found the tomb empty, and the two "young men in shining garments" told them he was risen, he was not there. They went away : Mary informed the disciples that the body of their Master was gone ;—Peter and John run to the tomb to see for themselves, and return saying it was just as the women had told them. Mary, lingering about the sepulcher sees the angels, and weeping over the loss of her Lord, is amazed at the sudden appearance of a stranger, whose single word, "Mary," quickens her vision and brings her to his feet, exclaiming "Rabboni"—"My Lord." There are many interesting points in these

phenomena, which will come up before us for examination as we proceed.

MR. ERRETT.

My friend says he will arrange matters so that there shall be no responsibility for sin thrown upon God. That is easily done, for he has no God; at least, none but an ideal one, without individuality or personal identity, thought, feeling, or will. By his principles, no one on earth has entered the third sphere, and all others worship an objective God, which, he says, is a mere idol. Even in that third sphere, the only God is found in the finite being's own consciousness. The fact is, his principles will just as surely run into blank atheism, as you push them to their conclusions. The moment you talk of God's responsibility, you make him an objective God, because responsibility implies objective individuality and mental personality, such as will constitute a moral agent.

He said, the difficulties which prevented the gift of the Spirit, lay in the disciples, that all that was lacking was fitness for reception, *in them*. But the *apostle* says the Spirit was not yet given, *because Jesus was not yet glorified*. My friend differs from the apostle's reason, and probably "repudiates" it. He told us, yesterday, that Jesus left the disciples where he found them: he made no impression upon them; was not, and could not get in *rapport* with them; he had to go away. If Jesus failed, then, in the name of heaven, how will my friend Tiffany succeed? What dreams and vagaries are these, of remodeling the world after the Son of God himself is proclaimed to have made a failure!

We had also a repetition of the assertion that there was nothing in the disciples to enable them to understand spiritual truth. I have already said enough in answer to that, and shall not repeat it here.

He tells us, John the Baptist baptized with water as a type of that which was to come. I should like to ask, what, in John's baptism, was a type of the *illumination* promised to the believer? I should like to know also what is the spiritual meaning of "leaven," and wherein a spiritual interpretation of that passage in which it occurs, would differ from any common-sense interpretation according to the ordinary rules of rhetoric. What is the spiritual meaning of "three," also; for the gentleman seems to use it quite literally. When I inquired, a day or two ago, how we might know whether there were three, four, or seven spheres, my friend said it made no difference. He appears to have come to the conclusion, now, that it is of importance to make just "three and no more." I have before me pictures of the spirit spheres, drawn by mediums under the control of the spirits them-

selves, and they do not agree very well with my friend as to numbers. This one, given by a spirit at the notorious "Koons' room" in Athens county, has *seven* spheres for spirits, besides sun spheres, and various appendages looking like Fourth of July fireworks. This other is given in the "Astounding Facts," so often referred to. It is not quite so fanciful as the first, but agrees with it in putting in *seven* spirit spheres. It runs both ways, up and down, and marks out the distances in miles. It is drawn by spirits also, and fixes a day of Judgment, along in the fourth sphere. A black place partitioned off, represents hell, where, the spirit tells us, *one fifteenth* of the human race will remain forever. Still a third picture, with rays, and glories and great heads, may be seen in Mattison's "Spirit Rappings Unveiled," all agreeing, however, as to the *seven* spheres. When my friend gets his picture drawn, we shall have the pleasure of seeing another, with *three* spheres, and it will have the interest of novelty. I fear I have wasted time with these trifling points, already, and will pass on.

I want my friend to tell us, whether the *people* were baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and whether the elements of spiritual truth, which they did not have before, were at that time conveyed to their minds. I would like to know also, if the prohibition of communicating with spirits under the old dispensation, was because the Comforter had not yet come; and whether we do not need the same laws now, since the danger appears to be about as great as ever, and especially since my friend says no one on earth has as yet received the Comforter. Is there not as great a necessity now as then, for stopping the foray of the black legions from over the Styx? Jesus, certainly, did not take away the prohibition, and give liberty to have such communications. If he says Jesus opened up a way of communication with good spirits, let him show it; let us have clear proof on every point which tends toward proving the identity of Spiritualism with the teachings of Jesus. Now, I utterly deny that the "signs," spoken of by Mark, were to follow all believers. They were given only to the apostles. The words of the commission were "In my name shall they *cast out devils*," but I demand time and place where a new way of communication with spirits was opened.

It will not do, in discussing a question of this kind, to show nothing but casual similarities in parts of systems. You can prove similarities between Spiritualism and Mahometanism; between my friend's estimate of the importance of *numbers*, and the ideas of Pythagoras; between some points of his philosophy, and that of Plato: but in this discussion, the thing to be shown is not similarity, but *identity*.

If I understand what the gentleman has been saying about

the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, he believes it must make the impression when the spiritual truth is received. Jesus could not do it: all effort to do it is in vain, and it rests upon the immediate communication of the Spirit of truth with the mind. If this is the gentleman's meaning, I shall know how to go to work when he has developed his system a little more at large.

I wish him to understand that I deny that the baptism mentioned in the Apostolic commission, was the baptism of the Holy Ghost: he must prove that, before assuming it. I ask, who was authorized to baptize with the Holy Ghost, and what peculiar blessings were to be conveyed by it, and what were to be the immediate results of it. We have heard nothing on these points as yet. I begin to fear that the time the Saviour spent with his disciples, would be much too short for the gentleman to reach any of these matters.

To return to my own course:—I shall now proceed to show some more plain contradictions between the teachings of Jesus and those of Spiritualism. *First; the doctrines concerning the Creation.* We read in the Bible, that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;"—"Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands." (Hebrews i: 10.) That is Scripture: now listen to Spiritualism, from the "Mountain Cove Journal."

"God the Life in God the Lord in God the Holy Procedure organized the first orb-creation in form of appearing as one globular ovarium, which was the germ of the terrestrial universe of universes; and within the globular was the embryo of the external of the universal, impersonal creation, as one curvilinear ovarium; and within the curvilinear the germ of the external of the universal, personal or intellectual creation, in the form of one vortical ovarium."

"In the beginning of the orb-formation preparatory for man-formations; vehicles of the Quickening Spirit into intellectual formations, the universal concavity, and the universal convexity, were co-enfolded and encompassed in the universal zodiac, and within the concavity was the visible disclosure unto the germ of the Terrestrial."

I am doubtful whether that can be "impressed" upon your consciousness, but that is the "spiritual" idea of the creation. At any rate it will hardly be called *identical* with the grandly simple account in the Bible, making God the creator of all.

Next; the doctrines concerning God's being and attributes. Mr. Davis says (Harmonia 2, 278), "Mind and matter, God and his body, are universal and eternal," and that "the mind rejects the proposition that God created the universe out of nothing." Judge Edmonds says (Spiritualism 2, 130), that Bacon declares God not to be a "person" in the biblical sense, and in the same

volume (page 288), the great philosopher declares that "among many spirits of high estate, there are many who believe *God himself the product of developed intelligence.*"

Christ says, "God is a Spirit." A. J. Davis says (*Harmonia*, 2, 266), that God is *matter*, and his elements and attributes are also matter. I cannot vouch for his God being the subjective Deity my friend talks about, but he evidently talks of a *material* God, a *mechanical* God, a God of *necessity*. "Inasmuch," says he (*Harmonia* 2, 264), "as God is the greatest fact, and the greatest reality in being, it follows from scientific principles, that he is a *fixed* Fact, and a *fixed* Reality. In plainer language, *God is a being of absolute necessity.*" Christ expresses his views of God's freedom by saying, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

Again; the teachings concerning Christ himself. Jesus says, "Before Abraham was, *I am*" (John viii: 58); and the inspired Evangelist says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John i: 1.) My friend says Jesus was a mere man. Davis says he was more of a *woman* than a man. "JESUS, in all the organic essentials of his spiritual nature, was a woman; a good, simple-minded, truth-feeling, truth-loving soul!" (*Present Age*, 35.) As a still further evidence of the estimate placed upon Jesus by Spiritualism, we had given in one of their periodicals, a number of portraits of seers and prophets, ancient and modern, Pythagoras, Jesus Christ, Judge Edmonds, and S. B. Brittan, taking equal places in the series! I never before realized so completely the truth of the adage, that there is but a step between the sublime and the ridiculous: Jesus Christ and S. B. Brittan!

Look now at the contrasted *views of Christ's doctrines*. He says of himself, "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world." (John ix: 5.) "The words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit* and they are *life*." (John vi: 63.) "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall *know the truth*, and the truth shall make you free." (John viii: 31.) "Search the *Scripture*, for in them ye think ye have *eternal life*, and they are they which testify of me." (John v: 39.) Over against this, you may place, by way of comparison, what I read in the beginning of the debate from Mr. Davis and Mr. Courtney, about Christ's teachings being worthless as "ginger-bread and knick-knacks."

It was, to the gigantic mind of Webster, a crushing thought,* he said, that God, vast and grand as he is, must look upon man as insignificant, and care no more for him than for the machinery of his universe; but the character of Christ, the incarnation of the divine, was still a refuge to him, and his soul found comfort in the Savior's sympathy with and love for the race. No mortal

could have written the sermon on the mount. It carries its divine authorship upon its face. You remember also his most touching lamentation over Jerusalem,—his indignant upbraiding of the cities in which most of his mighty works had been done,—the parable of the talents and the blessings bestowed upon those who improved what was given them, and the fearful punishment of the servant who hid his Lord's money,—all these passages boldly and strongly appeal to *man's conscious freedom* and sense of *moral responsibility*. They assume it as a thing unquestioned. I will contrast these with Spiritualism as taught by Davis. (Harmonia 2, 211.) He says, "I am perfectly aware that the whole Christian superstructure is suspended or sustained by the confidently asserted and supposed truth that *man is a free agent*." Since he is "perfectly aware" of this, he will of course show the *identity* of the systems, if there be any. He admits that not only the Christian system, but "the profoundest and *most spiritually illuminated minds*" have taken the same position. But, he says (page 212), "I am nevertheless *impressed* to enter the field against them, and demonstrate the fallacy of their decisions, by proving (as far as negative is susceptible of proof) that man is *in every possible sense*, a being of necessity—a depending and necessary part of the universal whole," and concludes the whole matter (page 215), with the passage once before quoted, asserting that the only kind of responsibility we can be expected to sustain, is the *responsibility* "the violet, the rose, the strawberry, and the peach" are under, to give forth "certain odors!" Can contradiction go further?

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend says I have no God, unless I have an objective one, and in that case, I am an idolater with the rest. I have not yet advanced to the point where I intend to take up the subject of the absolute, and, by the use of figures and types, and such language as I possess, make the mind understand what it is to have a God that shall be the absolute and subjective,—the truly divine. If we can not come to a perception of the infinite and absolute, then can we have no infinite and absolute God. In developing what Christianity is, as I understand it, I shall show it teaches that the mind *can* come to the infinite Father, and in reality worship the "only living and true God." But I can not take this subject up now.

He inquires what was the use of Christ's mission, if the Spirit of truth could not come till he was glorified. What was the glorification of Christ? It was the putting on his glorified, his spiritual body. It was a new step in the education of the disciples in spiritual intercourse, and fitted them for communion with the Spirit of truth when it should come. When I said that Christ had not

succeeded in causing his disciples to understand the truths of his glorious mission, I affirmed what my friend will not deny. If he should, he may read with me from The Acts of the Apostles, and see how much they understood, even fifteen or twenty years after Christ went away.

My friend brought forth the charts of the spheres, for your amusement, and showed that one of them had the miles from the earth regularly marked. Well, I remember an anecdote of a good old *orthodox* man, Billy Brown, who estimated the exact number of miles to heaven, by a calculation upon the time the Bible says it took Gabriel to come down to answer Daniel's prayer. We will put the pictures of the spheres and Billy Brown's calculation together and let them go.

He denies that the signs which were promised "them that believe," were to be given to any but the apostles. I will note the denial, and by it, in the second part of our discussion, I will prove that he is anti-Christian.

I gladly admit what he charges upon me as a fault, that I can not find any fact in the natural or spiritual universe which does not take its place in my all-embracing philosophy. From that very thing I argue its truth.

The contradictions and absurdities in the doctrines of spiritualists with regard to the creation, I might answer by reading the account in the first chapter of Genesis. I don't think my friend would altogether agree with that, unless he reads with more attention to its meaning than he did the passage from spiritualists.

But I will go on with the argument I was pursuing when my time expired. I had narrated the story of Mary at the tomb, and her recognition of her risen Lord, when he said, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Where had he been? On the day of the crucifixion he was to be with the thief in Paradise, yet on the third day after he had not been to his Father. He admonished his disciples before his crucifixion, that soon they should see him no more, because he should go to his Father; but they saw him after the crucifixion. Now, is there not a clear recognition of the fact that there was such a thing as going to Paradise and not going to the Father?

My friend's criticisms upon the use of numbers I care little for. It is of no consequence to me what significance has been attached to them before, or who uses them as I do: my use is the true one. Every sentient existence lives under the law and relation of the three discrete degrees of love; and there are three discrete degrees of wisdom, manifested by the cause; the fact, and the perception of the fact. There is also a trinity of *being*, *action*, and *manifestation* of the act. The idea of a trinity, though often made unphilosophical by the way in which it has been brought out by the human mind, has its birth in the very constitution of the

mind itself, existing in its three departments of absolute, relational, and physical. We may know what constitutes *Hell*, what *Paradise*, and what the *Heaven of Heavens*. Christ recognized the three. All nature recognizes the law of the *triune* in its unfolding. *Seven* is called a sacred number often. It is because it is a triune of triunes. You would say three threes make *nine*, but the lower member of the upper triune is the upper member of the next lower, and so with the lowest: thus the three threes make seven. Commensurability in motion is the law of all musical harmony, and when the poet talks of the "music of the spheres," he is talking of a harmony as real as any that ever broke upon your mind. Why is Jesus' office called the middle or mediatorial office, I ask? The very term mediatorial means middle. The absolute or divine, signifies the end or consummation. That by which every thing is to be brought into harmony, under subjection, is the means. Christianity, the everlasting truths of Christianity, reveal the workings of the Divine Father in bringing all earth and hell into submission to the absolute God. We only find the true intent of Christianity when we see that it is a means of bringing man up from the "blade" into the "ear," that he may be ready to bring forth the ripe fruit, and be taken home to the Divine Father, being called "the full corn in the ear." We are now in the blade, and we need to reach the point where we may be prepared to receive perfect truth, so that our highest destiny may be obtained, and the work of God be perfected in us. There is not a drop of pearly dew but has its part to perform in the work of elevating man. I tell you there is a point where partial evil becomes universal good, and all is in grand and glorious harmony. There is no wrong when we look at things from the plane of the Divine, and if, in our plane, every thing appears wrong, it is because the wrong is in us.

Christ is called "the way," because he appeared in this middle sphere, where he might take the things of the Father and show them unto the world; where he might take divine truths and bring them down into the heart of man, that he might be baptized with the Holy Ghost and be prepared to come out of this grave, this spiritual Gehenna, into Paradise, and thence into the bosom of his Divine Father. I have said, we are to pass from the literal into the spiritual; hence, literal language was to give place to that which would come and establish God's kingdom *within*: where men should not worship God as a being to be feared, but perfect love should cast out fear; and the delight, and joy, and harmony of the soul, would be the worship of the Lord; where man could drink the bitter cup as Christ did in the garden, with "thy will be done." Now, Christianity is a means of bringing man up from his lusts and animalism, from his low estate, his dark and benighted condition, into the truth as it is shown forth in the life of our Lord

and Master. Hence it is that Christ is the "lamp of light," our "way," our "guide." To understand all this, we need to know all departments of truth, and the glories of its wisdom will break more and more upon our vision forever.

Then let us understand that the Spirit of truth was to usher in a spiritual dispensation, and bring man where he would no longer follow after forms and ceremonies, but should reach forth his hand to pluck the clusters of God's planting, and feed upon the manna which came down from heaven, which if a man eat, he shall never hunger again. That spirit was to teach the meaning of the things spoken by Christ in parables, which could only be interpreted in a spiritual sense. Those things remained to be revealed after Jesus had gone away, till the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, which should abide forever, had returned.

My friend understands that the apostles only had the "signs" as a proof of their apostleship. But the people could not understand unless they, too, had the gifts of the spirit. Therefore, it was of the first importance that the spirit should come into their minds and illumine their understanding, that they might comprehend, as well as the apostles, those truths which were to make them wise unto salvation. It would be of no more use to them for the apostles to understand while they did not, than it was to the apostles for Christ to understand, whilst their own minds were in darkness. The gifts of the spirit were to follow, because they could not understand without them. Only thus could the connection with heaven be kept open, and the divine communications come down into the soul. Hence, after Christ had established in the hearts of his disciples an affinity and bond of affection, which should bind them to him after he had gone into the spirit sphere, he thus had finished the work his father had given him to do in this sphere. The breathing out the dying prayer for his enemies, was not in any peculiar sense the finishing of his work. That work was completed when he had prepared his disciples as far as he could, for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which was to make them like God; when he had made them understand that they must love their neighbor as themselves, and lead lives of purity and holiness. Further than that, he had not gone; for it was necessary that he should go away that the Spirit of truth might come and instruct them in the higher truths for which they were prepared. When, then, the spirit of Jesus was emancipated from the body, so that he could come spiritually into *rapprochement* with them, and make them understand by impression and impulse, and make them speak and act spiritually, he had laid a foundation upon which spirits of the better spheres might work. The consequence was, that as soon as their minds became calm, after his death and resurrection, when they came into such a quiet state that spiritual influences could act upon them, *Christ appeared to them*;—in a

material body? No,—but when the *doors were all shut*, suddenly he appeared in their midst, breathed upon them, saying, Peace, be calm. He showed them his hands and his side, and astonished them beyond measure. When they became thus disturbed and excited, he *vanished*: he did not go out, his body did not dissolve, but his spiritual presence was shut out by their external excitements, and their spiritual sense was sealed by the material one. When he had walked with Cleopas and his fellow traveler, conversing with them and showing in the Old Testament how he was typified and portrayed, they being calm and not suspecting who it was, saw him constantly; but afterward, when he was known to them in the breaking of bread, their excitement closed their spiritual sense, and again he *vanished*,—he ceased to be seen. But they said, “did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us by the way?” That was a true spiritual influence. Any man that has had the spirit poured upon him, and he alone, can appreciate that burning of the heart within them. Again: a few days after he met with the disciples in an upper room, and said “Peace be unto you.” He was making a spiritual revelation unto them, unfolding their spiritual faculties, that they might receive the Spirit of truth, which was to come to illuminate them, and interpret to their minds all the truth that Jesus had uttered in parables. These were all *spiritual manifestations*. My friend said it was Jesus’ natural body which appeared to his disciples: I will take care of that by and by. They were being fitted for becoming the subjects of inspiration, which they could not receive whilst Christ was with them. He could. He received inspirations from God, from the Universe, from Nature, and he spoke as one having authority.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish, in opening the discussion this afternoon, to read two or three passages of Scripture touching Jesus’ resurrection, and the nature of the body in which he appeared to his disciples after he had risen from the dead. Immediately following the passage in the 20th chapter of John, on which my friend has commented, occurs the story of Thomas’ unbelief (v. 25)—“He said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the prints of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.” No one can doubt that Thomas referred to our Lord’s *physical* hands and side, for otherwise the demonstration would be of no use. It was beyond question, the physical, natural body of the Saviour which had risen, and therefore *was not found in the tomb*. So at least the disciples believed,

and when Jesus appeared to them again, he saith to Thomas (v. 27)—“Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and *thrust it into my side*; and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.” If Jesus had not his natural body, the demonstration of his reality, by *handling* his person, which he offered to Thomas, was a mere cheat and delusion, and who will dare say that? But let us take a passage still more to the point (Luke xxiv: 36): “And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and *supposed* that they had seen a *spirit*. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled, and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: *handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*. And when he had thus spoken he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and *did eat before them*.” After that careful cumulation of *physical* proofs of the resurrection of *his body*, given by Christ himself, any attempt to interpret away the fact is an insult to common sense. Again in the Acts (x: 40), we have Peter’s testimony;—“Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*.” Yet, the gentleman says it was a *spiritual* body in which Jesus appeared! And why? Because a physical body could not go through the walls when the doors were shut! He has forgotten that Christ ever wrought a miracle. But I must show him that a spiritual body would labor under the same disadvantages, as we learn from the very highest spiritual authority,—from the “one in seventy-five millions.” Andrew Jackson Davis says (Spiritual Intercourse, page 125), “They (spirits) can not pass through walls, or hard, solid substances *any more than we can*; for they are organized as we are, and must necessarily submit to the principles of nature which govern matter and mind in all the vast realms of universal being. And here *I am impressed to be clearly explicit* upon this point, in speaking to those who have *erroneously* entertained the supposition, that spirits can go instantly *anywhere and through any thing*, ‘*like thought*,’ as they express it.” He gives a case in proof which came under his own observation. A poor Irish laborer was killed by the caving of a well, and as the neighbors dug for his body, when they got near it among the looser stones and dirt, the *spirit* began to come up through the cracks and the parts united above the heads of the workmen, so that by the time they reached the dead *physical* body, the last portion of the spiritual one had as-

cended, and the spirit hovered over them in the air! In a note to page 132 of the same work, he tells us that "the law of gravitation or association has a slight *but perceptible* motion upon the ascending spirit," as it has upon steam, and it therefore *necessarily rises* when in a denser fluid like the atmosphere. It must therefore go off from the earth, and can not come back except contrary to the laws of gravitation, and therefore *miraculously*, if it comes at all. According to Mr. Davis' doctrine, there was some real necessity for an angel to roll away the stone from the tomb, for he gives instances of guardian spirits influencing *sextons* to go back and open vaults, to give *spiritual bodies* opportunity to escape their prison (page 138)!

There is, therefore, the same difficulty in a *spirit's* getting into a room when the door is shut, as there would be in the case of a *natural* body, and the gentleman must overcome this difficulty presented by the doctrines of *Spiritualism*, as well as the trifling one found in Christ's emphatic declarations. Mr. Ballou gives a communication from his son A. A. Ballou (Spirit Manifestations, page 213), in which he says that spirits cast off *their spiritual form* when they enter mediums, to control them. Again, in the Spiritual Telegraph, No. 84, we have a communication from *William Ellery Channing* on the subject of Christ's resurrection from the dead, in which he says, "the spirit of Christ was not wholly separated from the body when he was placed in the tomb, and the guardian spirits, who had attended him through life, using him as a medium, rolled away the stone, *restored the spirit to the body, and Christ walked bodily out of the tomb.* Some time afterward *he died naturally*, his body was left to molder back to dust, and his spirit, seen only by those who were mediums, ascended to heaven."

Now, I must declare that this is the most contemptible stuff I was ever concerned with. Such interpretations of Scripture, such doctrines are too shallow to be dignified either with the name of religion or that of philosophy. Not only is the position of each of them absurd, but they contradict each other at every point, and yet there is none of them but has as good a claim to his position as my friend Tiffany.

I must notice another of the gentleman's interpretations. He quoted the passage, "Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and *while he opened to us the Scriptures?*" The last clause he omitted, and he appealed to those who had felt spiritual influences, if they were not familiar with the sensation referred to. You will remember that my friend has declared that the disciples did not receive spiritual truth from Christ, but had to wait for it till the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was given. Now this conversation was before that time, and it was concerning the prophetic parts of the Old Testament.

Yet it is quoted as a proof of spiritual influence, although the disciples had no inspiration to receive spiritual truth, and did not receive a single element of it, and it was *the letter* which was the subject of their conversation, which, according to the gentleman, is false, and oftentimes devilish, unless spiritually understood! Their hearts burned! Wonderful demonstration truly! But supposing the sensation to be good proof that a spirit was communicating with them, my friend's old argument, that as much inspiration is necessary in the hearer as in the speaker, completely falls to the ground, for here is Jesus making their hearts burn within them by opening the Scripture, while they were utterly without the inspiration to understand it. *Words* may be worth something after all! Yes there is *much* in words! When Mary, with her lone heart, was lingering around the sepulcher, and all the memories of the past were about her soul, as she thought upon the days of Jesus' life, when his divine heart was full of tender sympathy with her—when she thought upon the tears he wept at the tomb of Lazarus, the hours she had set at his feet and received the bread of life,—as her heart felt the burden of intolerable sadness now crushing her to the earth, there came softly upon her ear the single word, "Mary!" and in a moment peace and joy reigned triumphant, where all had till now been darkness and despair.

"But her sorrows quickly fled,
When she heard his welcome voice:
Christ is risen from the dead!
Now he bids her heart rejoice.
What a change his word can make;
Turning darkness into day.
Ye who weep for Jesus sake,
He will wipe your tears away!"

This was all before there was any communication with the Spirit from on high—before there was any inspiration of the Holy Ghost to teach "spiritual truth."

I have demanded the Scripture proof that Christ and his disciples received communications from spirits. He "will come to it by and by;" and he thinks you will be kept here, in corn-planting time, day after day, and week after week, and hear him talk of *threes*, and *triunes of triunes*, and take his promise that he will come to the important points "by and by." I assert that no such proof will be found, and further that their own pretended spiritual communications prove that if FRANKLIN had not gone to the spirit world with his knowledge of philosophy and electricity, and his talent for invention, such communication might not have been opened yet.

His reasonings, after the old Pythagorean style, about numbers were amusing, and I could hardly help putting in a "there-

fore," at the close—"therefore Chistianity and Spiritualism are identical!" Is not the connection of the argument most evident?

Let us look now at the Scripture account of the occurrences upon the day of Pentecost, as given in the second chapter of the Acts. The account opens with a description of the phenomena—the rushing wind, the tongues of fire, and the miraculous speech. The multitude had not shared in these phenomena but "were confounded" when they beheld them, and Peter, standing up, addressed them. But how? Does he make "impressions from consciousness upon consciousness?" No! He "*lifted up his voice* and SAID unto them, Ye men of Judea, *harken unto my words!*" If he was inspired with spiritual truth, he used common language to convey it, and observed that the men he was addressing were not themselves inspired; only the apostles and the hundred and twenty received the Holy Ghost. The multitude heard the word and were "pricked in their heart," and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" He told them to repent and be baptized, and *they* should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. The power had reached them through their ears, and pricked their hearts, and brought them to repentance before there was any promise of the Holy Spirit to them at all. The immediate result of the gift of the Spirit was the impartation of miraculous power, for they began to speak the wondrous works of God in various tongues.

I will now read an account from the *Plaindealer* and *Cleveland Herald*, of an assemblage at Cleveland, which spiritualists would dignify into a Pentecostal meeting; and as my friend was concerned in it, he can perhaps tell us more about it. A great gathering of mediums was made, and about thirty were present. "Just before the opening of the meeting the piano was played, the medium beating time, and some of the ladies sung *Ben Bolt*." The mediums were "very much excited, and making the most extravagant physical demonstrations, their nervous systems apparently stretched to their utmost capacity. The mediums *by the order of the spirits*, at this crisis, called for some lively music, and the tune of "Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm," was sung *with great effect*, the mediums testifying their gratification by violently beating time, and getting quite excited as the music waxed livelier and louder."

They found they could not get the manifestations in a promiscuous crowd. They tried it, but it would not work, and they excluded all but spiritualists, "the unrecognized being subjected to the test of a clairvoyant at the door." The raps then began, and "the spirits communicated that more lively music would be agreeable, and *Mr. Tiffany* invited the ladies to come forward and play and sing. He suggested '*Three grains of Corn*' as the spirit's air for the piano." Then raps, jerks, and "a sort of

Indian jargon" were abundant. So much for modern Pentecostal seasons.

MR. TIFFANY. So far as I am concerned, the account is apocryphal.

MR. ERRETT. These things *may be* regarded by my friend as nothing more than apocryphal, for we learned yesterday that the Spirit had not yet come. These are probably only the prognostications of what is to come. They are but the bud of promise, and give but an imperfect idea of what the mature flower will be.

In the "Journal of Man" for May, 1852, Dr. Jos. Buchanan gives accounts of the modern "gift of tongues," and of the speaking of French and unknown languages by mediums. Also, Mr. F. (understood to be Mr. Finney, the young spiritualist who lectured here last winter), says Dr. Buchanan "declaims in a language supposed to be Chinese, as he writes under the control of the same spirit, characters which resemble Chinese writing. I have several specimens of his writings in the character of a medium, some of which resemble the Chinese, others the Arabic, and others the Hebrew. As they have not yet been examined by any competent philologist, the true nature of these mysterious writings cannot be determined. I design, after submitting them to the investigation of the learned, to have them engraved and published in the 'Journal of Man.'" I must say I should like to see the investigation and publication.

MR. TIFFANY.

It is true that Mr. Finney was the medium referred to, and I have seen the publication.

MR. ERRETT. In the "Journal of Man?"

MR. TIFFANY. I think it was; but if not, it was in the "Spiritual Telegraph?"

MR. ERRETT. You are still mistaken. The writing has not even been *investigated*. I have here a letter from Dr. Buchanan himself, in which he says, "Finding it inconvenient, I have neglected the matter, and have not had the MSS. you refer to, *investigated or engraved*."

MR. TIFFANY. I certainly have seen specimens of such writing engraved and translated, but I may not be able to identify the particular examples.

I must say a word about the "Pentecost at Cleveland." So far as I am concerned, the account is entirely apocryphal, for I had no management in the matter, and did not suggest any thing about the "Three grains of Corn."

When we adjourned this morning I broke off abruptly, and will resume the line of reasoning I was then upon. The difficulty my friend labors under, in his theory of Christ's resurrection body, is one of interpretation. It lies in the difference in the accounts given by Luke and John. The body of Christ was not recognized by Mary when she first met her Lord, after his resurrection; and although Cleopas and his companion walked a long distance, it was only when he blessed and brake the bread according to his usual custom, that their eyes were opened and they knew him, and "straightway he vanished out of their sight." Strange! the moment they recognized him, that he should cease to be seen! Now-a-days, it would be called an optical illusion; but then, it certainly must have appeared strange. Now, it is all easily understood, and the difficulty in my friend's mind is easily explained. He *appeared* to have a natural body; it *appeared* to have the prints of the nails and the spear. If my friend was half as familiar with the appearances of spiritual bodies as I am, he would have no trouble on the score. But upon this subject he will not receive my authority, and as I can not impress myself upon his consciousness, I must leave it, only saying this, that descriptions only prove appearances, not actualities. I can give an incident which is in point, but it will, of course, be evidence only to those who can take my authority for the fact. I saw an individual in a spiritual form, and went on to describe minutely the appearance of the person, and asked if it was recognized. After giving the features, expression, &c., as nearly as I could, I remarked that it strongly resembled Governor Hutchinson, of Cleveland. A lady immediately said, "It is a description of my father. Governor Hutchinson has often made me think of my father." A number of likenesses were then put together, and without a particle of difficulty, I at once picked out the portrait of the individual I had seen. I only mention this incident to show that spirits may make themselves known by taking on the form and color of ordinary material bodies. Mr. Skinner, of Ravenna, once described a spirit, so that an individual present exclaimed that it corresponded to his son's appearance, and Mr. S. picked out his daguerreotype, in which the very *position* of the person was the same as he had given in his description. I will make one further remark, and you must, of course, be left to your own experience and investigations for the truth of these things;—spirits do not usually assume the appearance they had when on earth. The way we know who a spirit is, is by a much higher and more certain test than any outward form could give. It is as if every sense of the medium's body were quickened into one sense;—as if all the senses were concentrated in the ear or the eye, and an intuitive certainty of the identity of the spirit thus arrived at. But if a spirit chooses to put on an outward form, it can easily do so, so that there need

be no difficulty in describing it. They can assume the human form, and appear clad in shining garments; — spiritual garments, of course. My friend believes that angels so appeared, and when we have a narrative as the simple fact that Christ so appeared in a form that could be recognized, it is no difficulty in the way of believing that the form was a spiritual one. All the circumstances intimate that it was not a material form. A material form could not vanish from sight when the doors were all shut; and this single fact shows that it must have been a very different body from those that my friend and I wear in this world.

Christ's first word to the disciples at this meeting was a very important one. "Peace be unto you;" that is, be quiet, — still, — keep your minds calm! *This is an indispensable requisite for the appearance of form.* It is not because the spiritual form goes away, but because the excited state of mind closes the spiritual sight, so that the form cannot be seen. Could Christ have shown himself to the world, would it not have had a great effect? Could he have shown himself to the men who cried crucify him! crucify him! would it not have removed the necessity of a great deal of the apostles' labors in proving to the world that he was the Christ? But he could not manifest himself to the world, and only to his disciples when they were in a quiet, calm state of mind. But my friend says he ate and drank with them. Now if you will turn to the account given by John, who was the only one of the evangelists who was present and saw for himself, what he narrates, you will find the account of the three several appearances of Christ. The first was when the ten were together and Thomas was absent. In that case, as soon as they became excited, he vanished. The next time was eight days after, and at this second appearance Thomas was present. The disciples had told Thomas of the first, but he did not believe it. He was one of my friend's kind, — he would not believe upon testimony. Well, Jesus came; and when he had said Peace be unto you, he addressed himself unto Thomas: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing." He knew what Thomas had thought and said, and asked him to come and take the demonstration he had demanded. Thomas did not stop for that: he found it took less to convince him than he had thought it would, and he cried out, "My Lord and my God!" The next time Christ appeared was on the sea of Galilee. Simon Peter says, I go a-fishing, and the others went with him. They fished all night and caught nothing. In the morning, Christ comes to them and says, children, have ye any meat? They answered him, no. Then he told them to cast the net on the other side of the ship, and when they did so, their net was overloaded with fish. John then exclaimed, It is the Lord! and Peter, gathering his fisher's coat about him, plunged into the

sea and came to him. On the shore he found a fire, with fish upon it. Then comes the account of the interview between Christ and Peter, which winds up the chapter. In all this, there is not a word of Christ's eating, nor any thing which conflicts with the supposition that it was a spiritual appearance of Christ which the disciples saw. If you turn now to Luke's account, you will see that when he opens his gospel, he only professes to give the "things which are most surely believed among us," which he learned from the testimony of others, not professing to have been himself an eyewitness of them. Luke makes Jesus go right up into heaven, the same day upon which his resurrection took place. John puts each appearance of Christ in its separate place, and tells just what did occur. Luke's account is a simple summary of the general outline of events, but John's is the true account, for he himself was present and saw what he relates. Luke was only a compiler, and if we were without the histories of Matthew, Mark, and John, we should lose many of the most important facts in the life of Christ. He told every thing as he understood it, but John tells the whole story as he himself knew it to occur. I cast no censure upon Luke. He believed, and the apostles believed, that the physical body of Christ rose from the tomb; but when we examine the account in detail, we find that it could not have been so. I know that this is one of the points upon which my friend is laboring, and he will magnify it all he can. The fact is, that the three first evangelists do not give Jesus' words, and in many things they evidently mistake the true history of his life. For instance, is it not a little singular that after Christ had told his disciples three or four times, that he must be put to death in Jerusalem and rise from the dead on the third day, that none of them should understand such plain language, if he really used it? The fact is, they did not expect he was to be taken and put to death. After he was dead, they did not expect he would rise, and yet, by these accounts, only twenty-four hours before, he had distinctly told them so,—in so many words. This proves that these writers did not give Jesus' words, but their understanding of them after they were explained by the events themselves. Now John is the one who tells us what Christ said. His words were, "A little while and ye shall not see me, and again, a little while and ye shall see, because I go to the Father." John tells us that the disciples did not understand these words, and that Christ told them they should know the meaning after a while; and accordingly, it was not till after his ascension that they understood how he used the language. He did not say he would rise from the dead; he only said, "again a little while and ye shall see me." The Pharisees understood that the literal body was to rise from the tomb and take its spirit to itself again. Christ could easily have taught his disciples this if he would, but he did not teach it, he only said, "again a little

while and ye shall see me," and again, "Ye now, therefore, have sorrow, but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." Why did he not say, I shall go to Jerusalem, I shall be put to death and buried, but I shall not stay in the tomb! on the third day I shall come up out of the grave, I shall rise and death shall no longer have power over me! The great truth he wanted to impress upon their minds was, that though his *body* had gone into the tomb, *Jesus of Nazareth* was so alive that he could manifest himself to them. He could not tell them this in ordinary language, without their getting the idea that his body was to rise from the dead. Their idea was, that if there was no resurrection, there was no immortality, and as the Sadducees denied the immortality of man on this ground, the argument between them and the Pharisees turned upon this very point. Therefore, you could not convince the people of that day that Christ was yet alive, after his crucifixion, without also convincing them that his *body* had risen from the tomb. It was necessary that his body should be disposed of, for had it continued to lie there stark and stiff, where both friend and foe could look down into the tomb and see it, no amount of evidence would have proved to the world that Jesus was yet alive. The faith of men of that time in hobgoblins and ghosts was such that they would not have drawn any proper conclusion from such a manifestation. What, then, was to be done? Those legions of angels had an interest in the matter. They were all alert to do what was in their power for the redemption of man, and to them the task was given, of taking in charge and removing from the vision of men, the decaying body which Jesus had laid aside!

MR. ERRETT.

"A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Now the gentleman says these words were written by Luke, who, not being an eye-witness of our Lord's last appearance on earth, knew nothing about the circumstances except as they were given him by others! The gentleman will quote as much of Luke as will suit his theory, and the rest he can utterly discard! This does not suit my notion of propriety. He said in his discussion at Cleveland, and has said over and over, "I accept the facts of the Bible as true." * Luke is in court as a competent witness—the authenticity of his history is not in question, the gentleman has yielded that point. He has been over the whole ground, from Atheism upward, he tells us, and he has come to the conclusion that the Bible is true. By that confession he must abide, at least in this debate, and he cannot discard Luke as a sufficient authority

for the facts he narrates. But it does not rest with Luke; *John* says (and the gentleman declares John knew all about it), in the first verse of his first general epistle, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and *our hands have handled*, of the word of life," and *Peter*, at the house of Cornelius, told them that Jesus ate and drank with them after he rose from the dead. (Acts x: 41.) That was Peter's testimony, and he certainly was an eye-witness. So the gentleman could gain nothing on the score of witnesses, even if he could repudiate Luke. But he must not forget what I have before reminded him of, that the difficulty of passing through closed doors is not avoided by supposing the body to be a spiritual one. Mr. Davis has been in higher spheres than the gentleman. He has been enabled to see the process of death itself, and watched the spiritual body oozing from a grave, and uniting its parts above. He knows that spiritual bodies cannot get out of vaults. Does he not prove in that way, the necessity of an angel coming to roll away the stone from Jesus' tomb? Again, the gentleman says Jesus was altered in appearance so that the disciples did not know him. The *Scripture* says (Luke xxiv: 16), "*their eyes were holden*, that they should not know him." He says Jesus vanished out of their sight. Well, did he never vanish out of their sight before his death, before he had any claim to a spiritual body? The trouble with the gentleman is that he denies miracles, and he would fain get out of the necessity of a miracle here, but he can not do it. A miracle is involved in any view of it. The gentleman says they could not conceive, in those days, of a spirit living out of and apart from the body. He has forgotten that the Pharisees believed in angels and spirits, not making them the same things, either. They believed in both, and it was by no means so difficult to persuade them of the presence of a spirit, as of the presence of the actual body of one who had died. The disciples thought it was a spirit when Christ appeared to them, and the difficulty was to persuade them of his bodily reality. It was on that account he offered the most physical demonstration, "Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." So when he came to them upon the sea, "It is a spirit," they cried, and the great thing to be established was that it was a spirit *with* a body, and not one without. He says their belief in ghosts and hobgoblins was such that it would be difficult to make them believe in the existence of a spirit, if the body was still in the grave. Now, did they not say of Christ that he was Elias, and John the Baptist, after their bodies had lain quietly and returned to dust? No such difficulty, then, could be in the way in this case. Neither the gentleman's theory nor his objections meet the case in hand.

In referring to the writings in various languages, spoken of by

Mr. Ballou, I have already given an extract from Dr. Buchanan's letter, in answer to one I had the curiosity to send, inquiring concerning their publications. In the same letter Dr. Buchanan says, "one of the spiritual autographs which I have tested, gave a character by Psychometry, similar to that of St. Paul, who was said to be its spiritual author." I have shown from several spiritualist writers, that St. Paul never comes down here at all. You may place this beside the numerous other contradictions I have exhibited in their system.

My friend has commenced preaching, to give us that spiritual meaning contained in Christ's language, which Jesus himself was unable to convey when he was on earth. I protest against this till he proves his right and authority and ability to interpret the Scripture in this way. If we can take the language as it is, very well: but if there is no way to get the spiritual meaning but as it is imparted, and if the gentleman himself, with all the rest of us, is under the Mosaic dispensation, there being "not a Christian in all the world," as he proclaims—in that case I deny his authority and his ability to interpret spiritual things to us. Judged by his own principles, he has not the possession of the Holy Ghost, which he admits is necessary for the understanding of Christ's words, for he is in the first sphere himself, and must therefore be at least as badly off as those disciples to whom he says, not even Christ could convey spiritual truth. When Swedenborg attempts to interpret Scripture, he professes to have the proper preparation for it, forms a "science of correspondences," and says you can not get the spiritual meaning, but by a regular, consistent, and systematic treatment of the literal meaning. My friend on the other hand, takes a few beautiful things here and there, leaving out or selecting what he pleases, with perfect arbitrariness. He coolly robs Jesus Christ of his divinity, which Swedenborg's religion devoutly recognizes, and to make up for this, he dogmatically tells us his fancies about the meaning of *blood* in the Scriptures, of the *threes*, and the number of *triunes* in seven! He gives us no proof either of authority, inspiration, or learning, to fit him for spiritual interpretation, but gives us his vagaries and assertions upon the mere strength of his own *ipse dixit*. Some of it is pretty, much of it has been conned over and over in various schools of philosophy in ages past, and he may induce some individuals to accept parts of it; but when you regard it as a matter by which your eternal destiny is to be influenced—when you look upon that Lamb of God who, you have believed, taketh away the sins of the world, and feel like casting yourself before him and exclaiming with Thomas, My Lord and my God,—then the gentleman comes in with his system, saying, He is not your Lord and your God, but a mere man, and casts over your soul the chilling sadness which oppressed Mary when she said, "They have taken

away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." But all that we have received is merely Mr. Tiffany's dogma, which is no better than that of Andrew Jackson Davis, or S. B. Brittan, and I am confident that no one here will risk his hopes of his soul's peace hereafter, upon such dogmas as have been uttered by the gentleman as spiritual truth. You will not so cheaply give up that hope of redemption through the atonement of your Divine Saviour, which you have calculated upon to give you strength to meet the terrors of that sad, sad hour, when the eye grows dim, the pulse flutters feebly, death's darkness gathers over you, and you sink into the fearful coldness of the grave. But if, in that trying moment, you are asked to peril the interests of your undying nature upon the philosophizings of a man who is unprepared to interpret the Divine Word, who has no inspiration to fit him for it, I am sure you will demand at his hands his credentials for his work. In the name of humanity, of all intelligent men and women, I demand of him the signs of an apostle, and the proof of the gift of the Holy Ghost, before he pretends to come to us with such demands upon our faith! He professes to receive the Bible, but in what different manner does he receive it from that in which he would receive the Koran of Mahomet? He knows that you reverence the Bible, and finding some expressions there which he thinks he can harmonize with his theories, he uses the Bible to that extent, because it furnishes a ready and powerful means of influencing you; but the moment he finds any thing which interferes with his philosophy, he will coolly say, O! that was from a person who didn't know about it: that writer was misinformed!

When I hand you the Bible, I ask no confidence in my word; I tell you you must study it for yourselves and interpret it by carefully comparing Scripture with Scripture. I may assist you in the good work, but I have no power or authority to reject a part, any more than the whole. We must receive it as a body of inspired truth which shall be our sure and fixed standard and only guide in the journey of life. He who would set it aside must have equal authority with those who established it. Let the gentleman look to this. The apostles went not forth to teach in the name of Jesus, after they were baptized with the Holy Ghost, till they were able to give signs and do wonders, and then their words came not from them as their own, but with the power and authority of the living God! My friend has no more claim upon your confidence as an interpreter of God's word, than I have, unless he shows that he has indeed the gift of the Holy Ghost. If he does *that*, we will let the discussion close, and sit meekly at his feet to receive the truth. Till then, he must be bound by fair and common sense rules of interpretation, and having accepted the Bible as true, he must not seek to evade an argument, by repudiating

the portions which are not agreeable to him. For myself, I have claimed no apostolic authority. I stand up to preach under the general commission of the great head of the church,—“Let him that heareth say, come!” No man does or ought to receive the truth because I say it, and neither should any man receive any thing merely because Mr. Tiffany says it. He may tell what he thinks of the Scripture, and I may tell what I think, and perhaps he will say again that he does not know how to interpret it, and I do not know how to interpret it, and nobody knows how to interpret it; and what does it all amount to? We must, at that rate, leave spiritual truth altogether, and come down to moral teachings, and it is even doubtful whether we can understand that, for my friend does not decide that we are fairly out of the first “discrete degree,” as yet.

I wish it understood therefore, once for all, that I deny his right to go on arguing, now from some fancied spiritual import of Scripture, then again from the literal sense, as his mere whims may dictate,—casting Luke out, if he can not cast devils out. It would be no wonder if we should find him setting himself above Paul before he gets through; but I repeat the demand that he should either stop such a course of reasoning or produce the signs of his apostleship.

I have asked again and again for an explanation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, of the signs that were to follow those that believed, but he does not come to it. When I bring up spiritualist authors, he will not notice them, his lectures are all arranged, his theses all written, and he goes over the same old round, but there is no sign of his coming to the real issue,—the showing the identity of the two systems. We are now upon the fifth day, and we have not yet a definition of Spiritualism; we have only learned that we are all idolaters, and that the church is only fit to reform those that come out of brothels and sinks of iniquity!

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend has not exactly done himself justice this time. He must exercise patience. The audience must go, if they do not like to stay, but I must have my own way of making my case. My friend ought not to complain because I stopped upon the subject of the resurrection; I will get it out of my way, and then go on to the question of inspiration.

He says I am going to take away your Lord, as Mary complained that her's was taken away. I am going to take away the *dead* Lord, which Mary was looking for in the tomb; but if you weep when his mere body is taken away, you shall rejoice in the

risen Lord, when he speaks to you in the same tones, in which he said to her, "Mary!"

The gentleman intimates that I have taken something of my doctrine from Swedenborg. I thank him for the evidence of my inspiration. I have not read Swedenborg. I ask you to take nothing upon my authority. I shall not promise to work miracles as evidences of my authority. I do not force myself upon you. If you wish to hear me, and are profited, you can stay. If not, you can leave.

Now to the subject of the resurrection. I suppose the gentleman will agree with me that the flesh and blood of Christ did not go up into heaven; for flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of heaven. I have a right to criticise Luke, even if he is competent historical authority. Luke did not pretend to be inspired. He evidently was not. The apostles never claimed for him any inspiration. No one but the Councils of the Fathers and the authority of the Catholic church has said so. If you claim that Luke was inspired, I have a right to ask how you know it, and can claim to be as competent as my friend, to judge of that subject. The claim of plenary inspiration for Luke or the apostles, was not set up by them. The only argument used to stop us from exercising our own judgment upon the matter, is that the church has settled it. I shall have the question up. We can not discuss the nature and office of the Spirit of Truth without having it up: it shall have its place.

I say, then, that Luke wrote from information like any other historian, and was as liable to mistake in regard to any fact, as you or I. I may say here that the writers of the "Comprehensive Commentary," an orthodox work, take the same position on this subject that I do. You will find their opinions upon the 118th or 115th page of that work, I am not sure of the exact number; but they definitely say that it is false that Luke was *historically* inspired, and that his only inspiration was with regard to doctrines. My position is not so terribly infidel, therefore, since these Doctors of Divinity are with me; especially since I have the record of the beloved apostle John for my authority.

I do not think it necessary for my friend to dwell long upon that remark of Luke. He has got to get rid of Christ's earthly body somewhere, and it is only about the earthly body that we have differed. Leaving this, then, I will say that after the resurrection, Christ was a spiritual being; that he was to be in Paradise the very day he was crucified, and with the thief that believed upon him while on the cross. He manifested himself at different times for forty days, as he had opportunity, and when he was ready to leave them, and saw them for the last time before he went away, to be seen of them no more, he told them to continue at Jerusalem, till they were endued with the Spirit from on high, to qualify

them for their work. Now I hold that Christ must have spent those forty days for some good purpose. He was influencing them as a spiritual being, no longer encumbered by an earthly body. He was preaching, as one of the apostles says, to spirits in prison; performing a mission which it was necessary for him to perform. Now if my friend can, I hope he will tell us where Christ was those forty days. He certainly had not gone to the Father, for when he went to the Father, they were to see him no more. Where was that Paradise, those spiritual spheres from which the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, was to be sent? The very fact that Paul describes the highest heaven as being the third heaven, shows that there must be at least two others, for how can you have a third without a second and a first? This shows that I am right in saying that there are three spheres. There may be different degrees in the same sphere, and these may sometimes be regarded as spheres, but as to discrete spheres there can be but three; these are founded, as I have already shown, in the very nature of the human mind. Christ always spoke of the carnal sphere as that from which evil influence and sin arise. He spoke of Paradise, the second sphere, as that in which he would perform his mission for "a little while" after his resurrection; from which he would manifest himself to his disciples. The highest heaven, the Paradise of God, to which he would go when they should see him no more, completes the three. The doctrines which Christ taught while on earth, between the commencement of his ministrations and his crucifixion, were all intended to bring men out from the animal nature to the loves and delights of a spiritual nature; and every moral precept he gave, every law for the regulation of their lives, had in view the destruction of animal selfishness, and the elevation to power of the spiritual nature. In that way, man's connection with the spheres of outer darkness was to cease,—those spheres which are called Hell, the Grave, and Gehenna. They emblem mental and moral darkness, lack of perception. An individual in them can not perceive the things of God nor spiritual truth, and those who are under the influence of their selfish nature are in *rappor*t with those spheres. Those who come into a pure love for their neighbor, are brought into *rappor*t with that sphere from which the Comforter was to come, who was to enlighten them with all those truths which were to bring them ultimately to God. Therefore I say that Christ's mission was in this second sphere, where he stayed for the purpose of bringing the world up into the spirit sphere. For this reason he is called the door, the way, God's manifestation to the world. Hence, he was the divine Logos; not the divine *esse*, but the divine *existere*. To the world he was Lord, but to the perfectly sanctified soul, he was Christ. The step preparatory to his coming was the mission of John the Baptist,—the baptism of

water unto repentance; but it was not the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the only baptism with which Jesus baptized. Why did not Jesus baptize? We are told that he did not,—only his disciples baptized. It was because such ceremonies were not a part of the dispensation he came to introduce. I have no objection to any one's being baptized, who must come up through John's dispensation into Christianity: but do not call them Christian; call them disciples of John the Baptist! They may be candidates for Christianity, but do not profane the dispensation of Christ by saying that that is a part of Christianity,—that that is Christian baptism.

We come now to the Pentecost. How could Christ break all connection between earth and hell? Only by raising man above the influence of spirits of that sphere. The hells can only be subdued by taking from them the means of communication with the human race on this earth, and Christ's mission was to subdue the hells and open a communication with the world of spirits whence might come angels and the spirits of 'just men made perfect,' to guard us and raise us to communion with the Divine Father. The way in which this is to be done, is by keeping Christ's commandments; and this means more than eating bread and drinking wine upon set occasions. It means the purification of the soul, putting away anger and malice, lust and revenge. He required the old animal nature to be utterly slain. When you keep his commandments and love what he loves, you will be in such a condition that he and the Divine Father will be able to manifest themselves to you and through you. But before you reach the point where the spirit of truth can fully influence the heart, there will be a condition in which the spirit of love to your neighbor can influence you. Then, in proportion as your heart is cleansed, Christ will rule and reign in you, till he shall have put all his enemies under his feet, and you will still go on, being evermore lifted up by Christ, till you shall be where you will no longer need to ask through him as a mediator, but he himself shall be subject to the Father, and God be all and in all.

Christ himself taught this. He said, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." (John xiv: 12.) When we get so far, we shall be no longer under the dispensation of John.

A VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE. How far do you profess to have gone?

MR. TIFFANY. So far as subduing my anger and my malice, I say freely, I can not get angry, nor can any body rouse in me an angry feeling. I am past that. I have been past it for some time. I have passed John the Baptist's dispensation. I love truth better than life. So far I can say. As to how much of

the spirit I have received, it is not for me to boast. Paul, having the spirit in large measure, would not boast, and it is not for me, who have received it in small measure, to say any thing that savors of boasting.

I shall soon take up the subject of the uses of baptism, and we shall see what was the object and meaning of the dispensation of ordinances. Christ's dispensation has carried us by all these things; but it will be interesting to look into them, and my friend shall have all he wants upon the subject.

(In answer to a question not heard by the reporter.) We know that the baptism of the spirit took place, so far as the disciples and apostles were concerned, without any preceding baptism of water. We have no account that they ever received a water baptism. On the day of Pentecost, certain manifestations of fire appeared. It is of no consequence whether the tongues of flame appeared upon the heads of all: such appearances there were, and the inspired men talked in divers tongues, whilst some of the by-standers mocked, and others inquired what these things could mean.

MR. ERRITT.

We are getting along slowly in learning the gentleman's position. We have learned one thing in regard to baptism, from his last speech, and that is, that if he has not been baptized with the Holy Ghost, he has been with fire, and has had all the dross burnt out of him, so that there is fair promise that the baptism of the Holy Ghost will come, some time or other. Still, he does not seem to have been baptized with any spirit that would let him come fairly up to the question raised. The audience will bear me witness that I never raised the question of Luke's inspiration. My friend professes to accept the facts of the Bible as true, and yet he presumes to cast away Luke, and it was for that inconsistency that I am criticising him. Now I must say to him, that he makes sad work there, for it is from Luke, whom he so unceremoniously rejects, that he gets the history of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. He charges Luke with making the ascension occur on the day of the resurrection, yet it is Luke who tells us that Christ was *forty days* on earth after that event, and it is from Luke alone that he gets the account of Cleopas and his companion feeling that burning of the heart, which he claims is an indubitable spiritual experience.

There is nothing in the last speech which demands special notice, and in closing the labors of the day, I shall refer to some things that have been left behind. I desire to refer to the attacks made upon the Christian church. The church is declared to be

impure. If it were only said that it is not spotless and perfect, I should admit it to be true; it has always been true. It never has been, and is not now, entirely what it should be in all respects. It takes men away from their sins and lusts, and places them under redeeming influences, where they *may* form a pure character, — where they may *grow* in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. In it, there are babes, and children, and young men, and full-grown men, and fathers in Christ. When the net is cast into the sea, there is gathered into it of all kinds, and oftentimes there is sore occasion for the church to grieve over some in her midst, and to bear with them with long-suffering and patience, in the hope of bringing their souls to higher aspirations and a truer devotedness to the principles of the gospel of Christ. It requires firmness on the part of the church to do this, for it has to be done in spite of the world, who are ready enough to point in derision at the weak ones whom we are trying to make Christ's little ones. It shows how much of the baptism of the spirit of Christ the gentleman has received, when he charges the church with being so low that it cannot teach morality to most of the world, but is only fit to operate upon the grossly licentious and degraded. That the church does labor among such, is no proof that she cannot instruct the proud moralist. Christ labored among the publicans and harlots, and I thank God we have that evidence that we retain something of the spirit of Christ, and that in these days even our enemies are forced to admit that "to the poor the gospel is preached." The character of the church was stated by the gentleman in so many different ways, and he shifted his ground so often, that I gave up the attempt to follow him, in despair. In one breath, the church was the receptacle for the slop of the world; in the next, he declared it poured its slop into the world. At one moment it was said to be inferior in its morality to the Mohammedans and Chinese; then it was represented as keeping even with the world, and so on. I want now to read a little from a book that was handed to a brother of mine by a spiritualist, sometime ago, and called a better book than the Bible. You will remember the gentleman's remarks upon Christianity and science, and I will read from "Discourses from the Spirit World, dictated by Stephen Olin, through R. P. Wilson, writing medium" (pages 42, 43). "But what is the present condition of the earth, in comparison to its state two thousand or even five hundred years ago? Has there been no advancement? * * It is true, that the disposition and its manifestation to be engaged in bloody strife has not entirely ceased; yet it is every where evident that a more peaceable disposition is presented to the admiring gaze of earth's attending angels. Look in another direction, and what was the state of *intellectual* development several thousand years ago, in comparison to the present advanced state of society? * * Look again

at the state of the earth when Jesus lived, with reference to its spiritual development. * * Contrast this state of things with the present condition of mankind, and who will say that the earth has not progressed?" No one but Joel Tiffany, Esquire, even among spiritualists.

Look over the world and see where literature and science flourish;—see where the purest morality prevails; where human nature is elevated nearest the true standard! Contrast heathen nations with Christian nations, as a whole, and see where the advantage lies. Then contrast Roman Catholic nations with Protestant ones; take these last and notice which among them have the fullest influence of Christian intelligence, and the most complete knowledge of the Bible. Descend even further into particulars and contrast communities as you know them to be sincerely religious or not;—orthodox in their belief or sceptical: try them by the facts, and let the facts decide whether Christianity is a foe to freedom, to refinement, to literature, science, and art.

I have known communities where just such prating has been popular, and just such onslaughts upon the church approved for a time, and they ran their course of ruin till they saw their youth ruined in morals and manners, and hoary-headed sceptics have entreated to have Christianity preached among them, to save the community from all the horrors of a hell on earth. I know there are men in our midst, highly respected for their moral worth, who yet are not members of churches; men who may even have doubts of the inspiration of the Scriptures, but they would be among the last to wish the church destroyed. They regard its influence as a saving one, and would foster and support it for the moral salvation it accomplishes, whatever be the intellectual doubts they may have concerning its doctrines. When the gentleman gets any marks of approbation for such attacks upon the church as he has indulged in, he does not get them from moral men, but from those who have graduated from the low holes which unfortunately line some of our streets, and who, for a diploma, can show their fiery-colored faces. I know that there are men of good moral character who sympathize with the gentleman's Spiritualism, but they do not sympathize with his attacks upon the church. The brightest stars in the firmament of history have given in their tribute of praise to the name of Jesus, to the word of God and the church of Christ, and this they have done after the most serious thoughts upon the things of eternity. He talks of reformers! Heaven help them, when they stand beside our Wickcliffs, our Husses, our Luthers, our Calvins, our Knoxes, our Wesleys! men who could rejoice in the privilege of dying for the sake of truth; who, many of them, did die for truth's sake, "of whom the world was not worthy." He may say these were all religious reformers, but it was religious reform that gave birth to all other reforms. Bring for-

ward your temperance reforms, anti-slavery reforms, capital-punishment reforms, asylums for the blind, and all the rest : bring them up and tell us what they have done for the world. Every one of them has depended for its beginning upon the reforms of morals and inner life that Christianity has wrought. Otherwise they never would have been conceived. Those Christian heroes who shook whole kingdoms as with the might of God, gave birth to a movement that will never die, and in their wake has come every progressive movement the world has seen. The places where reforms do most of all flourish, and blossom as the rose, are those which, in the highest degree, have enjoyed the privileges of Christian culture and enlightenment. We have a right to boast of our Wilberforces and Clarksons, our Howards and Mrs. Frys, and the whole army of Christian philanthropists, whose crown in heaven will lose none of its splendor, because their deeds on earth were done when they were not greatly observed. Their reward will come from Him who said that he who giveth but a cup of water in his name, shall not lose his reward. I am well aware that the church is often too slow to move in works of reform, but we must remember that such movements have often started with a furious attack upon the church. The opposition of the church has not been to reform, but to those would-be reformers who have commenced their work by assaulting Christianity. Foul slanders and outrageous attacks have often kept the church back too long, I admit. She should not have been kept from working in that direction by such things, but the reason is a natural one, if not a perfectly good one. I can not do more than refer, in this place, to the vast amount of good done by the churches, which never appears in formal statistics before the world. When estimates have been made upon it, it makes many a pretentious reformatory movement dwindle into insignificance ; and yet the world know nothing of it, till such attacks force it into notice.

But I ask you to look at the result of the reforms carried on in a spirit of hostility to the church. They have died out, one after another, and have gone to the shades never to be revived again, whilst the institution they attacked, has lived on and on to bless the world, after its persecutors have gone to their final account. Remember the attacks of the French infidels. Their exciting cause was the corruption of the church, I grant, but with all their wisdom and science, what did they accomplish? Look at socialism in France, and the labors of Owen in our own country : look at come-outerism, what does it amount to? Weak and imperfect as the church of Christ is, I feel it to be the highest honor of my life, to labor in it for the redemption of the world. One of the noblest men of this age, Kossuth, who, when all rewards were offered him if he would accept the Mohammedan religion and abandon his Christianity, scorned the thought of making such a

sacrifice : yet said, if he were forbidden by the Bible to unsheath his sword for the sake of humanity, he would spurn the Bible. I do not justify his sentiment, but I say, that with all his burning desire to strive for liberty even with the sword, he was quite as good, as noble and as great, as the gentleman who condemns all war, and thanks God he is not such as Louis Kossuth. No one has any business to speak of such a man as the gentleman has spoken of the church, and yet he would make it a reproach upon the church that she would tolerate Kossuth within her borders.

The evening is drawing upon us ; we have to prepare for the solemn services of the Sabbath, that holy day, when we can commune with our Lord, and share the tender feelings with which a Mary would worship him. Let us close the week in peace. I have no unkind feelings toward the gentleman whose opinions I feel it my duty to oppose : let us close in peace and prepare for the duties of the day before us.

SIXTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—Our friend in his concluding argument, last week, said that I complained of the church for taking poor sinners by the hand, as the Scribes and Pharisees charged it against Christ that he associated with the degraded and low; and he intimated that the charge in both cases came from persons of like character. I shall say nothing about the compliment contained in the remark, but I wish it understood that my complaint of the church was that it receives into its bosom, those who are not Christian in character, and baptizes them in the name of Christ before they are Christian in heart, holding out to them the hope that they may enter the kingdom of Heaven whilst they are still under the dominion of lust and sin. I have never complained of attempts to raise the degraded. I say, take the poor sinners by the hand and raise them up; there are none so low, so poor, and outcast, but that you and I should go and breathe into their ears words of comfort and encouragement; saying as Jesus of Nazareth did, "Thy sins are forgiven thee, go and sin no more!" But I do not wish them to bear the Christian name and assume for themselves the promise of the Christian's heaven, till they have brought forth fruit meet for repentance.

The gentleman says, look over the world and see where science and art have prevailed, and if he find them most flourishing in so-called Christian lands, he infers that it is owing to the Christian faith. I admit that individual scientific men have been professing Christians, but that does not interfere with what I said of the position of the church as a whole. I said that there had been no science of any magnitude but has had to meet the opposition of the church, in its infancy. The church as an organization has opposed science, and the clergy as the leaders of the church have headed the opposition. Their Book does not teach science, but they opposed science because they thought it opposed the doctrines of their Book. How was it with astronomy? Did not the church put her ban upon it, because she thought it opposed the teachings of the Bible? How was it with printing? Was it not called the "black art," and did not its inventor go to prison (and I know not but to death), by the persecution of the church? How was it with the doctrine of the circulation of the blood? with geology? Were not men told that it was a denial of God's word to say that the heavens and the earth and all in them were not created in six literal days, some six thousand years ago?

How was it with phrenology, which is now acknowledged to be a science by all scientific men? Did not the church oppose it as anti-Christian? Take what science you will, and in its early history you will find that the church has been its enemy. If science prevails, it is not because the church favors it or teaches it, but for some other reason. Science prevails wherever freedom of investigation prevails and is not forcibly stopped. The church has tried to stop investigation, and therefore science owes her no thanks. I grant that science will flourish if the church only gives a very little latitude in investigation, and lays aside the behests of authority in some very slight degree. The human mind rises in its enfranchisement, just as the power of the clergy over it ceases. Christ did not speak as one *quoting* authority; he spoke by the authority of the truth in him. He taught us to speak the truth that is within us, and that which is perceived by our own consciousness, without quoting the words or opinions of others for its support. I care not for your books, though you pile them mountain high; I speak from the authority of the truth in my own consciousness: I have a higher knowledge than any that is derived from books.

Spiritualism has, of course, no favor to expect from the church. It must run the gauntlet as every other science has had to do. Their fate is only a prophecy of what it has to look for. It will rise however, as they have done, with the church upon its back, and in spite of all opposing influences. Truth is harmonious, and if there is any thing in the truths of Spiritualism which conflict with the phenomena and teachings of Christianity, so far Christianity must be false. If persons attempt to show that the two conflict, and cannot directly attack the truths upon which we base our positions, they do not injure us, but only prove the falsity of their own doctrine. If Christianity is true, it has nothing to fear from truth, and need only fear error.

We are told that if the church is not always up in reforms, it is because reforms have attacked the church. I say it is not true that reforms ever attacked the church, till the dead body of the church was thrown in their way. Garrison was in the church, till she shut her doors against the anti-slavery reform, and finding that he could not attack slavery in the church, he was forced out of it; not till then did he attack the church. Astronomy never attacked the church till the church attacked it. Geology never attacked the church till the church attacked it. Do not understand me as saying that a man cannot be a Christian and believe in these sciences. I say that true Christianity is consistent with these sciences, as all truth is. I will show that Christianity was from the beginning with God and of God, and that it harmonizes with all the sciences.

"French Infidelity!" The church had so debased herself by

her corruptions, that the outburst was necessary to throw off the decayed body. It was the infidelity in the church that caused the French revolution.

"Koesuth!" The gentleman does not defend his Christianity, but says he was as good a Christian as I. I can say for myself, that my principles will not permit me to take the sword, even to right my own wrong: they will not permit me to strike back or to revile back, and you may judge whether this is better Christianity than the other.

If the standard of religion in your church is not high enough, you can never get the church where it should be. That was the reason why Luther, Calvin, and Wesley came out. They could not reform the churches, and they were obliged to start new ones. So with Mr. Campbell.

He says that if I reject Luke, I can not prove the gift of the Holy Ghost. That old clerical dogma, that you must take every word or none, may as well be given up first as last. It is only the *cast* of the clergy. Suppose, in reading Gibbon's history, I should find that he has not stated some particular fact correctly, should I say that because he was incorrect in one point, he was false in all? Such a position is only known among those of the clergy who are the blind vassals of authority. I said that John's statement can be relied on as true, because he was present, but that Luke having thrown all the three appearances of Christ after his resurrection, together, has made a slight error in his statement. I have not therefore rejected Luke: but enough of this.

I was on the Pentecost, on Saturday evening, and I will begin upon the Pentecost to-day. The wonderful gift of tongues astonished the people, and Peter got up to explain the matter to them. He told them that Jesus of Nazareth, whom their rulers had just crucified, was the Messiah for whom the Jews had been so long looking; that he had been on earth giving proof of his character and mission, and that they had taken and crucified him, with wicked hands: he had risen from the dead, and by the power of that same Jesus, these wonderful things were done. He satisfied many of them that this was true; that the Messiah had come, and that they had slain him; that he, having risen from the dead, had gone back into the heavens. Believing this, the question rose in their minds, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They had killed the Messiah, and there was now no more hope for the deliverance of Israel! Their last hope had been that the Messiah, when he came, should collect the scattered tribes, drive out their oppressors, establish himself upon the throne of Judah and Israel, and protect forever the prosperity of the people. This hope had been their solace in captivity, but now, alas! he had come and they had not believed in him. He had died by their hands, and by their national suicide, the light of the future was

put out! No wonder they cried, Men and brethren, what shall we do?

Peter tells them what to do; "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." They were to be baptized, and that by immersion. I affirm with my friend that it was a complete covering by water. But they were to be baptized for the remission of sin. What sin? What was the sin charged? It was the sin of killing the Messiah, and this was what was to be remitted. It was *that* which he was pressing upon their consciences, and when he held out the hope that there might yet be salvation and deliverance for them, you can imagine how a Jew would feel. Though they had rejected and repudiated the Christ, and He had returned to heaven, there was still hope for them if they would repent. He would come again, they were told, when they repented of that great sin, accepted him as their Saviour, publicly professed it, and when the apostles had gone into all the world, and brought all the Jews to the same acknowledgement and profession. They would prove that He had come, had gone, and would return; and when this was believed, He would indeed return and establish his kingdom. Peter had not, at this time, the slightest idea of a religious or spiritual Messiah, and if my friend affirms that he had, we will take the record and go over the proof. When Peter said they must repent, he did not refer to their sins of selfishness, appetite, and lust, but to what they must do to recover their lost Messiah; that was what they wanted to be informed about.

I grant that Peter had received the gift of the Holy Ghost, but he could not receive more than he had room for. He was not yet enlightened with *all* truth; and for ten years afterward, although the gifts of the spirit were upon him, poor Peter had to be informed of many things, year by year, which he had not received from the spirit of truth at first. If my friend says Peter was fully inspired on the day of Pentecost, I deny it, and we will make a plain issue.

MR. ERRETT.

I must notice, in the first place, some of my friend's sober and ripened conclusions, after he has had a day to think upon what was said last week.

MR. TIFFANY. I have devoted no time to preparation for my argument to-day.

MR. ERRETT. I should think not from the replies which have been made. It would have been better to think upon it before speaking.

You will bear me witness that in his remarks upon the church, which called out what I have said upon that subject, the gentleman declared that the Church might be of some use to the lowest and vilest classes of persons in society. I read from his own lectures to prove that he considered the doctrines of the church, even that of an eternal hell which troubles him so much, necessary for the vile and low. He said, a faith in that doctrine "is perhaps the only thing which can protect society from their excesses and vices."

MR. TIFFANY. For the purpose of giving my ideas fairly, I will read a little from the passage the gentleman is referring to, and it shall not come out of his time. It is on page 360 of my printed lectures. After speaking of the class of "animal infidels," and using the language which has been quoted, I say "Such men are sometimes found in churches. I have not unfrequently heard ministers say if they knew the doctrine of universal salvation to be true, they would cut loose from all restraint, they would be infidel to every truth and virtue; they would indulge in the gratification of their appetites, passions, and lusts; thereby confessing that they do not love God, they do not love his character, there is no oneness of feeling or delight between them, and were it not for the fear of hell, they would be among the staunchest rebels. Men thus infidel at heart, act very foolishly to quarrel with the doctrines of universal salvation; for they are the only doctrines that can save them from hell. Such men cannot be made positively good and pure. The most that can be hoped of them, is to keep them in check from the commission of vices and crimes, by appealing to their selfish hopes or exciting their fears. This kind of infidelity is seen in the dram shops, at the gaming table, and in the brothel. It shines forth from the face of the profane and vulgar blackguard, and is heard in his cursings and vulgarity. It also appears in the polished rake, and the unpolished bully. This kind of infidelity extends to character, and is low, and mean, and beastly."

I have nowhere justified teaching what was false, but have only said that false teachings may have terrified vile men out of some of their excesses.

MR. ERRETT. I do not see that he betters his case. I was reviewing what he has said of the church, and what it is fit for, and had spoken only of his attacks upon the private members of the church, but in the passage he has read, he extends his attacks to the morals of the ministers. I do not know what kind of clergymen my friend has been familiar with. I know nothing of his "affinities," but I have not, myself, met with any such clergymen as he describes. My friend has practiced law, and has not had the advantage of a very high ideal of human character in the class that lawyers most deal with in their practice.

I said he was hurling in our teeth the old reproach, that we were the friends of publicans and sinners, but now he will not be understood to find fault with us for this, but only that we receive them before they are truly converted. I can only say that if we were endowed with the gift of seeing the heart, we might be responsible for all our members; but till we have that power, we are obliged to take men at their profession, and not believe them false and hypocritical, till they prove themselves so. After they are in the church, we try to take care of them, and though they may have faults and sometimes lapse into error, we are willing to take the reproach of keeping them, as long as we can hope, that by bearing with them, and earnestly laboring with them, we may save their souls. For all this, we are willing to bear the scorn and blame of Pharisaic spiritualists. I say Pharisaic, because, like the Pharisees of old, the gentleman began to tell us how good he was, and to thank God that he was not as other men. No! our fault is not that we take too many from the lanes and hedges, but rather that we are not active enough in compelling them to come in.

He asks if we would turn out of our midst men whom the world does not condemn. My answer is, that so far from seeking to please the world in that matter, we have the moral courage to keep in men whom the world cannot *taunt* us into turning out, so long as we can hope by laboring with them, to bring them back to Christ; and when we do cast them out, it is with sorrow and grief at their waywardness, and not because we fancy ourselves too holy for their company.

As to the church's persecution of science, the gentleman does well to go back to the dark ages for examples. He knows, however, that we are not responsible for the acts of the church in those times. We do not fear a careful scrutiny in this respect, and the church will be found receiving every thing in the shape of science which is susceptible of fair proof. But to talk about Spiritualism as a science! What is there about it to support any claim to such a dignity? What is there in the character or knowledge of its founders to justify such an assumption? What really scientific men can you now rank as its supporters? The fact is that it is from such men that it has received the most merciless ridicule.

Science, we are told, has developed in proportion to the freedom of the mind of man. Yes; but where has the mind been most free? How comes it that that freedom has so strangely kept pace with the march of Christianity? How is it, that wherever that persecutor of science, Christianity, flourishes most, there science is most advanced? How is it with those favored lands where the doctrines of Mohammed and Confucius have made a standard of morality, which the gentleman admires so much?

He says I differ from my Master in my way of enunciating truth. I admit it. Christ spoke by his own divine authority: I have no right so to speak, and do not speak in my own name; God forbid that I should. I do not come with the words, "I say unto you," nor will I honor him who does, till he can give me the proofs of his divinity. Till then, I shall not be ashamed to take the place of Mary at the Saviour's feet, and receive with child-like meekness the pure word of truth.

The gentleman does not care for books. What, in the name of common sense, then, are they flooding the world with the most trashy of books for? They do not give us from the spirits even a sensible book. Spiritualists occasionally utter sense in their works; my friend has some good things in his, and occasionally one like Mr. Fishbough will write a very pretty book: but the spirits themselves utter nothing but trash.

MR. TIFFANY. I believe you, except the "Epic of the Starry Heavens."

MR. ERRETT. No, sir; the "Epic" is not an exception. In the first place, it is not from the spirits; it is from Mr. Harris, whom the spiritualists claim was a brilliant writer before he wrote a line of the "Epic." In the second place, it was not written in twenty-six hours, but took many days, to say nothing of the acknowledged *years* of preparation, which may be proved from the book itself. In the last place, it is not an exception, because it is running over full of mere fustian and rant, and is by no means a high kind of poetry, as I shall show before I get through the debate.

The gentleman is loud in his promises that Spiritualism will put the church upon its back; but I doubt if more comes of these promises than of his former ones, to put me on my back in a day or two, in spite of which I am on my feet yet. His attacks thus far have accomplished little. Many who were here last week have gone home with a deeper and more firmly established faith in Christianity than ever they had before. I know there are some clergymen who have a foolish fear of discussion, but I can not sympathize with them. I will never hide myself in a pulpit and fear to meet that which comes in the guise of truth, and professes a desire to be met. These threats of annihilating the church cause no dread in me, and I know they excite none in Christians generally.

The gentleman has referred to the "Come-outer" movement as the great engine of anti-slavery advancement. I will only say to him, that the anti-slavery movement is not dependent upon such men. Were John Quincy Adams, the Jays, Birney, Dr. Bailey, the Tappans, Samuel Lewis, and such men, with the Come-outers? No, sir! The cause has been rescued from their hands,

and you can hardly find a place in the country where the leading anti-slavery men countenance that movement.

A word in regard to Kossuth. I did not think it was doing my friend any dishonor, to say that Kossuth was as good a man as he. I said and still say he has no right to call such a noble man, whose name is destined to be immortal, an idolatrous and unchristian man. Even if he were wrong in thinking he might take the sword for his country's protection, and to achieve her freedom, he is yet a sincere and honest Christian, and, I do not doubt, he has already attained all that the gentleman can ever hope to be, in purity, in true benevolence, in sincere love to God and his fellow-man, and even in genuine holiness.

As to our sectarianism, I am glad to know that there is a growth of catholicity of spirit every year. Neither old nor new schools stand where they stood twenty years ago, and though we admit that we *all* are apt to show a narrow and bigoted spirit at times, we are rejoiced to know that that spirit grows less from year to year. He says Mr. Campbell was obliged to come out from the church. In the sense he used the words, it is not so. Mr. Campbell never wished to leave the church; never despaired of doing as much to reform it, from within as could be done from without; never regarded it as corrupt and incorrigible. It was because the majority of the Baptist church were too dissatisfied with his views, to allow him to remain with harmony and pleasant feeling among them, that he was obliged to leave.

The gentleman says he does not reject Luke. No! he only rejects as much of Luke's gospel as it suits him to reject. He admitted the Bible to be authority as to facts, and he knows that, by the facts as narrated there, he can not sustain his theory as to the spiritual body of Christ: he must therefore find some way of escaping from the authority he has admitted. A gentleman is here, I am told, who has traveled ten miles to ask him what became of the physical body of Christ, and he must answer the question: it is a perfectly legitimate one.

We are told that Peter was not led into all truth on the day of Pentecost. How can the gentleman say what Peter knew or did not know, when he admits that Peter had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, and he has not. He must, according to his own principles, receive the same baptism and have the same inspiration, before he can even understand what Peter *said*, much less tell what the apostle knew or was ignorant of. The literal history of Pentecostal miracles may be entirely false, judging by what he has said on literal and spiritual meanings. He can not tell the meaning of a single thing Peter uttered after he was baptized with the Holy Ghost, till he also is inspired!

Peter did not command the people to repent and be baptized

for the remission of *a sin*, but for the remission of *sins*, and there is no evidence whatever that it was for the remission of the single sin of crucifying Jesus. He admits that Peter baptized with water, and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was not for the remission of sins. This point, then, is gained. We have water baptism interpreted by the apostle Peter, in the name of Jesus Christ, after he was himself baptized with the Holy Ghost and had divine inspiration. The gentleman says he was not fully informed and illuminated. If by this he means that Peter was not inspired in all he said then and there, I take issue with him, and assert that he had all the inspiration necessary to guide him into all truth, when by divine appointment he was opening the gates of the kingdom of heaven. He might not have had all the illumination necessary for his subsequent labors and teachings, but I maintain that he had all that was necessary for what he was then and there teaching.

It took us all last week to find out that no spiritual truth could be understood till Christ went away. When the Holy Ghost should come, then we should get into the proper "discrete degree," but from the way in which he deals with Peter's inspiration, even the gift of the Holy Ghost will not turn out very valuable, I fear. The Spirit of truth had come like a rushing mighty wind, and cloven tongues of fire had rested upon the apostles' heads; they had spoken with tongues, under the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, but yet, God was sanctioning, by miracles, the teaching of men who, my friend says, had not yet obtained spiritual truth!

MR. TIFFANY.

My Pharisaism, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must leave with you to settle; I shall not argue upon it. I have endeavored to speak to your understanding, and have taken as much pains as possible, to begin where we could see and feel alike, and go on from those settled points by degrees.

I said that mind has expanded just in proportion as it has been free to investigate. In that proportion it has expanded both in Christian and Pagan lands, and it has never been opposed but by the priesthood. I did not compare the *general* morality of Persia and China with that of this country; I only referred to their honesty and their freedom from thievishness.

As to the argument in support of the church, drawn from the continuance of such men as Tappan and Birney in it, my answer is, that though they did not leave the church, they united with a portion of it that ceased all connection with slavery.

I did not bring the name of Kossuth into the argument; but

I say what I said before, that it is unchristian to take the sword to right any wrongs, no matter whether Kossuth did so, or any body else. I will not sustain war by the authority of Moses, or Christ, or Kossuth either.

My friend says Mr. Campbell only came out of the church because they would not let him stay in. That is what I say, exactly. If you raise a higher standard than theirs, they will not let you stay in. My friend would not let me stay in his church, if I were in, for the same reason.

The promise to Peter was that he should have the Spirit of truth to lead him into all truth. Now had he "all truth" at the day of Pentecost? That was my question. I affirmed that he had not, and my friend cannot deny it. The very thing I intended to make out is, that inspiration is not a sudden, but a progressive thing, progressing according to the growth of the understanding and the purity of the heart. That was the case with Peter, and will be the case with my friend and myself, with regard to the influences of the spirit. What I say of Peter is, that he had not received the first idea of the spiritual Messiahship of Christ, or of the spirituality of the kingdom of heaven; that it was to be established in the heart of man. When he spoke on the subject, when he said "Repent and be baptized," he had no reference to such a kingdom as should be built up in the heart of the individual. It will not be questioned, that only two months previous he was fully in the faith that Christ was a temporal Prince and Saviour, and came to establish a temporal kingdom. When Christ met them for the last time before his final ascension, the inquiry was, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" He told them it was not for them to know, but the reason was that they could not know, because they were not in a condition to understand. They taught and the people expected from their preaching, that Christ should return and take the kingdom. It is this view of the matter, that I affirmed that Peter was preaching to the Jews, telling them the Messiah had come, they had rejected and slain him, he had gone home to heaven, and there was now no promised Messiah for Israel. Then he went on to inform them upon what conditions the promise might be renewed, and they be allowed to hope for a Messiah yet. He told them that when those conditions were fulfilled the Messiah would return, and that the mission of the apostles was to prepare the way for the Jews to receive him when he should come again. When they asked the question "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" it was to this he referred in his answer. Now, what was the great sin which Peter had been charging upon them, and which, as he afterward said, they had done through ignorance? It was the sin of rejecting the Messiah and putting him to death. It was with reference to that sin, that they acted, and the water baptism was only a public profession of

giving in their adhesion to the new Messiah who was promised. Peter himself had not yet learned that God was no respecter of persons; and, I ask, could Peter teach men that the kingdom of heaven was to be within their own hearts, and could men learn and comprehend this, without recognizing the fact that the Gentiles needed and might receive that kingdom as well as they? In those circumstances could they fail to see that what had reference to the purification of the soul and the reign of God in the affections, must be of universal application? Why, even ten years afterward, we find the apostles supposing that the Gentiles could only come into the kingdom by being circumcised and becoming Jews; and they called a council, and Peter, Paul, and James gave their opinions on the matter, and after long deliberation they came to the conclusion that they should not require the converts to be circumcised, but only to abstain from meats offered to idols, and such like things. There can, then, be no doubt about Peter's understanding of the matter: there stands the fact, and we can find his opinion in that record, as we find opinions in any other book. I grant that those facts do not give us the full conception of what the spirit is, but they show what Peter's idea of it was.

This brings up another question; the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I believe my friend's sect has not taken a definite position upon this question. I don't know whether Mr. Campbell has a place for the Trinity in his Theology, but I do know that clergymen, even here in town, are greatly troubled with the interpretation of passages referring to Christ. The language of the Bible implies, at times, that he has two souls. Sometimes he is equal with the Father, and then again, the Father is greater than he. I find no trouble with these things, and I can show you how, according to my philosophy, the Trinity is got along with, and that my explanation perfectly agrees with a fair interpretation of the Bible. The Father is said to be Love;—"God is love;"—the Son is the Logos,—the wisdom of God, and the spirit is said to be the Power of God. There are the three attributes,—the Love, the Wisdom, and the Power. The Father is the great absolute Love. The Son is the revelation, the manifestation of the infinite Father to the world: hence it is said of him, "By me were the worlds made," and, "All things were made by him," and, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Speaking of the Power, or executive energy of the Divine, it is said that it proceeds from the Father and the Son. It is the product of Love and Wisdom, the sensibility and the intellect. I ask who made the world? the answer is, God in his infinite Love,—the Father,—through his infinite Wisdom,—the Son,—and by his executive Power,—the Spirit. It was therefore the union of the attributes that brought all things into existence, and God performs all his works, by this

union of Love with Wisdom, which puts forth the executive energy spoken of as "the Spirit with Power." You may take up the book, and you will find the terms every where used in accordance with this view of them. *Jesus* was an individual, like you and me, but the Christ was quite another thing. *Jesus* said, "My Father is greater than I;" "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works;" "Father, not my will, but thine be done." *Christ* was the manifestation of the Divine Wisdom, yet *Jesus* was born of Mary in Bethlehem. *Jesus Christ* was the representative of light, of love, and of power; and when we come to speak of miracles, we will look minutely and philosophically into these manifestations, and see "what think ye of Christ, whose Son is he?" Was he the son of David? But David called him Lord, saying, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool." I propose to answer the question which the Jews could not answer, and show how he could be his Son, and yet be called his Lord.

There is no truth but what is from God. None in the natural, the scientific, or the spiritual world; in the low or high, the light or the dark spheres. There is no wisdom, no power, no love, in the absolute, but what is from the absolute fountain, and the Divine power; wisdom and love are seen working in all departments of nature. The Spirit of Truth, this divine power and energy coming forth from the Father and the Son, is seen in the fashioning of the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdom; in fashioning man, and developing him from one plane of knowledge to another. It is seen working in all planes, from inanimate matter up to the highest archangel in heaven. Now Peter, on the day of Pentecost, came only to such a station as enabled him to see a little of divine truth; he only received according to the then condition of his receptivity. Peter tells us by the facts of his conduct how much enlightenment he received, and it is evident that he did not receive enough to inform him that the kingdom of God was to be established in the human heart. He did not receive enough to teach him that Christ did not come to set up an external kingdom over the Jews. He did not learn enough to know that it was not necessary for a Gentile to be circumcised in order to become a Christian. He did not receive enough of that spirit to teach him that it was not imperative upon the Christian to keep the whole law of Moses. He had learned none of these truths. Baptism he had practised before. The Passover was kept before. Circumcision was practised before. In short, he had not learned that a single article of the Jewish creed was given up and done away by Christ. He supposed himself as much bound to follow that law, after the crucifixion as before. The first outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the gift of tongues was a sign to the unbeliever, not to the believer. He had received the power of that spirit to

such an extent that the imposition of his hands enabled him, as a medium, to convey that influence to another. That was why the imposition of hands was resorted to; it was an external means of communication, and when an individual came into that positive condition that he was ready to receive impressions upon him, it was then, by the imposition of the apostolic hands, the hands of those who had received the baptism on the day of Pentecost, that the gift of the Holy Ghost came upon him.

Peter believed that whenever the Jews should be satisfied that Christ was the Messiah, and acknowledge him as such, that he would then return and restore all things, as had been spoken of concerning him by the prophets. That was the extent of the enlightenment of his faith; you can not make any thing more of it than that. Our first business is to look at the facts and see what they prove on this subject, and then taking up the philosophy of the spirit, we shall find that the facts and philosophy teach the same thing.

Therefore I say Peter's baptism was no more a divine institution than was the observance of circumcision. Neither of them was a part of, or obligatory under, the Christian dispensation, and yet Peter and the apostles practiced both. My friend asserted that water baptism was necessary for the gift of the Spirit. It is not so. When Peter went to the house of Cornelius, the first intimation he had that a Gentile could be received into the Christian church, was the fact that they had already received the gift of the Holy Ghost, even as the apostles had at the beginning. It was for this reason that he could not refuse to receive them. I affirm that Christ's only baptism is a baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire. For this I have Christ's own declaration, and I nowhere find him affirming that his baptism was a water baptism.

MR. ERRETT.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to argue with my friend any further upon water baptism. If he is forced to deny that the apostles and evangelists were guided by inspiration, this reduces him to a sufficiently absurd position, for one who professes to assume in his argument the truth of the Bible, and I may safely leave it there. He admits that Peter and the other apostles believed it necessary to be baptized, but he does not think it needful, and *therefore* the apostles were mistaken and not inspired, as to that doctrine at least! So vigorous a mode as his of harmonising Christianity with his philosophy, would reconcile Christ and Belial! In taking leave of the topic, I will refer to a single thing. He told us, the other day, that water baptism was necessary as a preparatory thing, as a John Baptist's dispensation.

Now he denies that it had any thing to do with the reception of the Holy Ghost, as preparatory or otherwise.

But now I wish to know how far we have got along in finding whether the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical in character with those of Jesus of Nazareth?

The gentleman talks fluently about the trinity of Love, Wisdom, and Power, the three "discrete degrees," and other matters which every body recognizes at once as the technical expressions of Swedenborgian doctrine, and claims to prove his own inspiration by what most people would consider better evidence that he had borrowed his doctrines very largely from that school of theology. The doctrine of the Trinity, which the preachers hereabouts know nothing of, he has perfectly sounded, and can explain it all, and write it down! But I affirm that he has no God: there is no room for a God in his system. The moment we think of God as thinking, or acting, or feeling; as wise, or powerful, or loving; he declares that we finite him and objectify him. I have already put to him a dilemma on this topic, and he stands convicted of denying that there is any real God, till he answers my argument. I have demanded of him to show what kind of being that is, which neither thinks, feels, acts, or is self-conscious. What, then, is the use of taking up time in talking about Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, when the system rules God out, altogether? By this system you can not think of him or pray to him without idolatry.

When he referred to the morality of Persia and China, he says he had reference only to their freedom from a particular crime. Well, let it go to record so; for with such a meaning, all his remarks, in that connection, were utterly pointless and unmeaning.

He affirms that spiritual truth is not to be understood without the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Christ could not make his disciples understand it, all the time he was with them, and he left them that the Comforter might come to enlighten them. Well, the Holy Ghost comes, and the apostles are baptized with it and receive the illumination; and now comes a man who has not received that baptism, and has the presumption to tell you that Peter knew nothing of spiritual truth even then! He dogmatizes in the face of the whole world; throws away Peter's own words, and makes entirely null the fact of the baptism of the Holy Ghost! He gives us a good illustration of the truth that "the letter killeth," indeed. I will ask him, When did Peter open the kingdom of heaven, if not then? When did he use the "keys" the Saviour gave him?

We have had a long dissertation upon Wisdom, Love, and Power; but is that Spiritualism? You can find almost every thing else in spiritualist books but that. I am here to compare Spiritualism with the Word of God, and that is what I am

anxious the gentleman should come to. What have his peculiar notions about a Trinity to do with it? In which of their books is any thing of the kind recognized as Spiritualism? You can find in some of them the Holy Ghost called the "wife of God," but the gentleman will call that the dogma of the writers. Yet their dogmatism is, at least, as good as his, some of it quite as true, and to the full as interesting.

My friend tells us that Peter did not understand what the kingdom of heaven really was. In that case, he was preaching a false kingdom, and when the people were led to repentance they were led by a false view, and it must have been a false repentance, since it grew out of mistaken relations. When they asked what they should do, Peter was telling, he knew not what, and trying to guide them into a kingdom which Christ never set up nor intended to set up! What does it all come to? What is Christianity or the baptism of the Holy Ghost worth at that rate? He quoted the saying of the disciples, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel;" but you will remember that this was before the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and you never find them asking such a question afterward. The Holy Spirit was to guide them into all truth, and it did guide them, or Peter must have been uttering lies when he preached the kingdom of Christ there. We can understand that that must have been the case without any special inspiration, and every one can see that the boldest and nakedest infidelity is not more at war with the word of God, than what we have heard from the gentleman to-day.

When Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, and the people cried out "what shall we do," he uttered laws in the name of a new law-giver, and established a new order of things. It was the first time there ever went out a commandment in the name of Jesus Christ. They tarried till the power from on high came, and then they spoke as the spirit gave them utterance, teaching repentance of sin and baptism in the name and by the authority of Christ. That power from on high had made them know, *assuredly*, that God had made that same Jesus, both Lord and Christ, and it was in recognition of his Lordship and Messiahship, that they told the people to be baptized in his name. They were baptized, both men and women, not recognizing the old Jewish ideas of distinction of sex in the membership of the church. This very fact proves that they received all who repented and placed their confidence in the risen Saviour as their Lord and Christ, gladly receiving his teachings. And, we are told, they continued steadfastly—in what? in circumcision and the Jewish law? No, but "in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer,"—things not known to the Jewish economy. Such were the teachings of the apostles in ordaining a new institution, with new principles, new laws, and new life, and opening a new

testament in the name of Christ. Yet, the gentleman says, Peter was the same old Jew he was before, and was using the keys of the kingdom of heaven to re-open the old order of things! Surely you will have to read your Bible again, with the inspiration of my friend to help you, before you will dream of drawing such a meaning from it.

The baptism of the Holy Ghost was no commandment; it always came as a miracle, and is connected in the promise, with signs and wonders, with no special promise of conversion and sanctification belonging to it at all. There are but two instances of the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the whole New Testament, the one when Peter first preached the gospel to the Jews, the other when he first preached it to the Gentiles. When "the middle wall of partition" was broken down, the end of the Spirit's baptism was subserved, and you hear no more of it, and in neither case is it recognized as resulting in conversion or sanctification. The "baptism of fire" does not belong to the same class of persons at all. My friend says it was to consume lusts: I say it was to consume sinners. John had before him two classes of persons when he uttered these words concerning Christ's baptism;—those who would hear his words and repent, and those to whom he said "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come!" Every time you see the baptism of the Holy Ghost and that of fire mentioned in the Evangelists, you see these two classes of persons referred to; the wheat and the tares, the grain and the chaff, the fruitful tree and that at whose root the ax is laid; and when but one class is referred to, we find mention made of but one kind of baptism. We are told that when the reaper angels shall come, the children of the wicked one shall be immersed in fire, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." There is nothing said of a baptism of fire on the Pentecost. The one was a threatening against the ungodly, and the other, a promise to those who received the repentance preached by John. That is the way the Scriptures show the matter. Now I observe again that Christ's commandment to baptize could not be a commandment to baptize with the Holy Ghost, for it did not belong to them, but to Christ alone;—"He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." They were empowered to baptize, nevertheless; and to baptize into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, all who would believe, and the promise was that He would be with them in their mission, even unto the end of the world. The Holy Spirit was to abide with the church, and does abide with it. This is an important part of the Christian system. In this respect there is no identity between Christianity and Spiritualism. Spiritualism despises what Christians most prize, and if there is any thing which can clearly show the systems to be irreconcilable, it is the labored effort of the gentleman to explain away the Scrip-

tures. Luke must be cast out, as not a reliable historian, and facts must be wrested and contorted to make them harmonize with the gentleman's doctrines. How far has the world advanced, then? How much hope may we cherish for its salvation? The Holy Ghost did not teach Peter the truth, and what are we to do? We can have little hope of good from a system, unless it will guide us along faster than our friend's ideas of the effects of the Holy Spirit's baptism would warrant.

The gentleman has passed by several points with a promise to settle them, and I hope he will not forget them. He is to tell us how his theory disposes of Christ's body. In what sense Christ was the "first fruits of them that slept," if there was no especial deliverance of his body from the power of the grave, and he was obliged to undergo the ordinary process which had been going on from the beginning of the world, in all lands, among idolaters as well as among worshipers of the true God, among the polluted and vile as well as the pure in heart, before Christ as well as after. Unless the Bible is a farce, there was some especial meaning and peculiarity in the resurrection of Jesus; but by this system, there was nothing in it different from what had been happening for four thousand years, to every individual who entered the world: all had left their mortal bodies to return to dust, and all were able to communicate in spiritual form according to the "affinities" of the human race!

I want the gentleman to tell us, also, where we are to look for the teachings of Peter when he *was* guided into all truth. He was promised that he should be so guided, and we want to find him in that full development, and see what his teachings then were. Let us have the chapter, that we may be delivered from our imperfect views, and have Peter's final and fully inspired conception of the kingdom of Christ. Perhaps we shall there find something about the seven spheres, and the distance from one to another,—the "discrete degrees,"—the objective and subjective God. All this I suppose we shall find in that perfect inspiration of Peter, which led him into all truth, and made him know nearly as much as our friend. But let us see! Shall we be any better off then? Shall we not need the same inspiration to understand it? Without that, our friend tells us that we will have only the "letter that killeth."

I want to know also, if Peter's instructions on the day of Pentecost were the teachings of the Spirit. If not, when were they annulled and repudiated by the apostles? Let us know where we, poor pilgrims in search of truth, may come to the fountain of wisdom and learn our true destiny.

When all the gentleman's terrible batteries are mounted and ranged ready for their destructive sweep, we shall perhaps know something more definite upon this subject.

MR. TIFFANY.

I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my friend is so impatient, but I have my own way of doing business, and cannot very well get out of it. I will try and answer some of his questions as we get along to them.

As to Peter's "keys," I will say, keys are instruments for opening doors; Peter's keys must open the kingdom of heaven. The figure is worth nothing unless such a signification attaches to it. When we find that which opens the kingdom of heaven, therefore, we shall have Peter's keys.

My friend says I deny God, because I deny an objective Deity. Just affirm such a Deity, and you will see where I will land you. I do deny an objective Deity, I say it would be a finite one.

He talks of my dogmas about Peter's knowledge. I am arguing from the facts, taking them as they stand in the book. If my friend knows anything beyond that, let him show it.

The Jews were scattered throughout the nations of the earth, and the promise was to them that were scattered, even as many as the Lord should call. I am asked, when Peter opened the kingdom of heaven. If he will tell what the kingdom of heaven is, I will tell when it was opened. If we have access to any kingdom of heaven that is not within us, it is a different one from any that I have an idea of. The external and internal kingdoms will receive attention by themselves, and the "keys" will be minutely examined. We shall reach them in due time.

Christ sent Peter out to preach that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, before Peter received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or knew that the kingdom was not a temporal kingdom. Now, was Peter preaching a false kingdom or not? Answer me that, and I will tell you how far the Spirit was responsible for the teachings on the day of Pentecost.

Peter says Christ was the anointed Lord;—both Lord and the anointed one. He was anointed as David and Saul were anointed, and at that time the Jewish Christians did not look beyond a Lordship, and a Messiahship such as had filled their hopes for centuries before.

My friend says there are only two cases of the baptism of the Holy Ghost on record. One at the giving of the new dispensation to the Jews, the other when the same was given to the Gentiles. I will read a little upon that point. In the 19th chapter of the Acts we read,—

"And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he

said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism. Then Paul said, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands on them, *the Holy Ghost came on them*; and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

There is a baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the gifts of the Spirit following. You will find also that the gifts of the Spirit, which were to be the fruit of the descent of the Holy Ghost, were to continue. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and these signs shall follow them that believe." When Peter preached to the Gentiles and the Holy Ghost descended upon them, then Peter remembered that Christ's baptism was a baptism of the Holy Ghost. The church at Corinth received the spiritual gifts which were the fruits of the baptism of the Spirit. It was a pouring out of the Spirit "upon all flesh," and was not to come simply upon ten or twelve men.

He says the "harvest" was to be at the end of the world. What world? Of this Cosmos, this material world? No! no more than of the moon. It is not the same Greek word which has that meaning. It is the end of this dispensation; and when we learn what the end of this dispensation is, we shall know when the harvest will be, and who the reapers are.

He tells us the baptism of the Holy Ghost belonged to Christ alone. But Christ said of the believer, "The works that I do, shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." If, then, the baptism of the Holy Ghost was one of Christ's works, he who had been born again would do the same. Christ spoke of himself as doing nothing of his own power, and the same Divine energy would be manifested through every individual who came into the same condition. He never made any distinction between what he could do and what the true children of God could do. He said they should do greater works, and of course they could, when the world should be in a condition to receive greater works. When a person having the same endowment, comes into a world better prepared, he will do greater works, of course. Christ nowhere contradicts himself by saying that he does the works, but alway speaks of himself as a medium through whom God works.

"In the name," means, by the power. "In the name and by the authority of the State of Ohio," means by the power of the State. When we come to miracles we shall see how the power of Christ was manifested. We shall show that Jesus was not an exception to the philosophic law on this subject, but that he was working the works of God, just as any body else would work

them, if they came into the plane he occupied, lived the life he lived, and so became the recipient of God's wisdom and power.

"Christ, the first fruits of them that slept." Does that mean the first whose physical body was raised? Then Lazarus was the first fruits, or the young man whom Christ restored to life, or, still earlier, the child restored by Elias. There must be some meaning which will harmonize with the facts, and not array one part of the book against another. I tell you, his being the first fruits of them that slept, meant a good deal more than raising the body out of the grave. My friend says a man has come a long way to ask what became of Christ's body. I can tell him one thing: he did not take it to Heaven with him, for "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." Therefore I throw back the question, What did become of it? He could not take any but a spiritual body there, and now let us see who will dispose of it best; you or me. When you have tried and can not dispose of it, I will show you that I can. I shall come to the subject after awhile.

Peter did not preach a spiritual kingdom, because he did not as yet understand it. There is that implied in the knowledge and perception of the spiritual kingdom, which Peter could not have understood, or he would have seen that it applied to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. Had he understood it, he never would have been troubled with the question of circumcision. He had to learn as we learn. As we perfect our character and expand our understanding, we become fitted for receiving higher inspirations of the Spirit, and, in like manner, Peter could only receive what he was ready to receive. If God should work a miracle by putting in Peter's mind truths he could not understand or receive, then all the work of preparation would be unnecessary. God has but one law in making his communications to mind: the communication must be according to the state of the mind, and can not be otherwise.

My friend says I have got my ideas of the Trinity from Swedenborg. I say again, I have not read Swedenborg, but I know that what I have said is true, and I do not question that it is the same as Swedenborg taught, for I believe that he was highly inspired.

Power all comes from the same God, is all guided by the same Divine intelligence, and is all directed to the same grand and consummate end. But whenever God speaks, he speaks in accordance with the condition of the mind. He will speak the truth the mind is prepared to receive, and no other. If Peter was so prepared to receive the impressions of the Spirit, as to speak with tongues, he still might not be prepared for the gift of interpretation. The gift of speaking often goes without the gift of interpreting, and therefore Paul recommended that the gift of speaking should not be exercised where the gift of interpreting was not.

The gift of the Spirit, which enabled Peter to speak with tongues, did not address itself to his understanding. It was only a manifestation of power, by which he was to address the outer world,—the external sceptical beholders,—and so interest them as to cause them to investigate whether Jesus was really the Messiah or not. It was to excite their wonder and astonishment, and make them know that there was something more than the silly play of children in it. Peter went on to say that this power by which they spoke, and healed sickness, was the spirit and power of this Jesus of Nazareth, the same power by which he had wrought all his mighty works. That was the power that gave strength to the feet and ankle-bones of the cripple at the "Beautiful Gate." Such language excited seriousness in the people, and they began to inquire. Then Peter told them that this same Jesus who had proved himself by his wonderful works, a man mighty before God and the people, whom they had taken and slain, had risen again! the tomb could not hold him, and they had seen and talked with him, and beheld him ascend into heaven! They were witnesses of the fact, and it was his power which had come down upon them, that enabled them to do these things. This satisfied the people that the Messiah had come, and they had refused to receive him, demanding his death, and choosing that a murderer should be released unto them rather than he. This was all Peter was teaching at that time. If God could make him understand all things then, why did he not do it? The fact remains there, that Peter did not know or teach Jesus as the true spiritual Messiah. Look carefully through The Acts, from the first chapter to the council at Jerusalem, and taking it up verse by verse, tell me where Peter taught the kingdom of Christ in the true and spiritual sense. There is not a word on the subject. Look for it: find it if you can. I am telling you the sober fact, and showing you what the phenomena teach. I ask my friend, who is basing his faith upon that Pentecostal sermon, to re-examine the matter, and find out how much Peter really knew of the spiritual kingdom at that time. Listen to Peter years afterward, when, for the first time, he breaks out with the exclamation, "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." Even then he had not found out what was necessary to bring the Gentiles into the true relation to Christ's kingdom. When the apostles came together to consult on that very subject, they did not claim that the Spirit had given them any special instruction, but only proceeded to reason from the fact that the Spirit had descended upon the Gentiles. The gifts of the Spirit can only come by the descent of the Spirit, and the possession of the gifts is proof of the baptism of the Spirit. The facts that men exercised gifts, that signs followed them, the sick were healed, lepers cleansed, the dead raised, were proofs that they had received the Spirit and were baptized with it.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

There are one or two matters which I have been reminded of, that require a little "posting up" before proceeding further. I must refer to the position taken by the gentleman on Saturday, that Jesus could only appear to his disciples when they were calm and passive, and that he immediately vanished when they became excited. Now the fact is that he remained with them when they were most frightened. It is true that Luke says so, and Luke goes overboard when it does not suit my friend's argument to depend upon him; but I will read the passage (Luke xxiv: 36):

"And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. *But they were terrified and affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit.* And he said unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not *flesh and bones* as ~~ye~~ see me have."

All this was in the midst of their excitement, you will observe, and the account perfectly accords with the narrations of the other evangelists, only that it is more full and explicit.

When the angels (and my friend regards them as disembodied human spirits) appeared to the women, they were frightened, and the angels did not vanish, but made an effort to calm them, saying, "Fear not ye," as *Matthew* (xxviii: 5), not Luke, narrates it, and when the angelic message was delivered, the women "departed quickly, with *fear and great joy; and did run* to bring his disciples word." There could not be a more tumultuous excitement pictured, and yet it did not prevent spiritual appearance. So *Mark* makes the same narrative. The angel strives to quiet them with, "Be not affrighted," but could not succeed, for "they *fled* from the sepulcher; for they *trembled*, and were amazed; neither said they any thing to any man, for they were *afraid*." (*Mark* xvi: 8.) It was right in the midst of that excitement that Jesus appeared to them, saying, "all hail!" and he again, noticing their agitation, strives to comfort them, and says, "Be not afraid." I trust that theory of my friend's is now sufficiently disposed of, and that you understand his relation not only to Luke, but to all the apostles and evangelists.

My friend amuses himself with guessing sometimes. He guessed I was a Sadducee, and again that I deny the Holy Ghost. I shall not go out of my way to defend my orthodoxy, but when any subject comes properly up in answering his arguments I shall give my views as fully as necessary. I think none of you will be alarmed by his guesses.

His mode of disposing of objections to his theories is a little peculiar. He tries to drive out orthodox Christianity by a new system, and when objections are raised to it, he would avoid them by challenging us to spend the whole time upon objections to Christianity centuries old. If he uses up the whole debate in that way, he will accomplish his purpose by avoiding any test of his own views. A new theory bears the burden of proof, and we are not called upon to defend our belief, but to show that he does not positively establish his own. At any proper time I am ready to defend *all* points of my Christianity, but in *this* discussion, when he evades objections to his own system in such a way, it shows his defeat. I have said his system answers no difficulty with regard to Christ's resurrection; that he fails to account for the disappearance of Christ's body; that he offers no reason why, if his doctrine of spiritual communication be true, Christ might not communicate as well with his disciples after his ascension as before. Every point of importance is met with, "I will attend to it by and by." Christ's body, miracles, the keys of heaven, all are very easily disposed of by the one ever-recurring answer. He is getting his "guns" all arranged, and when that is done I am to have that terrible broadside that is to sweep me away. This has been going on for six days, and I am really afraid he is laying up too arduous a labor for himself.

Since he has asked the question, I will tell him my interpretation of the passage relating to the "keys," and he will then have no excuse for not giving his own.

The giving of keys is a symbol of giving authority to say who are entitled to enter, or the contrary. It was by divine authority that Peter was to open and shut the kingdom of heaven, and tell upon what conditions an entrance could be given; not at his own arbitrary determination, but as a servant of God authorized to declare His will by inspiration. Peter did this on the day of Pentecost when, in the name and by the authority of Christ, he told the convicted Jews what they must do to be saved. He taught them repentance of sin, which involved a change in their whole inner life. Yet, we are told, there was nothing spiritual in all this. The broken heart, the contrite spirit, the renunciation of evil, the giving up of sin, and the denial of worldly lusts,—nothing spiritual in this! Upon that day he used his authority announcing the laws of Jesus Christ. He used the same power at the house of Cornelius, giving the Gentiles the same place as had been before given to the Jews, by the Divine order and arrangement. The gentleman tells us there is no kingdom of heaven, but that which is within us. To unlock such a kingdom, then, could only imply the power to unlock his own thought and make his own experience known; this was his apostolic authority! Christ said (Luke xxii: 30), "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father

hath appointed unto me ; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Here are some more numbers for the gentleman ; he has talked of three, seven, and nine,—triunes and triunes of triunes, but now we have got to the twelves.

When I asked what proof there was that Peter did not understand the kingdom of heaven, he said the apostles did not understand it when they preached it as at hand, before the crucifixion of Christ. I affirm that they did understand all that they preached. They understood that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. This they proved to the people, and it was all they had to preach at that time. But on the day of Pentecost, it was the unfolding of the laws of that kingdom which was their business, and the introduction of persons into it, that they might have what they themselves experienced,—righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

The baptism of the spirit on the day of Pentecost, we are told, only conveyed the gift of tongues. I will ask, were the apostles Christians on that day or not? We have been told that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is necessary to make Christians,—that there is not one on earth, &c., and now let us know whether Peter was then a Christian or not, for you tell us he knew no more of spiritual things than he did before. Let us know if the Christianity which you say is identical with Spiritualism, is something unknown to the apostles on that day.

I said we have only two instances of the baptism of the Holy Ghost on record, and he turns me to the 19th chapter of Acts, where upon the new baptism of those who had before been baptized with John's baptism, and the laying on the apostles' hands, the Holy Spirit came on them. The question is whether that was the peculiar thing called the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost in the two passages I referred to. I deny it, and deny also that they received one spiritual gift from the baptism these persons then received at the apostles' hands. We will take issue there distinctly.

I quoted from another passage with regard to the baptism of fire, where it is said the wheat was the children of the kingdom, but the tares were the *children* of the wicked one ; not doctrines, you will see. The gentleman says that "the end of the world," in that passage, does not mean the "Cosmos." What of that? No matter at the end of what dispensation it was, the *fact* remains that whenever the harvest came, the wicked were to be *baptized with fire*. That is the point to be met, and as usual, the gentleman would like to get up a side question about the immaterial point of time.

He asks how any one else could do "greater works" than those which Christ did, if none but he could give the spiritual baptism. That baptism was not one of the works referred to, in

that remark of the Lord, any more than his atonement for our sins, his death, and his exaltation to be a Prince and Saviour were. The doing of "works" did not include every manifestation of Divinity, or the promise would make infinite Gods of all the disciples! It is an old rule, that you must interpret according to the nature of the subject.

Every believer could not confer spiritual gifts by the imposition of hands; it was the apostolic prerogative. Philip could not do it when he went down into Samaria, and the apostles went down to lay their hands on the converts. Paul longed to go to the church at Rome that he might confer upon them some spiritual gifts, but what need of his longing, if the gifts followed all baptized believers.

"In the name" means in the power, says the gentleman. Well, then, the converts were baptized in the power of the love and the wisdom, and in the power of the power! That is the *spiritual* meaning of the commission I suppose, and it sounds very much like his "perception of a perception of a perception."

He asks what we make of the resurrection of Lazarus, if Christ was the first fruits of them that slept. I must say that any child in our Sabbath Schools could answer that. Lazarus had no final resurrection, but his life was restored for a time as a miraculous manifestation of Divine power, and then he went back to his grave again. For Christ there was no such return to the dead; he was in the true sense the first-born from the dead, the beginning of hope and confidence in all his followers, that they should have eternal life. They were to rise because he had risen. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. iv: 14.) By the gentleman's theory it would be as good sense, philosophy, and theology, to say "if we believe that Moses died and became a spirit, so shall we also." Indeed there would be nothing which could be called a resurrection, for the spirit leaves the body before it is laid in the tomb. Even by the absurd notions of spiritualists, it takes only ten hours for the spirit to separate from the body, in such a case as that which I read, in which the grievous smashing of spiritual and physical heads together, was so pathetically dwelt upon.

In answer to the gentleman's strictures upon Peter, I put this case to him: If Peter was baptized with the Holy Ghost, and he is not, and if it takes the same inspiration to receive truth as to impart it, how can he presume to say what Peter taught. He has the facts he says. No, he has only the words, and it is for the interpretation of those words that he has stoutly contended inspiration is necessary. The principle is his own, he must abide by it. He has the letter, and takes the literal interpretation, and I say to him in his own quotation, "the letter killeth."

He asks why Peter did not understand every thing. I said he had all the inspiration necessary for what was then before him. He was preaching to the Jews then, and had all the illumination necessary for that occasion, and when it was necessary for the Gentiles to be taught, he received the inspiration necessary for that, although in the divine Providence it did not occur for some time afterward. What he said and did in both cases was fully inspired.

"Peter knew no more than John the Baptist." Well this is progression! A while ago, John's baptism was preparatory for that of the Holy Spirit, and when it should come, the disciples were to have spiritual truth clearly discerned; but it comes, and they are no better off than they were before! That grand event leaves them as carnal and as destitute of Christian enjoyment and spiritual light as the water baptism of John!

MR. TIFFANY.

If I want to know what Peter preached I will read from the book, and knowing what were his views before he commenced preaching, I can get his ideas by reading according to the common standard of criticism. From the book I have his arguments commencing with that opening speech, "Ye men of Israel, hear my words." From that whole discourse it is not hard to tell what he was speaking about, or how much he understood by the kingdom of heaven. Knowing that the Jews had crucified Christ, he charged them with it, and called upon them to repent. I say from all these things it is clear that the spirit poured out upon the apostles then, was only a spirit of power, and did not enlighten them: if it did, they gave no signs of it. Peter only argued as we might expect he would, knowing his previous views. By what authority can the gentleman assert that Peter knew what the kingdom of heaven was, when he did not know that the Gentiles were to have part in it? He affirms on his own authority simply. My affirmation is, that the Spirit of Truth led the apostles into truth as they were prepared to receive its teachings, but at the time referred to, Peter had not been led into all truth, and that it was the old Jewish notion of a Messiah he was presenting, and that too in a manner particularly calculated to affect the Jews. One thing is certain. Peter had not learned at this time that God is no respecter of persons, and still thought that the Gentiles were unclean, and could not become a part of the divine kingdom. If my friend admits these things, his difference from my idea of progressive inspiration can not be worth arguing about. Take up the thing as a mere matter of historical study, and you find nothing to lead

you to the conclusion that Peter was inspired with all truth. He wants to know when the apostle was led into it. I answer, day by day, and hour by hour: that his enlightenment rises just in proportion to the advance in his character. He never learned *all* truth; he is learning still, I doubt not. Till he becomes infinite he will never know it all. He said at that time what he conceived to be truth, and that his early education had its influence over him, and was the means of keeping his mind in a condition not to receive the truth, it is very natural to infer. Under these circumstances, since he himself made no claim to perfect inspiration, and no one has claimed it for him but the church, I think it should be backed up by something more than my friend's simple assertion. We gain nothing, and truth gains nothing, when we attribute to him that which he did not possess.

I asserted, and still assert, that only those are Christians who have received the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Paul said "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Romans viii: 9); and except ye have been buried with Christ in his baptism, and been baptized into his death, ye are none of his. He said, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened, till it be accomplished" (Luke xii: 50); and again, "the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." (John xiv: 30). When that struggle came, and he breathed forth his own will in resignation to the Divine will, and had no will of his own, then it was that he was dead to the world, then it was that the prince of the world could find nothing in him. That was the baptism he was to be baptized with, and with which you and I, and all must be baptized, and taking Christ as our example and brother, we will have a right and claim to be the divinely anointed.

I was saying this morning that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was progressive. It is the Power of God. Christ was the manifestation of God's wisdom, and the Father, the Love of God, was in him. Hence he could speak of his sending the spirit. So of his praying to the Father, and the Father sending the spirit. So he sometimes said all things were given to him, and again that he of himself had nothing. God created all things, but he works by means. God, working in the plane of the vegetable kingdom, making flowers, is a different influence from God, working in the plane of our hearts and purifying us, but the power is from the same being. Both are from God, from the spirit of God, which alone can impart life and love. We see an individual, no matter how weak, and we say God made him. God has done it, and that by means of ever-established influences. He has done it by his spirit. All life, all strength, all understanding must come from him. But this creative energy is a different thing from his working in our minds to bring us to a higher perception of truth. Nevertheless, all comes from God. If God works in my under-

standing, to communicate loftier truth to me, he is doing it by such means as are best fitted to address my understanding. It may be that he will proceed by external means and influences, but it is none the less God's work. In God we see, feel, and think, and he not only works by means, but it is the only mode by which he can work upon us. He might as well make me twenty years old in a month, as to enlighten my understanding without means,—without a process of education. Speaking after the manner of men, there are some things God can not do. If I am in a condition to receive but little truth, the spirit will work but little, and will place in my mind such truths as I can receive. So that when I speak of the spirit operating upon the mind, I do not mean that it inspires the subject of its operations with all truth. A man may be inspired with one truth, or two, or three, and be uninspired as to all others. Now, the spirit of God has an infinity of means; and when I speak of the spirit of God, I include every grade of spirit, from the divine to the lowest. Were you and I so elevated in our nature that God could speak to us without the intervention of angels, he would do it; but as we are in a plane where we can not hear the direct voicings of God, he must speak to us by the intervention of means. When, therefore, I speak of Peter's being inspired, I mean that his inspiration was in such measure as he could receive. The difference between Jesus and Peter was in the measure of their inspiration. Peter received in comparatively small measure,—Jesus without measure. Each received as he was prepared for the spiritual enlightenment. When Peter stood up on the day of Pentecost, he was the receptacle of spiritual influence so as to speak with tongues, and to heal diseases; but that is quite another plane from having the understanding illumined.

In calling attention to the fact that Jesus had come, that he had risen, such power was necessary, and an efficient aid. But suppose Peter had commenced preaching to them the kingdom in its spiritual sense, they would not have understood him. The first thing was to secure their attention and rivet upon their minds the fact that the Messiah had really come. The possession of the physical influence of the spirit was consistent with the absence of the illuminating influence. The illumination would come by degrees; as the person unfolded in character. My position is a broad one, but it is one that can be maintained, both by philosophy and by fact, and I enunciate it as a great principle, that *man's inspiration can not proceed more rapidly than the unfolding of his character and understanding*. When the apostles were so unfolded and developed that they could see all that was involved in the kingdom of heaven being *within* them, and could understand the real meaning of that saying of Christ's, "I am the resurrection and the life," they would be prepared to receive the higher truths of the gospel.

My friend will hardly deny that inspiration was progressive in the apostle. As Paul expressed it (Phil. iii : 13), "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." He said that at present he saw "through a glass, darkly" (1 Cor. xiii : 12), but afterward, when the mind should be fully illumined, he would see "face to face." I am not denying that they obtained inspiration, but I affirm that they obtained it by degrees. You can not get perfect inspiration in a man who will stand and dissemble. Jesus Christ could not have had full inspiration if he would ever dissemble. No; he was *truth itself*. Nothing else will represent his high devotion of soul to every thing that was pure, and just, and good. But Peter was found, twenty or thirty years afterward, dissembling; having one opinion before the Jew, and another before the Gentile. Such a character as that can not have perfect inspiration; and if you had no other proof, this single fact, standing out as it does, would be sufficient evidence to every true mind.

This, then, is my argument. God works by means, in every plane below the Divine. Here are the natural and spiritual planes, and God works by means in them both. The amount of inspiration you and I may have, depends upon the degree we occupy in the spirit planes. The amount of true love we are capable of experiencing will determine the plane we are in, and this will determine the amount of truth we are capable of receiving. The Holy Ghost, therefore, is the agency by which we receive truth in the spiritual plane; by which things are brought to our remembrance, by higher intelligences, who have been in a higher school. Through the influence of these spirit messengers, we receive instruction under God, and as we are perfected in character, we rise into higher and higher planes, and come under the influence of those higher truths which we need to understand. In the Divine plane, God no longer works by means, and the soul no longer needs a mediator, but God himself appears in us and we in him. Then the power and authority and rule in us that stands opposed to the Divine is all put down, and we become truly subdued, our own will being merged into the Divine will. Then cometh the end! Then Jesus ceases to stand between us and God, for the Father himself will love us, and manifest himself in us. Then we shall perceive God as he is, in the divinity of his being! The path is open before us, and we are invited to walk in it: not the path of fear, but the path of love, the living way, the way that takes hold of the soul and makes it dead to sin and alive to God. Not the baptism of water,—a form, a type; but having come where we take the reality itself, we shall no longer need a type.

MR. ERRETT.

The gentleman has made a long argument upon the meaning of Peter's sermon, as recorded in The Acts, and I am glad of it; for in order to make an argument upon it at all, he had to say that he deduced Peter's character and intentions from it, according to the *ordinary rules of criticism*. He has therefore taken back all he said about the necessity of inspiration to understand the Bible, and another of his sounding propositions has fallen, whilst my argument upon the proper mode of interpreting Scripture stands where it did before he attacked it. He has adopted my principle, that inspired books, like all others, must be interpreted by the ordinary canons of criticism, and he will find that it will interfere with his philosophy throughout.

We are carried along, now, to the new idea that inspiration is progressive. Peter *began* to be baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. I had always supposed it began and ended, but it appears it was only a beginning, and that in a low form. This doctrine, such as it is, is used to show that it will not require full inspiration to understand the Scripture, but only as much as Peter had; but after admitting the application of the ordinary canons of criticism, the gentleman had better stick to them, and let the subject of inspired *hearing* drop.

Whilst he was referring to Peter's sermon, I got hold of the literal meaning of the passage in it, "Neither did his flesh see corruption;" and now that the common understanding of the passage is to be our guide, it becomes a question of new interest how he will dispose of Christ's body.

He says that first baptism of the Holy Ghost was a baptism of power, but he has told us before that the Holy Ghost *means* power, and now he is going to have power, wisdom, and love, all conveyed by the same Spirit, the *power*, and the Father, Son and Holy Ghost will be so badly confounded by his system that it will not become him to cast reproaches at Trinitarians.

I shall have a right to treat the gentleman's assumptions of the spiritual meaning of Scripture, as mere dogma and arrogant assertion; for, by his own philosophy, he has not got high enough to receive spiritual truth, and it is only the literal word which he can understand. He tells us now, that he takes it as it stands on record, but the other day he declared some passages to be false and infernal as they stood, in the letter, but in the spiritual sense, true and good.

Taking the relations of Peter to Christ, and looking at the miracles and wonders which he performed in attestation of his authority, no candid person can doubt that God, by granting the miraculous power to him, sanctioned what he taught, and made it the very word of God himself. If my friend wishes to deny the miracles, or to assert that they could be performed without the

special interposition of Divine power, let him do so, and take open infidel ground; but so long as he admits that they *were* miracles which Peter performed, he has no right to deny that the teachings and commands of the apostle came as the well-attested word of God. Taking it as such, the believer was to repent of his sins, exercise faith in Christ as his ever-living Saviour, submit his own will to the will of God in baptism; and when this was followed by deep and abiding peace and joy in Christ, with a firmly-rooted faith that everlasting life was secured by his atonement,—if that be not more than could come of Judaism, or the baptism of John, I am free to admit I know nothing about it. The gentleman says Peter did not possess all truth. I have not claimed that he was omniscient in the absolute sense, but I have asserted that all that Peter preached was true and must have been true, if he was inspired at all, plenarily or progressively, in a high or low degree. His notion of progressive inspiration is, that inspired men get more or less of *truth* according to their state of progression; and it would be false, by his own theory, to say that men get *lies* by inspiration, and teach them with miracles to sanction them. There stands the fact. No matter whether Peter was more or less inspired, he was inspired with *truth*. It was the Holy Ghost speaking through him. Christ had told the disciples they were not to premeditate their speeches. It was *given them* what they should speak. The glaring absurdity of disputing the truth of what the apostles uttered, whilst it is still admitted that they were baptized with the Holy Ghost, and worked miracles in attestation of their Divine mission, will strike every one. Nothing could be more absurd, unless it be to set up the teachings of Modern Spiritualism as Divine truth, and our only hope when the apostles and evangelists fail!

He says I should back up my position by some philosophy, when I say that Peter preached the true kingdom of heaven. I have backed it up by his own philosophy, as I have just shown; and I back it also by the words of Christ, who said the apostles should be led by the Spirit into all truth, and directed them to wait till that Spirit came upon them, and then go forth preaching to all the world, beginning at Jerusalem.

I must be pardoned for my dullness, if I do not understand the gentleman, but sometimes I can not quite understand him. He says, God makes the flowers. Is it an objective or a subjective God? The moment he talks of God's doing such things, he objectifies him, and becomes an idolater, by his own doctrine. A subjective God can not be conceived as working in any such way as he is made to do in the gentleman's philosophy.

I will ask the gentleman, If Peter did not preach baptism correctly, did not know what was the kingdom of heaven, or that Christ was a spiritual Messiah, what was he inspired with? What

truth did he teach? There is nothing left but the speaking with tongues, and no proof that he understood that. It would seem that Peter taught only his own notions. It was not the will of God that the people should be baptized, there was no remission of sins, no acceptable belief. All was Peter's notions!

Inspiration, we are told, is in proportion to the unfolding of the intellect and character. The gentleman denies that God can speak through ignorant men, or use them as means of giving utterance to Divine truths. Yet he is inconsistent enough to admit that under the influence of the Spirit, men may speak tongues which they do not understand. Accepting the facts of the Bible as true, I should like to know what he makes of the phenomena of Balaam's ass rebuking the prophet; whether he ascribed any elevation of intellect or character to that animal. Or in the case of Balaam himself, how perfect was his character, when he tried so hard to curse Israel, and the Spirit of God turned the curses to blessings on his tongue? The fact is, the gentleman's whole effort is to get rid of miracles, while he professes to receive the narrative of them as true, and he would bring the universe down to a mere machine, calling the laws of nature God, and denying any consciously acting and thinking Deity. Davis goes so far as to make all material;—God, the universe, man, and all else. But even could he get rid of scripture miracles, the gentleman would be sure to stumble upon them in his own system, for I have already shown that spirits being formed of very attenuated matter, by their theory, they could only reach the world by oversteering the law of gravitation. They could no more remain on the surface of the world than air can remain under water. They would necessarily rise to the surface of the atmosphere.

"Jesus was truth itself," says he, and so say I; but notice, that unless he formally abandons his philosophy, he holds that every man must be as much *truth* as Jesus was, in order to understand his teachings, and profit by his truth. You must become "truth itself," in all its fullness and divinity, unless you would have only the letter which killeth.

My friend tells us that spirits are the means of conveying instruction from the Divine mind to us. I ask proof that Christ conveyed truth by means of spirits, or in any way but by words, or that the Apostles did so. This must not be assumed, but proven. The gentleman's remarks upon the Holy Ghost seem to mean that the inspiration upon the day of Pentecost was only a communication from spirits such as they claim to deal with now-a-days. You remember his doctrine of affinities, how like seeks like. Apply this to the case in hand. The gentleman has studiously represented Peter as an untruthful man; a dissembler, one who had, only a few days before, thrice reiterated a most awful falsehood. Now, how does his system account for Peter's preach-

ing being essentially untrue in regard to the nature of the tian dispensation? It is not unfair to suppose that by his doctrine of affinities lying spirits were attracted to Peter and through him, and this, his elastic system would include under the general term "inspiration," and give as a *spiritual* interpretation of the Pentecostal Baptism of the Holy Ghost! Is not this proving the teaching of Spiritualism identical with those of Christianity? It is only by just such a *degrading* process that he is able to force Christianity down to the level of Spiritualism in any respect, and there he would leave it, robbed of every particle of what we esteem its divinity, and ourselves at the mercy of every lying spirit, even when we think we have the inspired words of God, given at the beginning of a new dispensation, just inaugurated through the loving and care of our God! I have seen dirty urchins spatter with filth, those into whose company they could not be received, so that they might not be more clean than themselves, and such seems to be the treatment adopted by Spiritualism toward Christianity.

I have to lead myself with a great burden of books, showing what the spirits teach in these modern days, and from all this the gentleman will not allow that we can get any light—it is all dogma; and now the Bible must go the same way. The words inspired by the Holy Ghost are degraded to the same level, and we are left without truth, without any thing upon which to base our faith. The gentleman is very far from consenting to let the plain words of the Bible, and the communications of spirits be received as showing the two systems. He knows well that it would be preposterous to claim identity from such evidence, so he gives what he chooses to call Spiritualism, degrades the Bible to a level with it, and says his case is made out.

There is no evidence that Jesus was ever in company with spirits to communicate with them, but when Moses and Elias came miraculously to lay their crowns at his feet and hear the words "This is my beloved son." The gentleman is evidently troubled with the task of harmonizing Scripture with his theories, but he can not bear to give them up, though his trouble grows worse and worse. I have asked him to point to the passage where it is said that Christ and his apostles received their doctrines from spirits. The "truth itself" listen to the babblings of lying spirits, when for eighteen hundred years we can get no better things from them, than the stuff in this pile of books called their teachings! Jesus, the Witness faithful and true, the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the Almighty,—He dependent upon such spirits as these for his inspiration! The idea is sheer blasphemy!

MR. TIFFANY.

I have never affirmed, nor do I believe, that Jesus depended upon the spirits for his communications. I have said of Christ what he said of himself, that he received his communications from the Father. I have said this, and I maintain it still. But whilst Christ received his communications from the Father, because he had been developed in the divinity of his nature, it does not follow that Peter received his inspiration directly from the Father. I have also said that Jesus communicated with spirits, but not that he received any information from them. The gentleman has set up a new man of straw to kick over, and he may kick it. I said, no man save the Son had seen the Father, and no man could see him, unless begotten of the Divine Spirit, born of God, so that the spirit of the Divine Father may be in him, and he in the Father. But whilst the disciple was in such a condition that he could not directly commune with the Father, there was a way in which they could come to the Father. As to the story of Balaam's ass, I believe there is still some dispute whether the ass spoke at all or not; whether it was not the angel's voice which Balaam attributed to the ass. I doubt indeed whether my friend himself would attribute speech to an ass, unless the animal took on a human form; there are some of that kind who talk enough. But, to be serious, my friend will agree with me that the promise was that the Spirit should lead the disciple into all truth, and that Peter on the day of Pentecost had received but a small portion of truth. In giving his injunctions to repent of sin, Peter undoubtedly had inspiration in that direction, but in his sermon he was only carrying out his old ideas, and I leave it to you to make, each of you, what you can of it. My friend cannot find fault with progressive enlightenment, it stands too plainly written there. I have not charged Peter with lying, but have only shown that his views were mistaken ones. He might be mistaken, and still not be in a condition to attract lying spirits about him. It is the *character*, the intention, that draws upon the affinities of spirits. Peter said what he thought was God's truth, but, as I believe, he had not as yet attained to the idea of the government of God within man, and therefore preached the return of the Messiah. My friend asks if God makes flowers, and if he is, then, an objective God. I will return the question, Do you believe that God makes flowers, and that he is therefore an objective God?

MR. ERRETT. Certainly.

MR. TIFFANY. I have got him where I want him. He says God is an objective God—a finite God. We will find directly what the conclusions resulting from this are, and you will find that it will lead to worse than paganism. I shall show the difference between an objective God and a subjective one, if you have

the understanding to comprehend it. Every thing lives and moves in its omnipresent God. I will explain this by and by.

We are upon the subject of baptism. I was speaking of ordinances, and among them of that of baptism. All that my friend has to sustain him in the position that Jesus baptized with water, is the fact that the disciples did so while he was with them; and on the other hand you have the fact that John declared he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Christ is indeed coming to cleanse and purify and purge, but not to burn any one up. When we come to the subject of eternal punishment we shall talk about my friend's notion of the baptism of fire.

I affirm also, that Christ never instituted the Lord's supper. What took place on that occasion, and which has since been considered an institution of that ordinance, was intended to teach that as bread was necessary for the support of the physical body, so Christ was necessary for the support of the spiritual body. At that supper he called our attention to the constant necessity of having him in ourselves, in all that constituted him a perfect Lord and master, and when he said on a previous occasion, except a man eat my flesh and drink my blood, he hath no part in me, he referred to the same truth, viz., that we cannot be perfect, can not see God, except as we incorporate his nature, his love, his wisdom in us. By his blood is figuratively represented his life, and we are taught that we must live his life, we must feed upon his word and truth, that meat of which his disciples had at that time no knowledge—without that we could not be his disciples. That saying, that he would give his flesh to them to eat, offended many of his disciples so that they went back and followed him no more; it was to them a hard saying. When Christ blessed the bread and wine, he referred to the symbolic meaning of the food, by which we nourish our bodies, and if you will notice the figurative meaning, you will see how far it is above a mere ordinance. We must eat and drink, or we die. We must do it constantly. No matter if we ate yesterday, we must eat again to-day, if we would live. That which we eat must be digested and assimilated and incorporated into our bodies, becoming a part of us. You know this very well in regard to our physical bodies, and now suppose your soul feeds upon Christ's spiritual body, will it not need to do so just as constantly? Does not your spiritual life depend upon your having your spirit constantly united to Christ's spirit? Can it live a day, an hour, without having its spiritual food? No, you must partake daily of the spiritual blood which is Christ's life, and the spiritual flesh which is Christ's word of truth! That is the explanation of the figure. Christ's body and blood must be spiritually taken into you and incorporated into you, becoming a part of you. It must become your truth and your life, or you

are not his disciple. Will that doctrine make people worse? Is it a bad translation of the figure? When Christ said, "as often as ye eat this," &c., he referred to the frequency of eating food; as often as we eat we are to reflect upon the necessity of spiritual support, thus testified. When he told them to do it in remembrance of him, he did not mean in remembrance of his suffering and death, but in remembrance of him as a living teacher. Can you hate an enemy? Remember him, and cease to hate. Can you feel the monitions of lust? Remember him, and put away that lust. Paul made it typically represented by the passover. That may be done if the higher meaning is not shut out; but the sacrament that you and I eat should be every mouthful that goes to our lips. While we are nourishing the perishable body, we should be as constantly nourishing our spirits. Such was Christ's institution. It was not intended to stir your sympathies by the remembrance of his sufferings, but to stir up the good that is in you—the life and soul—and cause you to grow up into his love and wisdom, so that he could manifest himself to you. Compare this idea of the sacrament with the formal one of the passover, and tell me which is the holier one; which utters the highest truth. Tell me which holds up Jesus of Nazareth as the living bread and wine of the soul. The language of the Holy One is, "Ho, every one that thirsteth." There is beauty and divinity in that, and the common view as taken by my friend takes away the charm. I do not stand here to say I am inspired. No matter where I got the idea. I can only say it is true, and that it does honor to our Father in Heaven to suppose that such was the teachings through Christ Jesus. You want Christ to nourish you spiritually, to make you temples for the living God to dwell in. My friend talks about having him for a Saviour to pay a debt for us. Christ never came to pay debts for you and me, or to live a life of righteousness to excuse you and me from doing so. The doctrine was not that God was to be reconciled to the world, but that man, being in fault, needed to be reconciled to Him. Man was in lust and crime, and needed some one to point the way out of the darkness and lead him to the light. Christ was that light; it was incarnated in him, and he is to the world a burning and shining light. He is the Sun of Righteousness, and carries healing in his beams. Now, as we try to find what was Christ's mission, as well as what his works were, we shall better understand what was the baptism of the Spirit and for what it was needed. Water baptism means nothing of itself, it only *represents* the death unto sin and renewed life unto God, and as a mere representation, expressing what the mind knew before, cannot be valuable. Whereas, the baptism that makes us wise, and puts God's law in our understanding, and writes it in our hearts, so that we grow up, step by step into all truth, that is an all-important baptism—the bap-

tism of the Spirit of Truth. It is by its influence that all honest, earnest truth-seeking men and women, are raised up from degree to degree in their character, and from glory to glory ; till all ideas of formalism and Judaism shall drop from their minds, as I have no doubt they did from Peter's in the spirit world, and they drink in large draughts of Divine truth. If we have the true desire to know truth as it is, free from all prejudices and preconceived notions, we shall by and by begin to feel the spirit within our souls, illuminating our minds, giving us new thoughts, and showing us higher doctrines behind those verbal formulas which we had supposed described mere forms and ordinances. Then all literal contradictions shall disappear and we shall find one spirit breathing through the whole. The skeptic is disarmed when once he begins to get the key of the kingdom ; the truth will begin to come into his heart. Not all at once, but it will come, and he will be little inclined to run after degrading manifestations of spiritual power, but will strive after the higher truths which will make him wise unto salvation.

MR. ERRETT.

We have one point finally settled, so that I think there will be no further misunderstanding about it. It is that Christ got his teachings direct from the Father and not from any spirit, whilst all these communications of spirits in these days, come from spirits and not from the Father, and therefore they *can not* be identical in character with Christianity. For this very reason the teachings of Jesus are trustworthy ; they are true, *all* true ; they are pure, all pure ; they are righteous, all righteous ; they are spiritual, all spiritual ; whilst those of Modern Spiritualism are neither true, nor pure, nor righteous, nor spiritual. If, therefore, it is possible to settle the point at all, this decides that there is no identity of character in the systems. It is now settled by the admissions of my friend himself, and he can never make them stand side by side without working miracles. To ask a man to come down from the teachings of the universal Father, to the trifles, nonsense, filth, falsehood and iniquity embraced in the teachings of Modern Spiritualism (and embraced in it by the gentleman's own definition, for he says you must take it *all* in), to do this, and believe that the source of both is the same, is most preposterous. Let any one take the vileness of Mr. Gridley's book (*Astounding Facts from the spirit world*), which I dare not read before this audience, and do you think he could force himself to believe it came from the same source with Jesus' teachings, from the Divine Father ? There is not a parent here to-day, father or mother, who would dare let some of the spirits' books I have, go into their families.

No one who has any regard to common decency would do it. So far from being identical with Jesus' teachings, they are as much at war with them, as darkness is with light. The world is confessedly flooded with lying spirits. The best of them are but imperfectly developed. You can not depend upon any of them for truth, and yet they and their teachings are identical with the teachings of Jesus, who was "truth itself!" I am willing to leave it with your common sense.

He says that all I have to sustain me in regard to water baptism, is that the disciples of the Lord practiced it. That were perhaps enough to sustain it, but I have beside, the authority of my friend *Tiffany* to uphold me, for I read from his book a full endorsement of the practice, and he has not retracted it. I have spoken of the instructions of Christ, and the practice of the disciples under it. The gentleman has acknowledged that when Peter was filled with the Holy Ghost, he baptized *three thousand* with the *power* of the Lord. We have water baptism before the gift of the Holy Spirit, and water baptism after. If it was a preparatory ordinance, it should not be found there afterward. The baptism of the Holy Spirit can not come by commandment, the ordinary baptism which is spoken of in the Scriptures, *was* administered to believers by the express command of Christ.

We are told that Christ never instituted the Lord's supper. What did he do? Turn and read the account. (Matt. xxvi: 26.) "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Mark and Luke give the same account. It was his body *given for them*, that was represented by the bread, and they were commanded to *do this*, keep this ordinance, in remembrance of him. But was there any doubt as to the meaning of the evangelists? Paul removes every uncertainty in the eleventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, saying, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the *Lord's death* till he come," not the Lord's life, mark you, but his *death*, his atonement for our sins. "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And again, "If any man *hunger*, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation." What man in his senses can say that that passage refers to ordinary meals at home? The fact is, that Paul will have to go by the board with Luke in this matter; the gentleman's theories will over-ride them all. But to stand up in the presence of the apostles and evangelists and say whether they taught the truth or not, seems to me the most monstrous arrogance: it is assumption be-

you'd any thing I have ever known. Until he can show an equal inspiration and give the proofs of it, he has no right to stand here to overturn these truths, and shake the confidence of men in the word of the living God. At the Lord's last supper, He was establishing something or other. The gentleman says he was only symbolizing spiritual truth. Well, if so, spiritual truth needed to be symbolized, and the mode of conveying truth which he then chose and established is a divinely-appointed symbol. He who is *the truth* found it advisable to seize upon the symbol. He knew the inside and outside of man's nature, and had explored it through and through. He knew what was in man; He was the way, the truth, and the life, and shall we lightly throw aside, as useless, the ordinance which He established? He perfectly understood our moral and physical nature, and did a thing which is unparalleled in the world; He established an institution to commemorate, not his birth, but his death: not the hour which gave him to the world, but the hour in which he was taken away. That hour, with all its shame and its agonies, was the one in which the veil of the temple was rent and the Holy of holies opened to us, and *Jesus* thought it wise for his disciples to commemorate it by a solemn ordinance, but my friend *Tiffany* declares it quite unnecessary, a mere empty formalism! He is greatly afraid of our being enslaved to forms, but takes a novel mode of preserving us from them, when he would make us multiply the form as often as we eat. Much less danger of formalism no doubt, than there would be if we celebrated it with solemnity, once a week, or month, or season! I saw very well in your countenances, as he was speaking, that many of you regarded his system as an attempt to sweep away the only refuge your souls depend upon. When you look back upon the sins and errors and follies and aberrations of the past, and with sincere repentance look to God for forgiveness, you are told that before high Heaven there is no forgiveness. You have a God that you can not think about. To think about him is to objectify him, and make yourself an *idolater*! You can not think of yourself as holding any relation to him, and every hope of the contrite heart is struck down.

He asks what good such an ordinance as the Communion does? What good do the monuments in the grave-yard do? Why has earth all over its surface, here and there, its monuments to tell of the dead, and remind our souls of those who once were with us but have departed? Why is it that your tears flow afresh when you read there upon the simple slab of marble the name of one who was dear to you in life? You remember them every day in your private hours; but he has studied the human heart but little, who does not know that the visible memento makes an impression far more deep and powerful than any produced by simple reflection. I appeal to you who have fathers and mothers,

brothers and sisters, in the grave; why have you raised a monument over their dust? Was it that you feared you would forget them? No, no! it was because a feeling in your heart urged you to seek remembrances of such a kind. It is akin to that which makes us love to have the portraits of our living friends, which has made the Daguerreotype so universally popular. A principle in our nature calls for some remembrancer of the departed, some "forget-me-not" to link their memory with. Now, if God in his Divine Providence has appointed an ordinance peculiarly fitted to arouse our hearts to the remembrance of the things most necessary for our salvation, what other proof do we need that it is both our duty and for profit to observe it sacredly at the place where we assemble for God's worship, and not at our homes? All death-scenes are sacred. We treasure up the remembrance of the hours of suffering and grief; of the friends that are gone; the songs they sung, the prayers they breathed. But in the death of Him who gave his life a ransom for us, is there nothing in that to profit us in the remembrance? Oh! if I remember my Saviour joyously when I feel his strength helping me in my scenes of toil; if I look upon him with gladness when I see him binding up the broken heart, and giving "the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness;" if I honor him when I see him calling back to life the widow's son, after his mother had lost all hope of seeing him again in this world; shall I forget him in that hour when, in excessive agony, he cried, "Oh, my Father! if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and the waves of darkness rolled over him, and from the gloom and shame he took that which should bring life and light to every heart? Must I banish this from my memory? If I remember him feeding the hungry multitude, and stilling the waves for the frightened disciples; must I forget him when he "gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair?" When I am told that that death and suffering and shame are linked with my life and salvation; that my life grows out of his death, and my hopes are centered in him as the Lamb of God that took away the sins of the world, who loved me unto death, and gave himself to save me in the hour of peril and bitterest necessity; ought not his memory to be dear to me? If there is any thing which can call man from unholy ambition, the carking cares, and the unnumbered defilements which surround us every day, it is that tale of the depths of the Saviour's love, when he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we were healed. If love is ever to rule and sway the human heart, I know of no richer, deeper, fuller, holier love, than pours in upon the soul before the cross of Christ; and it was in view of it that Paul exclaimed, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord

Jesus Christ," and that he was determined to know no one among men, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. Is that the captivating theme in Modern Spiritualism? Any thing but that! I have read what it teaches. I know my friend has more exalted views; I am glad of it; but he is not with other spiritualists: he stands by himself, and even his views are infinitely below those of the Christian who knows in whom he has believed. He says many things which would lead you to suppose that he has proper conceptions of spiritual truth; but in a moment they are overthrown and gone from you, to be seen no more forever,

SEVENTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—During the progress of this discussion my friend has been obliged to admit and state the following positions as true, for the purpose of supporting his argument. 1st, God is not infinite in being, because he is an objective being and is the subject of influences out of himself; for no such being can be infinite. 2nd, God is not infinite in his wisdom, as he is displayed in his works. That is, his plan works out effects not in accordance with his will. He cannot be perfect whilst the fruits of his plan are evil, and by its fruits it should be judged. 3d, Neither is he all-powerful; for the Devil has compelled him to give up his plans, and sacrifice his son. 4th, He is not perfect in glory and happiness; because he would have been better pleased had there been no sin in the universe, and he is, moreover, doing all things *now* for his own glory, thus implying that his glory can be added to. 5th, Neither is God immutable in his state of mind, but only in the laws by which his mind is governed. Hence he is no more unchangeable than any part of his universe; for in it, the laws are unchangeable, the phenomena only changing. If God be all-powerful, he can by miraculous interposition change sin to holiness, and can purify the universe in an instant. The saints and angels would rejoice to see the sinner made holy, and if God has the power, why does he not do it. It is because my friend holds that God changes as man changes, that he affirms verbal prayer has a tendency to change the Divine mind, and that external worship is pleasing to God. 6th, That such a finite being is fit to take the place of the infinite and perfect, and that doctrines based upon such views are proper to be received into man's mind as a basis of truth, and a standard by which to try truth in every part of the universe. 7th, That an appeal to our sympathies is a better way of bringing us to a knowledge of God, than an appeal to our highest and holiest nature. Here you will remember what I said concerning the Lord's supper; that Christ intended to make all our eating and drinking a type of eating and drinking his spiritual body and blood; and that as what we eat enters into our physical body and becomes a part of our physical nature, so must this spiritual food enter into our spiritual body and become an incorporated part of our spiritual nature; and that as we have need of physical food day by day, that we may be nourished into physical life, so we have need of spiritual food day by day, that we may be

nourished into spiritual life. My friend says this was not the object of the Lord—to appeal to our loving, instead of our sympathetic natures. He has not yet learned the difference between our loving and sympathetic natures. He regards it as something that may remind us of suffering, and awaken that reflex feeling, known as sympathy. Now suppose Christ wanted to impress upon his disciples that they should remember his sufferings and death—for what purpose did he do it? That they should mourn over his sufferings, and shed their tears for what he had done and endured? Was this the purpose? Suppose I should say to my friends, “I don’t want you to forget that I have suffered and died; remember my sorrows that your love may be excited through your sympathies;” you will find upon analysis that selfishness lies at the bottom of that impulse. It has its basis in a desire to be famous, to be known and remembered. This ambition for fame is too imperfect and selfish a motive to have entered into the mind of Jesus of Nazareth; it would do no honor to any perfect man. No! If he wished to be kept in remembrance, it was from no such motive; it was on account of no honor or benefit that might accrue to him thereby; but it was for the sake of its influence upon his disciples. Now, which of the interpretations would have the greatest effect in building up the disciple and nourishing his spiritual nature; my friend’s or my own? The construction my friend puts upon it, is infinitely below that which Christ meant; and every one who looks at it in the light of his own understanding, will see that such a construction will not compare, for usefulness and dignity, with the one which I have presented as that intended by Jesus himself. If you simply appeal to your sympathies and sorrows for his sufferings, it does not awaken within you the true spiritual life. It may cause the tear to flow for a moment, but it passes quickly away, like all that is emotional. But when you look at it in the other light, it sinks down into your soul and becomes the very air you breathe, and you come into such a state that you cannot live without partaking of that spiritual food. Here I will leave the matter; each of you may refer to it, and determine which is its true significance.

The baptism of water, my friend says, was a commandment, but the baptism of the Holy Ghost was a promise. How could the disciple baptize into the power of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, without the Spirit? The mere mention of the name is not baptizing into the Father, Son, and Spirit. It implies baptizing into their power and authority. Hence none could baptize except those who had been baptized, because those only who were already baptized, could be mediums for the communication of the power. The power did not originate in Jesus of Nazareth. He said all things were given him of his Father, and that the works which he wrought were not his own, but those of the Father who dwelt in

him. He always represented himself as a medium through whom the Father could operate upon the world, and his disciples were to go forth in his stead; he sending them as the Father had sent him. He told them He had been the medium of Divine communication to the world, and now they were to be the mediums. He had been baptized with the Spirit, and they were to be baptized also. Was it a mere form, or was it necessary that the disciples, or some one, should lay hands upon the convert, that he might receive the Holy Spirit? The answer is simple enough. The position of the disciples was that of mediums between God and man, and it is very plain why the imposition of hands was necessary. Some were so subject to spirit influences that it was not necessary, but generally it was. My friend claims that God could not impart the gift of the Spirit to the Roman Church, till the apostle should go there to impart it to them. This is all plain enough. Christ was a medium; the very term "mediator" signifies medium. He was a *means*, and through him, power was communicated. This is characteristic of all mediums; and the apostles were perfected in their mediumship just in proportion as they were elevated toward Christ's plane of understanding and character. When they inquired how they might work the works which he did, his direction always was that they should become like him. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments, and my Father will love you." Keeping his commandments is not being baptized, and eating bread and wine once a week. His commands are deeper and more fundamental than that: they have reference to the sanctification and purification of the heart; to the overcoming of lusts. It is in this sense that he said, "He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." Though you perform all the baptisms the world has ever seen, your faith is not the true one if you lack this. One other thought—John, the beloved disciple, who was present during all these events, very carelessly omits all mention of Jesus' instituting such an ordinance. In giving the things he thought essential to the salvation of men, he did not think to include that. It is in only two of the evangelists: 'one says (Matt. xxviii: 19.), "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;" and the other is (Mark xvi: 15), "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe;" &c. The one who was most like Christ, the "beloved disciple," never thought to mention that Jesus had established certain ordinances, and has strangely overlooked several other things which have

been thought very essential by people who would flatter themselves with the hope of Christian salvation. In speaking on this subject, my friend assumes that because nothing is mentioned in which the believer was to be baptized, *water* is necessarily meant. There is no proof that Jesus baptized with water. He did not do it, nor did he tell any one else to do it. Before he introduced his own dispensation, he said it was proper to be baptized, and he himself was baptized with water; but that was the baptism of John, and you cannot find within the book, that Christ's baptism was a water baptism. The disciples were to baptize in Christ's stead, and with his baptism; and since that was a baptism of the Holy Ghost, the promise of the Holy Ghost was given to them. If they could not baptize with that, they did not possess Christ's power. If they were to go forth and baptize with Christ's baptism, and if that was a baptism of the Holy Ghost, they could only do it with the gifts of the Spirit. Those who received these gifts could do it; others could not. Hence Christ was only a medium or means of communication, and his disciples were to be in his stead.

My friend remarked, pathetically but not philosophically, that I took away Jesus as a sacrifice for sin. I have already given you the proposition that the Omnipotent can not be frustrated, and the laws proceeding from the Omnipotent can not be suspended, but will work their proper work; God's laws cannot be broken. Hence, if sin be a violation of God's law, man cannot sin. Hence, man is not answerable to God, in his own consciousness, for violating any law with respect to the Divine, neither doth the Father hold him responsible or judge him. The evils of sin are manifest in the consequences of sin, and where no evils are manifest, sin can not be made to appear. Hence it is impossible that man should feel sorrow with respect to God, for God can not be affected. Hence, sin can only have respect to those who are subject to its influence, and sorrow for it can have respect to them alone. Sorrow for sin can only exist with respect to the effects of sin, and hence, man cannot have remorse for sin, or self-condemnation, on account of its effects upon God, for he is not affected by it. If God, therefore, has not been injured in his being, frustrated in his work, defeated in his plans, or obstructed in his will, man has nothing to mourn over, so far as God is concerned. Again, man never intended God any injury, and never did him any, and consequently can not have any remorse or regret therefor.

MR. ERRETT.

I am sorry to say, Mr. Moderator, that my respect for the gentleman's course does not improve as we go on from day to day.

We have before us the proposition that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical in character with those of Jesus of Nazareth. We are now upon the seventh day of the discussion, and he continues to talk *about*, and all round about the subject, without ever coming *at* it. The audience is diminishing day by day, and I feel that the patience of the people is being imposed upon; for after leaving their work for several days, in the expectation of seeing Christianity and Spiritualism fairly compared, they are only told, "I will come to this by and by," and "I will take this up when I come to it," whilst he goes on in a tedious reiteration of his peculiar speculations, never mentioning Modern Spiritualism, or noticing the communications of spirits. He pays as much attention to the subject of pressing importance, as did the boy who, when told to drive the hogs from the field, replied that he would not act rashly; but if the proposition were submitted to him *in writing*, he would take it under consideration till *after harvest*.

I said nothing about water baptism in my last speech, for I was sick of his quibbling on that subject, and had determined to leave it. What profit is it to argue with him about the critical meaning of the language of authors he does not in the least respect, and whom he disposes of with the flippancy he has treated Peter and Luke with, when they give a direct contradiction to his theories? I have sufficiently exposed his manner of treating Scripture, and have forced him to show that his accepting it as an arbiter in this discussion is a mere sham, and that he will not abide by it one moment when it crosses the track of his speculations.

I might let the subject of the Lord's Supper pass in the same way. I will only call your attention to the fact that he has not made the faintest attempt to answer the array of Scripture I presented on the subject, and especially the authoritative interpretation of the apostle Paul. Any one who pretends that the apostle did not treat it as a solemn ordinance, and *not* as an ordinary meal, puts himself beyond the pale of argument.

So in regard to my reply to his quotation of the 19th chapter of Acts upon the subject of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, he puts it by "till he comes to it."

We are told that Jesus was a medium. Well, then, let us have a medium from among your modern spiritualists who will compare with Jesus Christ: one before whom the disciples can throw themselves with rapture, and cry, "My LORD and my GOD." Let us see what similarity, to say nothing of *identity*, he can make out.

He has stated some six or seven propositions which he says I affirm; but I am not conscious of affirming any thing of the kind. If he can prove that they logically flow from what I *did* say, he

is welcome to show it, and I will attend to his logic. All the figments of his imagination which he has presented as a metaphysical system, I will agree to riddle before any intelligent audience; but regarding it as entirely apart from the question under discussion, I shall not impose upon the audience by paying any more attention to it than I can help. I have told the gentleman that, by his system, he can not prove a God. He does not deny it, for he admits that the subject is out of the province of logic and reasoning, and that you can only know him in consciousness.

Two or three other points may be noticed for a single moment. The gentleman said that when Christ was asked what they should do to work the works of God, he told them they must be like him. He told them no such thing. He said (John vi: 29), "This is the work of God, *that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*" I protest against his quoting Scripture till he can quote it correctly. He is constantly quoting it incorrectly, and in the multitude of points I have to notice, I can not always remember to set him right.

He says John did not mention baptism and the Lord's Supper, and there is nothing left unsaid by John: therefore he majesterially rules out Matthew, Mark, Luke, Paul, and the rest. Last winter, spiritualists were telling us, "The gentleman believes the Bible as fully as you do; he reads a chapter and takes a text, and quotes it all the time." I was anxious for this discussion for this very reason; that I might show that the apparent devotion to the Bible was mere pretense. Now we have it. Matthew, Mark, Luke, Peter and Paul, are repudiated; The Old Testament is an "incarnation of animalism," and John is already at war with the gentleman's theory of spiritual appearances, and will go the way of the others before long. Just so with Spiritualism. He repudiates Andrew Jackson Davis, the great Seer, far higher in the spheres than the gentleman can pretend to be, sent forth as the anointed prophet of Spiritualism, with peculiar solemnities: the *Seer* is declared ignorant, and every thing and every body else is ignorant. If it be possible to form a distinct issue at all, it was done yesterday when I affirmed that he admitted a vast difference between Christianity and Spiritualism, when he acknowledged that Jesus Christ obtained his inspiration from the Father direct, and not from spirits. I denied that such an inspiration was true, in any sense, of Modern Spiritualism.

To prove that the Bible is in opposition to Spiritualism, it is only necessary to read the Scripture itself. Paul says, sin is a transgression of the law. Mr. Tiffany says sin is not a transgression of the law. I can not promise to notice every quibble of this kind. Most of you are well enough read in Scripture to notice them for yourselves.

I shall now compare the teachings of the two systems in several respects in addition to those I have already noticed. I quote first from the Saviour, to show that God makes the laws of the universe (Matt. vi: 28); "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if *God* so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Again, (Matt. vi: 9), "After this manner therefore, pray ye: Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name; Thy kingdom come, *thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven.*" Now turn to Modern Spiritualism, and read from the *Great Harmonia*, 2, 348. "The laws of Nature, like Nature itself, and the human soul, *were not created by the Deity*, but were and are the spontaneous attributes of his Divine existence and constitution. * * Here I affirm that the Deity did no more create the laws of Nature, *than they did create him.*" In the same paragraph he says, "All argument concerning the possibility of *special Providences*, or of supernatural manifestations and miracles of any character or extent, which are claimed and believed by many nations, sects, and individuals, can have their intrinsic value summarily determined by the syllogistic form of demonstration," and he forthwith determines, to his own satisfaction, that that value is no greater than that of "any other absurdity and fallacy." On page 349, he says, "Hence it is unreasonable and unrighteous to believe that God takes special notice of those numerous transgressions, by which individuals only injure and experimentally educate themselves." On page 354, he declares the manner in which God answers prayer to be mediate and indirect. In these respects, Spiritualism is in direct antagonism to the teachings of Jesus, who taught both the special Providence of God over his works, and the direct answer to prayer, as I have shown from his words. Compare also Davis' denial that God notices our transgressions, with those words of Christ (Matt. xii: 36), "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." According to Spiritualism, God does not care a farthing whether you tell a lie or the truth: it is of no consequence to him whether you are abominable as a devil, or holy as an angel. It is only a question of profit and loss concerning yourself.

Again Christ says (Mark vii: 21), "From within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: *all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*"

Contrast with this the following passage from Davis' "*Present*

Age," page 215: "I find no intrinsic corruption in the soul of man. All 'evil,' so-called, and 'sin' are external." There is no sin and evil *within* at all!

"The works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me (John v: 36). So says Jesus. Mr. Davis says (Divine Revelations, page 511), "The miracles, as recorded in the New Testament, are of such a nature as only to create fear and marvelousness in the minds of those who might witness them; and also in the minds of those who hear or read the accounts of them. * * There exists in them no grand and elevated principles—no intrinsic beauty or excellence, which can have any tendency to benefit or re-organize mankind. It is well to inquire what possible good can arise from a *little experiment*, like that of turning water into wine, or from any of a similar nature?" Then he passes on to the consideration of the "possession by Devils," and reasons that out of existence in the same way.

Let these passages go side by side as a representation of identity of the philosophy of Spiritualism with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. The question is not now as to the truth of either, but as to their identity. If the gentleman would deny the truth of Christ's teachings, let him take open infidel ground, and we will meet him there: but I protest against his coming here to give utterance to abominable sentiments, and still pretending to be a better Christian than any the world has seen. I am here as one professing to believe in the Holy Scriptures. I affirm that Modern Spiritualism is not identical with Christianity, but that if Christianity be true, the spiritualist is a miserably-deluded man, robbed of the peace which God gives those that love him. He is bankrupt in all that is promised in the gospel of Christ. I am here to compare the two, and prove that they are incongruous and have no identity.

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii: 16). *John* said that; not *Matthew*, *Mark*, or *Luke*. Again, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John iii: 36). Such is the teaching of Jesus;—such the promises to those who have faith in him. Listen now to Davis, upon the same subject (Divine Revelations, page 516).

"Faith,—what is it? Certainly it is a conviction of the judgment, resulting from appropriate and adequate evidence. Then it is an effect derived from knowledge. It is therefore *void of all merit or demerit*, inasmuch as it is a natural consequence of known facts, and not a voluntary acquirement of the mind. Is it proper to call upon man to believe an inconsistency, in order that he may escape an irretrievable condemnation? This, indeed, is the most unnatural demand that folly can possibly urge."

There are the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth and of Modern Spiritualism upon the subject of *Faith*. Place them side by side and judge for yourselves.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend is all the while proclaiming on your behalf, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I am protracting this discussion. It is chargeable upon himself, rather than upon me; for at the outset, if he had either admitted or denied my propositions, and discussed them, we might have come to some conclusion. He has scarcely admitted or denied any of them, but has only picked flaws in them, and kept me busy noticing his attacks. Before we can settle whether Spiritualism and Christianity agree, we must settle what both are: I am not to take his views of Christianity, but to go to the book and see what it is. I am showing that adopting his standard of faith, he falls inevitably into contradiction and absurdity. By it, he can prove no doctrine. His standard is, that the literal meaning is all that is intended to be conveyed by the Scripture, and that there is nothing beneath, to be spiritually understood. The reader must yield up his judgment, and become the blind devotee of authority. The propositions I have laid down, neither he nor any man can meet. The doctrine of the immutability of God overthrows every article of his creed. My business is to show this, and that his conclusions are false. It is of this that he complains. Starting with the idea that God is finite, limits the Deity in all his action. Truth will harmonize, but if your Bible teaches what he says it teaches, it will not harmonize with truth, and is false. His notions of the Bible impugn the wisdom of God. I stand here prepared to show that the Bible is true, and to defend the immutability of God. I brought my propositions on purpose to have him meet them, and I insist that they come within the legitimate scope of the discussion. My friend's interpretation of the Bible is not the true one. No such interpretation can make it the "wisdom and power of God unto salvation." For taking this position I am charged with being an infidel, and with throwing Mark and Luke overboard. I stand here uttering my most solemn protest against misinterpreting God's word.

"The works that I do, they bear witness of me," said Christ. I grant it; but to whom? To those who cannot receive a higher witness. They are only addressed to man in his ignorance, arresting his attention, and fixing his mind upon Divine things. But when man is fitted to perceive the truth spoken in the soul, he has an evidence such as no external work can give. If my friend would carefully examine Mr. Davis, he would see that it

was in this last sense that he was speaking, and that in that sense he speaks the truth. There was a time when Christ's miracles were evidence to me, and I receive them still, but perhaps not as what you would call miracles. I have, now, far higher evidence that Christ was the Son of God, than any miracles or wonder-working could be.

My friend claims to prove that Christianity and Spiritualism are not identical, by showing that Christ said evil comes from within, whilst Mr. Davis says it is outward. The fact is, both said the same thing, only in a little different manner. Christ spoke of sin as proceeding from the carnal love, and that love or desire Mr. Davis includes in what he calls outward. We all say it is from the selfish and lustful heart that these things proceed, and Davis calls it the outward and not the inmost heart or affection. The difference is not in meaning but in use of terms; and the fault is in my friend's interpretation of Davis.

I do not purpose to follow through all his asserted contradictions, because it would take up too much time.

The last proposition which I laid down in reference to sin, he is invited to notice here or elsewhere. He says Paul defined sin, "a violation of the law," and I said it was not. Well, Omnipotence cannot be frustrated, can it? Yea or nay! If not, its laws will ultimate their perfect work: will they not? Hence, God's laws cannot be broken in respect to himself or his government; because they are omnipotent. Hence, in respect to God and his government, man cannot sin; for he cannot suspend an omnipotent law. Here are propositions which must be harmonized with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, or you have got to give up your intellect and become the blind vassals of authority. If there is a straightforward, consistent way, in which there is harmony between the intellect and the Bible, it is more likely that it should be the true meaning of the Bible, than that the two should conflict at every step. I will show by my principles that the Bible is all consistent with the perfections of God, and that man, if he would obtain perfect salvation, must do it in the way *really* pointed out by the Bible; for there is no other way than that which Christ pointed out, which is consistent with all the attributes of the infinite God. Now, when my friend says I take a position opposed to the Bible, by saying that God's omnipotence can not be frustrated, let him take the opposite view and support it, if he will. His notions of a sacrificial atonement have their origin in the idea that Satan, somehow, had made a jar in God's government which it was necessary to set right; and I freely grant such notions must be given up, and if they are taught in the Bible, either it or God must be given up. I claim to show that the Bible does not teach them.

I will go as fast as my friend pleases, when once he has met

these points; but if he stops me with a mere show of logic without truth or reason, and forces me to take time to expose his fallacies, we shall not get along so fast.

Under the first covenant, it was necessary to have teachers to expound the truth to their neighbors; but under the second, men are to be taught by the spirit of truth, so that all shall know God, and the spirit of truth shall lead them into all truth. A spiritual standard shall be set up in man, by which he shall be made wise.

My friend said I have not quoted Scripture correctly. I may not have made a literal quotation in all cases, but I challenge him to show that I have misapplied the meaning of a single quotation. He gave as an instance the passage concerning those who do the works of Christ, being those who believe on him. But who is he that believeth? Why, he that doeth his will and keeps his commandments. That constitutes the true Christian faith. I do not call that a misquotation.

Again to those who are under the first covenant, the Divine Being appears as one subject to external influences, by means of which he is pleased or displeased, made angry or pacified, and that he blesses or curses according to his pleasure or displeasure, and his favor is propitiated by religious services. Such are my friend's views, if I can understand him.

In the second dispensation, man does not believe that God is subject to outward influences, but that his love is unchanging. Christ made it all turn upon this, viz., the condition of the recipient; his fitness to receive. The only real restraint upon the flow of Divine influences into the soul, is that which grows out of the condition of the recipient. If we would be like God, we must love our enemies as friends, and make no distinction in our love of them, for God makes none in his.

Again, those who are under the first dispensation seek God from a selfish impulse, for the purpose of gaining Heaven and its happiness. It is in such a case that the "prayer of the wicked" is said to be sin. Those who are under the second dispensation, are under the influence of love, pure and holy; are directed by spiritual light; are drawn toward God, and have arrived at that point where perfect love casteth out fear. Those who are under the first, suppose that God has need to be informed of things which concern them, and that he can be moved by such motives as they can present, to change his purposes. Such persons love to pray in meeting-houses and synagogues, and at the corners of streets, so as to be heard by others besides God. Those who are under the second, retire from the world, going apart to a secret place, and there commune with their Father. They purify their lives and affections, that Divine love and wisdom may flow into their conscious being. Those who are under the first dispensation set apart particular seasons and places for worship, and think one day

more sacred than other days of the week. Some say they must go up to Jerusalem to worship, and others that they must go to Mount Gerizim. Those who are under the second dispensation, devote *all* their time to the work of the world's redemption; they pray to their Father in secret, and strive to be delivered from *sin*, and not from its consequences. They press forward toward elevation of character and more perfect communion and harmony with the Divine. The subjects of the first dispensation fancy that God has somehow provided a way to wipe out all their sins at once, and receive them into the Divine love and joy; not knowing that the only salvation is from sin, instead of from its effects. This last salvation was the only one Jesus of Nazareth taught.

As these governmental dispensations have their basis in the degrees of the mental unfolding of man and his development in love, so is it also in the spirit spheres. Hence as man has three natures, and there are three governments, so there are three spheres, viz., the Gehenna, the Paradise, and the Paradise of God. The subjects of the various dispensations on earth have intercourse with the spirits of the related spheres. The man of the first dispensation can only communicate with the spirits of Gehenna, and therefore it was necessary for a new dispensation to open the way to a higher sphere. The second dispensation must perform its work, and then the third, known as the millennium, shall come. The men of the first dispensation are said to be in darkness, and the spirits of Gehenna in the grave. They are figuratively represented as in Egypt, under taskmasters, making brick without straw. But the time is coming when they that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and live!

MR. ERRETT.

I wish to read, first of all, a passage from my friend's lectures (page 308), bearing upon the question of his accuracy in using Scripture.

"Thus in Nazareth, he was unsustained by the faith of those about him; and the result was, he could do no mighty works there, because of their unbelief." I ought, perhaps, to go further back, to do him justice. He was arguing, on the preceding page, that Jesus was under the necessity of having faith, in order to perform his miracles, and could not always succeed without the aid of faith on the part of others. "Hence," he says, "he frequently enquired of those who asked his aid, 'Believe ye that I am able to do this.' He could not always succeed without such assistance." It is in this connection he made the remark I first quoted. Now, I defy him to show that he gives either the words or the sense of the

passage he has misquoted. The words of the Bible are (Matt. xiii: 58), "And he did *not many* mighty works there, because of their unbelief;" the implication being that he did *some* mighty works, notwithstanding their unbelief, as indeed Mark directly asserts. Take another example, which I intended to refer to a day or two ago, and overlooked. He positively denied that the Bible speaks of the spirit as *lusting* against the flesh, because he wished to consider that word as being *always* used in a bad sense. He declared the *Greek* would be found different, if the English was not. The same passage he has misquoted in his book, giving it thus, quotation marks and all (lectures, page 259); "The spirit *warreth* against the flesh, and the flesh *lusteth* against the spirit." Turn now to your Bibles (Galatians v: 17), and you read,—"*For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh,*" and the English version corresponds exactly to the Greek, but the one verb, *epithumein*, being used. What makes this of some importance is that he attempted in both these cases to found an argument upon the particular form of the words. These examples are enough to establish my point.

He charges me with adopting an improper system of interpretation to support my positions. I have simply read the Scriptures, leaving it to you to draw conclusions from the passages. It is himself who brings in a labored system of interpretation, involving far-fetched "spiritual meanings," and decrying apostles and evangelists when they contradict him; and he does this although he has taken away from himself every pretense of authority to interpret, by assuming that the same inspiration is necessary to receive as to impart truth.

Yesterday my friend was back upon the ordinary canons of interpretation, or what are called the received principles of Hermeneutics: to-day he don't find it convenient for his purpose, and flies from it again. I think your judgment will bear me out in asserting that I have fairly met him upon his ideas of interpretation.

He says I have not met his propositions. I have not taken them up in order. That was not necessary; but I have shown of some of them, that they were mere facts, to be received upon authority, according to his own principles. Of that most important one of them, that God can only be known in consciousness, I have forced him to admit that it *can not be proved*, and that logic has nothing to do with it. Whoever receives it, therefore, must do so upon authority or upon experience. Whenever he brings up God's omnipotence and reasons about it, I show him that he objectifies and finites God (in his own language), by reasoning concerning him. I show him, also, that his notion of God's immutability, is utterly contradictory to the idea of God's being a *living, thinking, soul*. I contend that in so doing, I have fairly

met all that is essential in his propositions, and demolished them, so that he can not base any sound argument upon them. I believe that there is not a soul in the audience, who can form any conception of such a God as the gentleman talks of: a God who can not be loved, adored, or *thought of*, but only felt, and that imperfectly, in some sublimated form of meditative consciousness. I claim that it is *he* who demands that you should give up your intellect and your common sense; for, by his principles, the moment you use your intellect, your judgment, your sound sense, in regard to Deity, that moment you objectify and limit him, and create an idol which is no God! Which, then, demands that you should give up your intellect? It is he who would make of you (to use his favorite phrase) "blind vassals of authority." You learn nothing of the Deity from him but upon his authority; for reason and judgment are repudiated in the matter. And what do you receive, even in that way? Nothing to think about, nothing to perceive, nothing to know; for any of these mental operations would make, he says, an objective and false God!

A moment, now, as to my interpretation of Davis. He says Davis and Christ teach the same doctrine as to the source of evil, for Christ meant *outward* love, when he said the affections of the *heart*. You see how it is that the "letter killeth." We have thought that our *inner* nature needed purifying, but it turns out that it is the outward nature that Christ referred to! He *said* within, but he *meant* without! There are *two* "withins," and we have to refer to the gentleman to tell us which is referred to, when it is said, "The kingdom of heaven is within you." I suppose we shall learn "when he comes to it." I appeal to you if I have spent much time in explaining or interpreting Spiritualism. I have left it with bare quotations, and if he would do the same by Christ's teachings, I fancy much of his time would be saved.

The gentleman dwelt at some length upon the difference between the old covenant and the new. I will show how the apostle presents the difference. The members of the old covenant, who entered the church by birth, were to be *taught* to know the Lord; but in the new dispensation, they come into the covenant by a new birth and spiritual regeneration, and therefore come with a knowledge of the kingdom of Jesus Christ previously obtained. The *least* comes knowing that; for all, from the least to the greatest, in an institution requiring faith and repentance, must have that amount of knowledge.

But I can not see what reason my friend has to spend time upon the old and new covenants; for, by his system, there is certainly little to choose between them. He tells us that there is no baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that when it comes, it will only cause a speaking with tongues, as in the case of Peter; and what

is said in such circumstances, he takes the liberty of calling false. The prospect is, certainly, not very encouraging.

A word with regard to the gentleman's comments upon the passage, "The works that I do, they bear witness of me." He tells us they were evidence to persons of so low a nature that they could not understand higher proof. He has some strange notions upon Christ's miracles, and I will read from page 306 of his Lectures :

"It was through the power which the Spirit possesses over the media of vitality and sensation, that Christ was enabled to cure diseases, to feed the multitude, or to convert water into wine, and he taught his disciples that they could exercise the same power, through the same instrumentality. * * When he sent them out to preach the coming of the kingdom of heaven, he empowered them to do these things by authorizing them to do them in his name. *His name* was the *great charm* they were to use. He inspired them with the belief that, by using his name, they could command his power. * * * Could he have given them confidence in *any other charm*, it would have answered the purpose *equally as well*. * * That conviction (i. e., that they could command the power) might be awakened by the use of the name of Christ, or by the use of *any thing else* in which they had equal confidence." What a beautiful convincing power there was in miracles! They could cast out devils in the name of a hickory stick, as well as in the name of Christ, if they only had confidence in it *as a charm*! Will any man of common sense admit that any thing wrought before his eyes by such charms, could have any tendency to convince him that the thing uttered was truth from God? If there ever was a time when such works were evidence to the gentleman, I think his philosophy has done him some good in making him progress beyond it. Again, on the 321st page of his Lectures, he says this power "has existed from the earliest ages of the human family," and "that which in the earlier ages of antiquity was considered *miraculous*, as proceeding directly from the special interposition of God, or magical, as coming through the agency of the Devil, will be found to be rational, and as truly subject to certain physical conditions, as any other phenomena in nature." He frequently refers to the same thing in his Lectures. On page 323, he says, "Under the instructions of Joseph Smith, the Mormon can call the elders of the church, go to his sick brother and pray, and anoint him with oil, and lay on his hands and command the fever to depart," and that confidence in those means will very probably be sufficient to effect a radical cure. Of course, then, such evidence is as good proof of the truth of one's doctrines in this last case as in any other. It results, therefore, in this : that Christ must have been as much of

an impostor as Joe Smith, or Mohammed, or any other deceiver. Where is the connection between Christ's miracles and the truth of his doctrines? The gentleman can show none, for he says (Lectures, page 327), "*Mormonism is not without its miracles, and they are as true and genuine as ever were performed!*" Place such doctrines beside Jesus' declaration that his works bore witness to the truth of his teachings, and see how much identity you can find between them. Remember that the question is not which is true, but are they *identical in character?*

The gentleman remarked, also, that faith and obedience are synonymous in Scripture. I deny it. It is one thing to say that faith *springs from* obedience, but quite another to say the terms are synonymous. Again, he said Christians look for some other means of salvation, beside renouncing their sins and seeking for righteousness. I need hardly say, in this community, that it is an unjust representation of the churches. It is certainly not taught in the pulpits here, nor in those known as orthodox throughout the land, that a person can, by any observance of ceremonies and rites, have the favor of God and peace in his soul, without utterly renouncing sin and evil, and every thing that tends downward and hell-ward. In the creed of what church do you find it, sir? In none at all; and least of all in Christianity itself. I only mention these things to show how little reliance can be placed upon his statements of what are the teachings of the church, or of Christ.

I will close this argument with contrasting Spiritualism with Christianity, in reference to the object of the death of Christ. *Jesus* says (John x: 15), "*I lay down my life for the sheep.*" (Luke xxii: 20), "*This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.*" The same truth is expressed in many other like passages. *Spiritualism* says, through Mr. Davis (Divine Revelations, 521), "*The death of Christ had no possible connection with the sins of the world, nor with the cause of sin.*" On page 516 of the same work, speaking of the atonement, he says, it "*involves a charge of injustice, unworthy the deeds and character of a heathen potentate.*" In Judge Edmonds' second volume, page 153, he gives a vision of the cross of Christ, and says, "*Directly over the summit of the cross was a scroll which seemed to spread abroad a feeling of solemn awe. On it was inscribed, 'He saved mankind by living, not by dying.'*" Below the transverse piece was a small scroll, on which was written. "*Do thou likewise.*" Such is the plan of salvation Spiritualism offers. Are they identical?

MR. TIFFANY.

It does make some difference in the understanding an audience gets of a person's idea, whether it is presented properly and clearly or not. My friend has read from a volume of lectures of mine to show that I contradicted myself when I said there was a time when Christ's works were an evidence of his Divine mission, but that I have now a higher evidence than that. Now here is the proposition which was under discussion in my lecture: That the mind has power over diseases of the body, to cure them by its own strong, energetic action. Nothing is more common than sickness which is caused by the state of mind, and since it is universally admitted that the mind's influence over the body is very powerful, there is nothing that need alarm any one in my assertion that if a sick person exercise strong faith, it will have an influence upon his disease. This power was often supposed to be miraculous, and the effect of Divine energy. In my book, I gave a long list of cases from medical books, showing how often the body is influenced in this way, and that the mind may, by its own thought or volition, utterly extinguish animal life. The condition of the powerful influence is strong faith and expectation. Now, if my friend will take issue upon that proposition, we will meet. The fact is recognized as true, by the whole medical world, and if Christianity conflicts with that, it conflicts with a truth. It was by this action of spirit upon matter, that Christ's works were produced. My position was that Christ, owing to the development and unfolding of his being, had the power from the Father, which enabled him to do these works in accordance with the immutable laws of God's universe.

I will read a few lines in the connection from which the gentleman quoted—(page 827, Tiffany's Lectures):

"But the world will eventually become too much enlightened to attribute these and the like phenomena to any special interposition of God. But this enlightenment will not banish God from the world; on the contrary, it will reveal him in every thing we behold. We shall then recognize his presence in the thunder and tempest, in the still, small voice of the evening zephyr, and the noontide calm. We shall hear him in the roaring of the lion, and the chirping of the grasshopper; in the thundering of the cataract and the purling of the rill; in the warbling of the linnets' note, and the music of the celestial spheres. We shall perceive him fashioning worlds, suns, and systems, by the same presence and law with which he fashions the dew-drop upon the flower, or the tear-drop that moistens the mourner's eye. We shall feel him in our own souls, drawing us to himself by the cords of infinite love, wisdom, and power; and then, and not till then, shall we understand that we are children and heirs of God and

joint heirs with Christ to an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.

"Think not that the age of Reason will be an age of infidelity. Reason is the first-begotten of God and truth; it is the first-born child of immortality. The age of Reason will be an age of faith in God, not altogether derived from books of ancient or modern date; but derived from the revelation which he has made of himself in his works, and the divine instructions of an enlightened and purified soul. It will be an age of hope and redemption: redemption from sin, redemption from ignorance, and redemption from all the ills that flesh is heir to, through the ignorance, passion, and lust of this age of superstitious darkness and gloom."

Now that is to deny Christianity and the divinity of Christ, is it? If there is a position taken there, in regard to faith, which fact and science do not sustain, then I will admit it to be false; and if Jesus Christ, in all his works, did not harmonize with all the works of his Father as they are manifested in all the infinite round, then I will admit myself to be infidel. The idea that Christ's works were wrought by special interposition of Divine power, is owing to a lack of knowledge in our minds. When we come into communion with the Father as Christ did, we shall be in a position to enable us to do the same works as he did. He has every where taught this. To deny it, is to deny Christianity, the power of God, and the power of Christ's mission to redeem the world. Any other theory would make us seek our Christ in the dead body at the sepulcher, and we should need another angel to tell us that he is living and must be alive in our own souls, in order to do us any good.

In talking of my interpretations, the gentleman says he supposes I consider Jesus and Mr. Davis as teaching the same doctrine on the origin of evil actions, because Jesus says "within," and Mr. Davis says, "without." If my friend would drop his literalism a moment, he might see how they were consistent. Here there are three natures or lives. The physical and selfish is called the external or outward, and by it, man is impressed by outward objects. The inner or moral nature is that which takes cognizance of relations, and the laws which should control us in our intercourse with other finite and objective intelligences. The third or *inmost* is the divine, the *central*, and it alone enables us to commune with the Father. All outside of it is called external in Mr. Davis' phraseology; and this *external* includes the same mental and emotional nature which Christ includes in the terms "*heart*," and "*within*," in the particular passage quoted.

My next proposition is this. As a lawgiver, Moses was the representative of the animal nature, and his institutions, the expressions of that nature; so Jesus was the representative of the

spiritual nature, and his laws, the expression of that spiritual nature. Moses was a type of God by absolute contrast; but Jesus was a type of God by similarity. The life under the first and second dispensations are contrasted in like manner, and the harmony of the two is found amid this apparent antagonism; only noticing that both typify or represent the same things, by the two modes of contrast and similarity. The "key of the kingdom" must unlock and open the book so as to show this harmony in differences running through the whole.

Hence, as Moses and his institutions were an expression of the animal or fleshly nature, and as Jesus and his institutions were an expression of the spiritual nature, there is necessarily an antagonism between the two; for the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit warreth against the flesh. Each will war or antagonize with the other. Christ showed this in his first sermon, and declared that the old should not continue, but the new should take its place. For this purpose it is necessary that the spiritual communication with the other world should be kept open, that the disciple may be led into all truth; for the things of the Spirit must be spiritually discerned, and man's spiritual nature must be carefully cultivated by means of such communications, that he may be enabled to grasp higher and still higher spiritual truths. The illumination of the Divine Spirit can not take place till the disciple passes into the second dispensation, and so becomes subject to the Divine impulse. God could have inspired Moses with a perfect knowledge, as well as Christ, were it not for the difference in their own spiritual cultivation. God can not, in consistency with his laws, give power to one who is not capable of receiving, nor is it wise or good that he should do so: it would destroy the harmony and glory of the universe, and of the Divine nature itself.

Christ consummated his work by overcoming the world in his own soul, and putting down all rule and power within him but the Divine, and when the disciple puts on Christ, he does likewise, overcoming every sinful and selfish desire. When he has done this, to him will Christ "appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation;" he will appear spotless before God, will be "born of God," and can say, "I have seen the Father." This spiritual unfolding may take place while we are in the flesh, as it did with Jesus of Nazareth. It all depends upon our own character and the life we live, and whether we make love and truth our meat and drink. The only important question is, to which of our natures do we yield ourselves "servants to obey?" We may become subjects of spiritual influence from Gehenna, and be ruled by demons, or we may be led by the lovely spirits of Paradise, and illuminated by their inspiration. Nay, we may go higher, and be the subject of influences purely divine; and we will be, if ever the millennium dawns upon earth.

Every individual is subject to influences from the spirit spheres, in accordance with his unfolding and love; and different persons in the same community, and even the same family, may be in communication with very different spheres: "one shall be taken, and the other left," according to their own planes or conditions of soul.

All associations of spirits are according to their affinities, affinities are according to the ruling loves, and hence ruling loves determine to what sphere a soul belongs. If his love is that of the spirits in Gehenna, in Paradise, or if it is the absolute and divine love, his spirit sphere will be determined accordingly.

Hence the laws of mind have their basis in the situation of the mind itself. They are therefore the same in every age of the world, because the situation of mind has been the same. The laws of spiritual affinity have in like manner been uniform, and for the same reasons. They are the same to-day that they were when Jesus of Nazareth was on earth, or when Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt. So, also, the laws of mental impressibility are the same in all ages of the world, and the same conditions of receiving influences exist now as formerly.

Hence *inspiration*, which is only the inbreathing of thought, feeling, or sentiment into the soul, is given by the same law of mental impressibility to-day, which governed its manifestation eighteen hundred years ago. The needs of the mind are the same to-day, so far as its nature is concerned; they are the same in all ages, and unless God changes the administration of his government, the same laws will continue while eternity endures. When you have ascertained the law of an existence, it is inseparable from the existence itself; hence, under Christ's system of teaching, those only can be inspired like him who are developed to the plane of his inspiration. All turns upon the condition of the mind, and the law of your mental advancement is as immutable as God. It is only by perfecting himself in the spiritual, that man can be unfolded in the Divine: it is only by obeying the moral laws of Christ that we can attain to Divine inspiration. For this reason it was necessary that Jesus should unfold his disciples in the spiritual of their natures, that they might ultimately become susceptible of divine inspiration. They had to eat of the same bread and drink of the same wine with Christ: there was no other way known under heaven among men, whereby they could be saved.

Again, the exertion of spiritual influence upon man increases his susceptibility, and as he advances he can receive higher and holier inspiration. The history of the disciples attests this truth. My friend said I had no business to read and interpret the Scripture unless I pretended to divine inspiration. If he would recognize the three spheres which I have explained, he would see

that in the intellectual and relational, reason is absolute; it stands at the helm; is arbitrator and judge. There is a difference between inspired history and doctrine, which he must recognize.

Inspiration is progressive, and is in accordance with the capacity of the subject. It can be perfect only when the recipient's character is perfected in the divine.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish to notice some matters spoken of in my friend's closing speech in the morning, before proceeding further. He asked me to deny that the mind has power, under certain circumstances, to control disease. I raised no such issue as that. I believe that the mind has such power, under certain circumstances, but I shall not spend time in defining those circumstances. The point I raised was, that the gentleman, in his book, denied that Christ's mighty works were miraculous at all, but identifies them with Mormon miracles, and asserts that the name of Christ was a mere charm, which was no more powerful than the name of the Devil, or any thing else would be, if only they could exercise some faith in it. I said that the miracles of the Scriptures were thus entirely made away with. This point was not explained by any thing the gentleman subsequently read.

My friend has had a good deal to say, first and last, about God's immutability, but it really seems to me that he does not argue very consistently with it. He tells us that though the world had been going on for thousands of years, under the dispensation of Moses, "the incarnation of animalism," no one had reached a high whence he could commune with the Divine, but that Jesus was the first to whom the Father made himself known. But if Jesus was the first to whom God revealed himself, then, at that time, *something new* was done by the Deity, and God put forth an act which was a *change* in him. Thus, the gentleman is continually crossing and contradicting his own doctrines, for he has insisted that God could not change, either in thought, action, or sensation.

He gives us, also, another explanation of what Mr. Davis meant by external evil, and endeavored to show that it was not at variance with Christ's teaching. I will read a few lines from Mr. Davis himself, as the only answer called for (page 215, *Present Age*): "All 'evil,' so called, and 'sin' are *external*. How can God be inwardly depraved? If the spirit of man comes not from the infinite fountain of goodness, and love, and wisdom, and perfection, whence, then, is his life derived? * * All human evil, so called, can be incontestably and mathematically demonstrated

to proceed, not out of the essences of the soul, but from the following external and superficial sources: First, Progenitive or hereditary misdirection; Second, Educational or sympathetic misdirection; Third, Circumstantial or social misdirection. It is most beautifully clear, to my perception, that the in-dwelling forces of the mind are pure, and, in germ, as perfect as THE FOUNTAIN from which the myriad streams of spirit-life flow!" The audience can now form their own opinions as to what Mr. Davis preaches upon that subject. There is no escape by my friend's philosophy. It is by forming proper marriages, and establishing proper schools and external arrangements, that men are to be made good. That is all that is necessary, according to Spiritualism. It recognizes nothing within that needs to be transformed or renewed; and whilst my friend is contending for some kind of a kingdom of God within us, Mr. Davis is arguing for an external, social, and political order of things, which shall allow the soul to have its legitimate external development, without reference to internals. He carries this out in his ideas upon society, and you can not escape that understanding of him, when his language is taken together, whatever may be done with isolated words and phrases.

I will read, in this connection, a little of the teachings of the spirits themselves, in regard to good and evil. It is given in review of Mr. Davis and some things said by my friend this morning. In Gridley's "Astounding Facts," page 142, a spirit, from a very high sphere, thus discourses of good and evil, and a personal Devil:

"If no such evil Entity exists, as we devoutly hope, the restoration of the race is sure and inevitable; God can never reject his own. All the evil that has flowed from him must return to its source, but it argues little for his goodness or benevolence. No earthly parent, since the world began, would have let his children live in such discord and wrangling, while he could have prevented it, as the God of Love is accused of doing. * * He has acted the part of a deceiver among all nations; refused instruction that he could easily have given, and is, of course, forever unworthy the confidence of his own creation. Such is the legitimate and unavoidable conclusion of all that admit but a single fountain to have discharged its waters upon portions, at least, of the universe. While, on the other hand, if, as we believe, there is an Evil and self-existent intelligent Fountain, that has, with its bitter waters, more or less marred the perfect work of God; if there has been an opposition to encounter and overcome, that nearly equals in strength and power the Omnipotent of all good, then may we well conclude that the pretensions of the latter are sincere, and that his plans are laid in wisdom; for it is easy to conceive that nothing less than his own *uncreated son* could successfully compete with an *uncreated antagonist*. Such a view clears the God-

head of all participation in evil, both in its present and future results."

So argues this spirit, and it is about as positive as my friend talks, whilst it has the advantage of coming from a very high sphere, and of being part of the teachings of Spiritualism, which my friend's teachings are not. Thus, we have the existence of a Devil and positive evil asserted and denied in never-ending contradictions, and yet all must be harmonized and embraced in one system!

I must also notice the gentleman's reply to what I said about his right to interpret inspired Scripture. He affirms that in the second sphere, reason is absolute. But we were talking of the words of men who were baptized with the Holy Ghost, and spake with the power of God. The second sphere has nothing to do with God, according to his system, and reason, therefore, can not deal with the things of God. In the third sphere all is consciousness—there is no reasoning; and hence it appears that, by his own principles, he has no right to use his reason in interpreting the truths of inspiration. My remarks, therefore, are still applicable.

We will now pass on to additional readings from Spiritualism. I showed, in closing my former argument, that the Bible declares that Christ laid down his life for the sheep, whilst Davis denies it, and Edmonds declares that he saved mankind by his life instead of his death. Both these writers profess to be taught by spirits of very high spheres. The same idea is urged by my friend, in his Lecture, page 297. He says, "the virtue of Jesus Christ, as the Redeemer of the world, does not consist in the blood he lost, or the pain he suffered, or any debt he paid; but it consists in the truths he revealed, and the practical illustrations he gave of those truths." I will simply place this in contrast with the inspired words of the beloved disciple (Rev. i: 6): "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever." So speaks the Spirit of Truth, whilst these sham spirits give forth the doctrines I have read, varied occasionally by such self-glorification as the following: "Let not the toils, the trials, or the temptations of life impede you, and to you be all the glory."

The Bible declares that Christ is "risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept;" but in these days of spiritual wisdom we are taught that it is not so, and William Ellery Channing comes back from the spirit world to tell us it is not true!

Again, the word of God teaches that to put away one's wife and marry another, is to commit adultery, and that whosoever marries her that is put away committeth adultery. But here Mr. Gridley teaches us that the spirits communicate beforehand to men

and women that they are to have other companions, and then *deliberately* kill the ones they now have, to get them out of the way. I have referred to this before and need not dwell upon it. The whole story, and the abominable pretense that it was a marked instance of *spiritual prophesy*, is found in the 8th chapter of his "Astounding Facts." The horrid deed, so complacently narrated, is said to have extended through several months, during which time, his familiar spirits were performing their murder, by inducing disease "by electric currents which we threw upon her liver." It is of no consequence that this is a silly and disgusting fiction; the morality of the doctrine which it teaches is none the less odious and monstrous. The act is narrated as a veritable performance of *pure* (!) spirits, and the world is left to draw its own conclusions as to the obligation of the marriage tie, and the permanency of the bond which connects husband and wife.

We are left to believe that whenever Spiritualism shall become established, and we have no God to pray to, but only spirits of various spheres to communicate with by raps or otherwise, there will be going up a prayer from discontented husbands and wives to relieve them of the burden of their connection, and remove the troublesome partner of their lots, either by those "electric currents upon the liver," or some other equally refined and sinless mode of committing willful and deliberate homicide!

There it stands without rebuke. Andrew Jackson Davis has reviewed Gridley's book in a tone which shows that he was not unwilling to cut severely with his criticism, wherever it was at variance with his own views, or the received and orthodox Spiritualism, but he has not one word of censure for so remarkable and (to most of the moral and religious world) so horrifying a doctrine as this. Neither has he aught to say against the spiritual brothels described in other pages of the same remarkable treatise, and to which I have also alluded before. This book has been recommended by spiritual papers; it is advertised as a spiritualist book, and never a word of dissent has been uttered with regard to it. It is thus approved and endorsed, tacitly at least, by the spiritualists on earth, and there has come no voice from the spirit-land to rebuke it. I said there was no dissent from it; I will partly retract that. Adin Ballou has opposed it, but this single uninspired man against the crowd of arrogant mediums and rapping spirits is of little account, and his voice and his warning meet with no response.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend is still busy helping me to make out my case, by reading further evidence that there exists a class of spirits belong-

ing to the first sphere. It seems to be the sphere he has taken as a matter of choice to dwell in and get his revelations from; so I will leave him there and not trouble myself about it: by and by I will bring spirits from another and higher sphere to testify.

The gentleman has so often referred to a position I have taken, that truths peculiarly spiritual can not be communicated to the mind but by inspiration, and he has applied so sweepingly to all classes of truth, intellectual, moral, and social, as well as spiritual, that I think I will give him, here, a proposition that expresses my opinion on the subject. It is this:

Whatever is presented for the consideration of the understanding, whether fact or truth, must pass the ordeal of criticism, and the mind that shrinks from such a trial of its belief, is not true to itself.

Hence, all systems of philosophy, whether scientific, moral, theological or otherwise, with their evidences, must pass the rational ordeal.

Hence, all writings or pretended revelations, with respect to their genuineness, their authenticity, or their doctrines, are proper subjects of criticism.

In my investigations I have observed, and allowed my friend the benefit of the proposition here affirmed, with the corollaries which flow from it. These principles give full latitude for all proper investigation, and under them there is abundant room for establishing and teaching all that man is prepared to learn in the natural sciences, in metaphysical philosophy, and in theology. If my friend were to investigate concerning the proofs which Mohammedanism furnishes of its Divine revelation, he would use a standard of rational criticism, appealing to man as a rational, intellectual, and social being, and would fairly demand that the system should pass such an ordeal. So in testing the Bible, I apply the same rules, and in all scientific and moral questions, I claim that the intellect is the proper arbiter and judge; but when I come to truths peculiarly spiritual as distinguished from all the other classes, then I claim that inspiration is necessary for their comprehension. If my friend understands this, he will have no further occasion for his frequent assertion that I can not make you understand what I am talking about.

I do not propose to follow the gentleman through all his objections to Spiritualism, now; for he is anxious to have me show how my system bears upon Spiritualism. I will proceed, therefore, and will come to the application after a while.

You will remember that I said that the laws of human impressibility depend upon the nature of the human mind, and therefore have undergone no change. We may have animal impressibility, or spiritual, or even divine impressibility; each in its own sphere. There can be no divine impressibility till the absolute or divine

sphere has been attained. In its outward manifestation, it might be made manifest in the sphere of the spiritual or social nature; but in its principles, its divine essence, the absolute can only be made known in the sphere of essence,—the third sphere.

I proceed to affirm, next, that the apostles were the subjects of spiritual, not divine inspiration. They progressed by degrees according as their understanding became enlightened, and as their characters were perfected. That unfolding of their minds was the law which governed the degree and quality of their inspiration, as is plainly shown by the history of their lives and teachings.

My friend had to admit, yesterday, that Peter did not understand truth faster than it was necessary to use it. We know that he did not understand, for ten years, that the principles of Christ's government were to be applied to the Gentiles; therefore he was not as fully inspired at the day of Pentecost, as he was ten years after. His inspiration became greater as his character was perfected, and his intelligence enlarged. There can be no exception to this rule found in the history of society from the days of Adam until now. No exception can be taken to it, upon any principle known to the human understanding. It is a broad and universal principle: deny it, and you involve man and God himself in absurdities from which escape is impossible. Hence, the apostles being only unfolded in the spiritual of their natures, they were liable to err in many things in respect to which they were not inspired; and, therefore, those who consider them divinely and plenarily inspired fall into divers errors. If we attribute to Peter perfect inspiration, we place his teachings upon as high ground as those of Christ himself; and then upon comparing the two, we find difficulties which it is impossible to reconcile. When, however, we come into possession of the "keys of the kingdom," and see what was the real state of the case as to Peter's inspiration, we see at once the beauty and harmony of the whole.

The spirits of the first sphere are sometimes referred to as the spirits in prison. They are those who are under the influence of their lusts, appetites, and passions; who have yielded themselves servants to their lusts; who are strangers to the joys of virtue and temperance. They are ignorant of the truths which are necessary to enable them to understand the things of the spirit, or those which pertain to the moral department of man. They know not what it is to be just and true. Their life is a life of self-gratification; they are in a reign of darkness.

These spirits are continued in this low condition by the low estate of the inhabitants of this earth, because they resort to earth that they may obtain gratification by means of those who are in the body. Hence, these spheres act and re-act upon the earth as appears from the quotations my friend has read. We act upon them, and they re-act upon us in our impulses, delights, and desires.

This is not a new doctrine,—that evil spirits influence us; it is as old, at least, as the days of Jesus of Nazareth. My friend has demonstrated it for us, and Spiritualism affirms it.

Hence, the spirits of Gehenna will not be likely to be redeemed until the Earth is redeemed; until those that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and live. Then, and not till then, will these low and dark spirits be subject to the redemptive influences. * Hence, "he that converteth a sinner from the error of his ways, shall save a soul from death."

Spirits of the spirit heavens are engaged in communication with earth, according to the various means which may be within their control. Those of the lower degrees in Paradise are engaged in removing evil influences they have left behind them. They can not progress till this is done. They did not agree with their adversary quickly when in the way with him, and now being, in a sense, in prison, they can not escape till they have paid the uttermost farthing." Some who are fitted for the work are engaged in urging good men on in the work of philanthropy and reform, stimulating them in every way to put forth their utmost exertion to raise poor fallen man. Those who are bound by ties of affinity and love to the dear friends they have left behind them, watch over the loved ones on earth and become their guardian spirits. We shall see, directly, whether the same doctrine can not be found in Christianity.

The discrete degrees of conscious perception and impulse in man are easily marked and noticed. That which perceives mere existence and manifestation, is one degree; that which perceives the relation, is another; and that which perceives the essence, makes the third. These discrete degrees have been the same in all ages of the world, although there have been very various degrees of unfolding. Therefore, the laws of action and manifestation, having their basis in these fundamental elements, must have been the same in all ages, and there can never be any difference in the real character of the phenomena and principles which come from these respective spheres. Each sphere has shown its own law and ruling impulse in its manifestations, and has always been self-consistent and distinct from the rest.

My friend has been showing how the manifestations of false morality, false philosophy, and the whole body of miserable and pernicious teachings of spirits from Gehenna are identical in character with those which like spirits made in the days of Christ. He proves that they can not see by the light of God's truth, but are given up to work every abomination. So Christ taught concerning them in his day, and herein you see a resemblance between his teachings and those of Modern Spiritualism. I am indebted to my friend for making out this part of my case for me. One thing let me impress upon you: that we have a responsibility

resting upon us, in regard to these undeveloped spirits, and that our acts may be the means of continuing them in their depraved conditions. These things are as much God's truth as any ever revealed to the world, and is as important for you and me to know them, as it is to know that there is a God. They have much to do with making us wise, teaching us how to shape our life, how to war against evil; and they stand like beacons to warn us from the sunken rocks on which we may shipwreck our own and others' happiness. He that will yield himself a servant to obey his selfishness and lust, is surely preparing for himself a place in that dark sphere; and it becomes us to heed the warning. If we go to that Gehenna and return again to earth, like those dark spirits we shall speak a low philosophy and even theology which will demonstrate the character of the sphere we may be in.

It is the philosophy and theology of that sphere, which my friend has been laboring to prove discordant with the doctrines of Jesus. I have not said it was the same; but I say it proves that Jesus' philosophy is true, and this every man and every woman knows, if their eyes are open and they look candidly at these things. Jesus did not require man to yield himself to these foul spirits: neither does Spiritualism. We are enjoined to *try* the spirits; to try them thoroughly and well, before submitting to them, or yielding to their doctrines and influence. Spiritualism demonstrates that any apparent difference between the manifestations of different ages or individuals, which strikes the observer, is owing to the difference in the medium through whom the manifestation is made to the world. Hence, the differences between the manifestations made through Jesus and those made through Peter and John, and between those made between these last and those of Simon Magus, were all owing to the different development of the individuals, and the consequent different affinities and associations between them and the spirit spheres to which they were connected. Put that down and meet it. The principles of affinity are the same in each case. Simon Magus spoke the principles of the spirits in affinity with him; Peter, Paul, and John spoke as they were inspired by the spirits in affinity with them; and when Jesus spoke, the Divine spoke through him, and Divine truth came down to man, in its highest possible manifestation. The difference was in the medium: the principle was the same; to wit, that man's enlightenment and inspiration is according to his own development and unfolding. Purify your souls, bring all your appetites and passions in subjection, exalt your nobler nature to power and let it rule you, and then you shall be advanced to mansions in your Father's house, which are fitted for your cultivated nature.

MR. ERRETT.

The gentleman thinks that I am helping his case along, and, with both of us at it, it must be a desperately bad one, if it should turn out that it is not established after all! He says he is content to have me present the spirits from the lower spheres; but do you believe he would have brought them in, if I had not? Did he tell you of them last winter, when he was here? When he took his own course, with no opponent to prompt him, did these things come up? Spiritualist lecturers are not in the habit of calling out these things; they are content to let them lie in the dark, and do not reprove them. You may judge whether he is candid in passing it over as if I were helping him make out his case. He tries to identify these with the teachings of Jesus; but I defy him to show any thing taught, I will not say by Jesus, but even by "Ghost or goblin damned," before the days of Modern Spiritualism, so abominable as these things. The devils, whom Jesus cast out, were not vile enough to talk such things. Let us see when Jesus allowed such things to go forth as a part of Christianity or its phenomena. I demand the proof. He rebuked, and silenced, and cast out the demons, even when they would bear witness to his mission. But these things spiritualists have published to the world, and they glory in them; they form a large part of the spiritual food of whole classes of spiritualists at the present day, and no spiritualist can help being responsible for them, outraging, as they do, all ideas of propriety.

He says I quote from spirits of a low sphere. I have quoted from such mediums as Davis, and Edmonds, and Dexter, and Ambler; from such spirits as Swedenborg, and Bacon, and Channing, and now I demand of him, in plain words, does he dare stand before the world, and before spiritualists, affirming that these all belong to Gehenna and the pit of Hell? He knows right well that I have made no selection of the low and vile, but have taken a wide range, and endeavored to give you a complete idea of Spiritualism as it is presented by their own literature. If Davis and Edmonds deal with the low spheres, where, in the name of sense, do you find the high ones? I have given you their teachings, line upon line, and finding how perfectly absurd are his attempts to show any identity between them and the doctrines of Jesus, he tells you these are very low down! Where are the higher teachings? There are none, and you must judge how much there is in Modern Spiritualism to inspire your hearts with confidence, and give illumination to your minds.

I have not objected to what the gentleman presents as fair matter for reasoning; all such things I have tried by the understanding; but when he has given us *spiritual* teachings and doctrines, such as he tells us Christ could not make his disciples understand, *because they were not yet inspired by the Holy Ghost,*

then I have stopped him with his own argument, or rather dogma, concerning the necessity of inspiration to understand an inspired revelation. When he began to *reason* about the infinity of God, and to tell what he could do and could not do, I stopped him with his own dogma, that to reason about God is to make him finite, and deny his divinity; and I claim that it was a perfectly legitimate mode of stopping him. I fully met his arguments on this subject at an early period of the discussion, and whenever he attempts to use those propositions, or in any way to draw them in question, I have a perfect right to expose the gross inconsistency of his reasoning. We have no question about the truthfulness of the facts of the gospel history, for that was assumed at the outset of the discussion, so that we might have a common standard to which to go.

After telling us several things which he, probably, considers of importance, he says, "these are the great truths of Spiritualism." But I deny it, and declare that there is nothing but his word for it. I have read to you from a great variety of books, but it is not there, and here, as at former times, I oppose his right to speak upon his own sole authority, as to what is or is not the fundamental doctrine of Spiritualism. I do not dispute that certain doctrines are fundamental to his *philosophy*, but that is not the question. We are trying to discover what are the teachings of *Modern Spiritualism*. Spiritualists number their converts by tens of thousands in the land, but these are not the fruits of my friend's philosophy; indeed, if it rested upon that, I am doubtful whether there would have been a single convert to this day, for I doubt if any one understands what he has been saying about a subjective Deity, and a God, known only in consciousness. There is more or less taken from Christianity, and mixed up with his doctrines, so as to make it go off well, to some people's ears; but when you sit down and inquire what are its peculiarities, you find nothing which you have not met before, except such things as his notions of the inside heart that was *without*, and the two *within*s, — the carnal *within* and the spiritual *within*. All that he says about the affinities of good spirits for other good ones, and the obligations of purity and holiness, I suppose you have heard hundreds of times before. The only influence his system can have will be derived from the Christian morality he strives to unite with it, and which has attracted some who could not understand his philosophy. I deny that his doctrines are part of Spiritualism, and invite him to show how far he can get any acknowledged leader of Spiritualism to go with him. He can find none who agree with him as to the main points he has argued. So far from teaching that God exists in consciousness, they tell you that God is matter. Some run into Pantheism, some into Atheism, and some into Deism, and among them all there are gross differences

and contradictions at every step, instead of that harmony which their system so stoutly professes. The doctrines the gentleman advances are his dogmas, but he has no claims to call them the great truths of Spiritualism. Some of them are true and good, some are false and not good, and some are very doubtful indeed. Keep in mind therefore the important difference between his philosophy and Spiritualism.

The gentleman insists that the inspiration of the apostles was progressive. I have denied that it was so in the sense he intends by the term, but if it were, it would prove no identity between their case and that of the spirit mediums, for whilst they were ever rising to more sublime heights, these mediums are constantly getting lower and lower, and their spirits themselves are degenerating. Take the communications of Swedenborg as given by Edmonds and Dexter, and those of Bacon also, and compare them with their teachings when on earth, and no one can help seeing that they have become woefully degraded. Take what Dr. Channing taught, and see how it compares with the drivings which Spiritualism attributes to him now. You cannot make out a case of immortality even, if you allow these spirits to be the same who bore their names on earth. They are going down at a rate which will soon make them mere slavering idiots, and fit them for speedily sinking into eternal annihilation. I ask what ray of evidence of "progressive inspiration" is afforded by these pretended communications from men who were the great lights of the world. There is a point to start from. I wish the gentleman would take up the evidence and try giving an answer.

He says the literal teachings of the Bible are full of contradictions. We have had this point up before and I have noticed the absurdity of claiming that what is literally contradictory can be full of spiritual harmony and truth. Literally false and pernicious, but spiritually full of truth and divine blessedness! Whoso can believe it, let him believe it.

The gentleman's application of the passage of Scripture concerning agreeing with our adversary, is an amusing specimen of his interpretations. In the portion of the Sermon on the Mount, commencing at the 21st verse of the 5th chapter of Matthew, Christ was commenting upon the sin of anger and unkindness, showing that not only to kill, but even to call a man a fool, is a grievous sin in God's sight. Then in the 25th verse, he turns to another case and dwells upon the evils and wrongs of a litigious spirit, and shows the wisdom of loving justice, and dealing kindly with men in our business relations. Upon this passage, my friend, in common with the Roman Catholic priests, builds up a doctrine of purgatory! In the text it is simple and easy to be understood; but he turns it to superstition, and advances the doctrine of papal Rome, that men work out the penalty of their sins

and then are released and taken into heaven! Spiritualists find themselves in the exact position of the Catholic priests, and I have heard of persons going to Judge Edmonds to inquire whether their friends were in Purgatory; and spirits from the ill-fated Arctic came back to him to learn how to start on their road to Paradise! The Judge tells of numerous such visits from spirits, and after a few lessons from him it appears that they get so far that they can get along without his help, and go on their way rejoicing! These mediums acting as a kind of priesthood, teach an abject and servile slavery of mind, such as the darkest days of Romanism could hardly match. They work upon all the superstitious hopes and fears of their followers, and under the pretense of introducing freedom of thought, they make them subjects of the vilest delusions.

The gentleman tells us that the laws of communication, of affinity, and of mental unfolding, have been in all ages the same. Is it not strange, then, that there has never been but one Christ? —but one who has had communication with the Father: only one in all the centuries before and since? All others received their communications from inferior spirits, and there must then be a law, the conditions of which none but Jesus ever fulfilled, and it stands a miracle among the laws of the universe. He stands alone, and is, after all, the only luminary to whom even my friend can turn your minds with confidence. He is the only teacher upon whom you can rely for all that pertains to moral and spiritual good, and the preparation for a pure and happy destiny hereafter. The gentleman says the phenomena of Spiritualism teach that what Jesus spoke is true. Many things do that, which are not identical with Christ's teachings. We must not confound evidences with doctrines. I can show that these phenomena verify many things which Jesus said. In their failure to convert the human heart they show that if men "will not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be converted if one rose from the dead;" for spiritualists profess to believe that they have the benefit of Dives' prayer, and that the dead preach to them. The Spirit of God also teaches that times shall come when men will "give heed to doctrines of devils;" and these manifestations prove that prophecy true also; but does this make it out that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical with those of Jesus of Nazareth?

My friend says you must try the spirits. I took issue with him there, the other day, and showed that they demand the entire passivity of your nature before they can communicate with you, and that therefore weak-minded girls were generally mediums, whilst strong-minded men seldom receive communications, and even from *good* mediums the spirits might be exorcised by a dose of tartar emetic! Now you are to try them! Go in, and try to

reason in their circles, and you will soon receive an intimation that your room is better than your company.

[As Mr. Errett concluded his remarks, a woman in the audience broke out into incoherent exclamations, accompanied by violent gesticulation, continuing but a moment and then ending abruptly. This was repeated two or three times in the course of an hour, and caused considerable merriment. This fact will explain some remarks of the speakers which would otherwise be unmeaning.—*Reporter.*]

MR. TIFFANY.

I suppose that if this was in a Methodist camp meeting, it would be a solemn occurrence. If it was an attendant upon orthodox preaching, it would be considered evidence that the Spirit of God was upon the individual. The difference depends upon ourselves. In this case you can laugh; in the other you would feel solemn. I hope the audience will please give me their attention, for I shall speak directly to the point. My friend said he made an issue the other day, to which I did not reply. He is mistaken; my answer was, that spiritual communications *now* demand only the same passivity which Christ required when he told us to retire into the closet of the heart and shut out the external world, when we would commune with the Father. I said we have within ourselves a principle of our nature, which has power to resist the devil. It is the power of the will, not of the thought. It has its basis in the affectional nature; in that department of man's nature in which he lives. The passivity has reference to the external, and not to the moral and relational. It is a passivity of body and thought, not of love or desire. If a person becomes passive both externally and internally, he is not in a position which is commanded of him, if he would be protected from the influence of evil spirits. It all turns upon the question as to the ruling love, for upon that the doctrine of affinities and spiritual communication is based.

My friend complains of me for saying that the Bible is full of literal contradictions and yet is spiritually true. I take an example before referred to, when Christ says, "Except a man hate father and mother, he can not be my disciple." (Luke xiv: 26). We turn to another evangelist and find it written, "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." (Matt. x: 37). Here is a plain contradiction in the literal meaning of the two passages, and yet, taking the spiritual sense, they are perfectly harmonious.

MR. ERRETT. What is the spiritual meaning of the word "hate?"

MR. TIFFANY. The spiritual meaning of hate is devilish; but the spiritual meaning of the *passage* is that unless a man love Christ so much more than father and mother that in the comparison it shall seem like hate, he can not be his disciple. It means much more than "love less," as it is commonly interpreted. Nothing short of the word *hate* could express what is intended by the *passage*.

We will try, now, to explain the difference between spiritualists and Spiritualism. Suppose I wish to teach you the language and phenomena of geology; where do I go to get it? There are any number of geologists who study the same book of nature, and each has his peculiar views. One has his peculiar ideas about the drift, another of the transitionary strata, and so on. I meet my friend and make the affirmation that the language of geology is true; that it teaches truth. Thereupon he goes to work to contrast Hutton's views, and Lyell's and Buckland's and Hitchcock's, and Pye Smith's, and showing their differences, he says they must all be taken as geology! I take it up in its phenomena and present it to you giving the laws which I see governing it, and the means by which you may interpret the phenomena for yourselves, and ask you to decide without taking my notions, but upon the evidence which I furnish you. In which way would you get the teachings of the science? Just so in regard to Spiritualism. He says you must find it in the teachings of spiritualists: I say, not so. You may get what Judge Edmonds says, what I say, and what any one else says, and you have only the doctrines of spiritualists; but when we present simply the principles and phenomena, and ask you to decide for yourselves, you may in that way determine what it really is. What makes a spiritualist? What faith is it necessary for one to have in order to be a spiritualist? Why only this; that the spirits of the departed hold intercourse with the inhabitants of the earth. No matter how much or how little more he believes. But does that make Spiritualism responsible for all the philosophies and vagaries of the individuals who believe in that simple fact? I tell you, no! The language of the phenomena is what alone can constitute Spiritualism. Hence, while my friend has been inquiring what all my argument has to do with Spiritualism, I have been laying in your minds the principles upon which you can determine what the phenomena teach, independent of any one. All I ask is that you should take and apply them; and then, the principles being true, the translations of the phenomena by their aid, will constitute the language of the phenomena: it will be Spiritualism, and not the dogmas of spiritualists.

The doctrine of a vicarious atonement is one which is to be judged by the reason and intellect. The meaning of vicarious atonement is an atonement made by one being in the place of

another. It implies *relations*, and every thing coming into the relational sphere is to be judged of by the intellectual faculties. In all matters pertaining to my relations, I am held responsible for the exercise of my reason by all governments to which I owe allegiance. If I were an idiot, I should not be called to account for my actions in the relational sphere, and no tribunal would judge me for them. I say then, that the subject of a vicarious atonement, being one which lies in the relational sphere, must be judged by the criticism of our reason and intellect, and when we reach that topic, I will subject it to this test. If I should not exercise my faculties on such subjects, I should not be true to the powers God has given me.

My friend says he has read to you the writings of spiritualists of exalted character. He has read from Mr. Davis who stands high in the relational and moral sphere, and he has read nothing low or vulgar from him. So far as Judge Edmonds is concerned, he sat to receive communications from all who chose to communicate, being passive both in affection and thought. He was not bound to sit in that way: he could have placed the standard of affection so that spirits of dark character could not communicate with him. But he had the power in himself to determine his affinities and relations, and if he saw fit to sit down entirely passive and suffer any one to control his nature, the communications so received are simply facts, and impose no authority upon us. We can judge of them as we would judge of any phenomena. I have not said that Judge Edmonds, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Ambler belong to a low sphere; but only that any individual may determine his own sphere, and that it will be according to the state of his affections. If his affections are pure and active, dark spirits can not influence him. He may be pure, and yet yield himself to any who choose to approach him; or he may be corrupt, and then good spirits can not communicate with him. The general principle is that a man's affinities are in accordance with his character; but so far as external manifestations are concerned, he may be approached by a wide variety of spirits. Still he has the power in himself, by which he may determine whether he will be approached or not. I state what I know to be true, but not authoritatively.

I come then to the application of my principles to the phenomena of Spiritualism, not of spiritualists. I only ask you to take the incontrovertible principles which I have laid down. My first position under these principles is this: That it is universally true, without a single exception, that our affinities are as our characters, and these characters are according to the ruling love impulse in us, that governs us. If we are devoted to self-gratification and the worship of mammon, which is the spirit of the carnal heart and natural mind, we attract to us those who are living in the same loves. We belong to the general sphere of

self-love. Now there are as many differences among those who are in this sphere, as there are modes of self-gratification. We have in this world a representation of the societies and circles in that sphere, for we see all men associating with those who are most agreeable to them. I illustrated this the other day by calling attention to drunkards, gamblers, &c. They associate together because they are pleased by the same modes of gratification, and happy in the same course of life. We see this disposition manifested in a high way. Those who belong to the same church will sit together here in this room, because they think and feel alike, and when they get into the spirit-world, they will begin to inquire where their church is, there, as much as here, for it is the law of their affinity. This is not an attraction of your bodies, but of your spirits: it is the law of your *mind* that your associations are according to your ruling love, and that love has its basis in your affectional nature. I leave you to decide by your own consciousness and observation, whether it is not a universal law.

Hence, you will find that an individual belonging to a particular plane of development, will seek out for associates, those who belong to the same plane, and thus it happens, for example, that between vulgarity and refinement there is a natural repulsion. Our associates, in the church and out of it, are not higher than ourselves. If we are as good as our neighbors, we do not feel condemned, and can walk out, hold up our heads, and even feel Pharisaic if we compare ourselves with those who may be below us. But if we compare ourselves by a standard above us in moral purity, intellect, and every thing that makes one pure and good, we acknowledge our superiors and hang our heads. What is the difference? Our characters are the same! Yes, but we have been trying ourselves by a different standard. In judging of the morality of the world, we do it by the world's standard; but you may bring your best specimen of man and woman, and let me try him not by the standard of the world, but by the absolutely just and pure standard, and you will see whether he can endure the test, and go away like the Pharisee, thanking God he is not as other men, or whether he will not rather have occasion to cry with the poor publican, God be merciful to me a sinner. Those two characters have great significance. Now I will affirm that in what the world calls morality, justice, and truth, the standard is below any respectable moral standard. In the loves that we call pure and holy, there is a great deal of selfishness and lust mixed up. I refer to this as showing how high the standard of the world is. Take the loves that children bear their parents or parents their children; husbands their wives, and wives their husbands. Judge of them by their fruits and see if there is not selfishness in them. Begin with husband and wife, and see how much pure and holy affection characterizes that relation. When a young man seeks a wife, what is

the course his mind takes in making his choice? He has many wants: he wants some one to keep his house, wash his linen, mend his stockings; some one that will be a comfortable partner for him through life,—whose society he can enjoy. So when a young woman thinks of getting a husband, like selfish calculations are made, for it is a fearful thing to be an "old maid," you know. She wants somebody to take care of her, to give her a home, to share her joys and sorrows, and she anticipates a very happy time when she shall find some one to respond to all these needs of her's. Now what is the result? They get married, and the husband is not as kind as the wife expected, and the wife is not as amiable as the husband expected, and how do they feel? Are they happy and satisfied? Do they find their love kindling up into a perfect blaze, or is the effect a contrary one?

I only call your thoughts to this to try our standard of loves by the high standard that has no selfishness in it. If the husband turns away, becomes cross and abandons his wife, does it prove his love was unselfish? Try it by a just standard. If she had fulfilled all the uses he expected and desired of her, he would have delighted in her; but it would have been all for the sake of her utility to him in one way or another, and just as far as she falls short, he feels disappointed.

[Here the interruption before mentioned was repeated, with a similar effect.—*R.*]

MR. ERRETT.

When I agreed to meet my friend Tiffany, I did not agree to debate with the whole spirit world, or any portion of it; and if he has any power over the spirits, I hope he will keep them still. Unless it was a gentle hint that it is time he was coming to the question, I can't imagine what it means.

I wish to notice a few more points of contrast between Christianity and Spiritualism. Jesus said, "In the resurrection, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." (Matt. xxii: 30.) Davis says (*Harmonia* 2, 205), "In reply to the question, Will *all* the individuals, married in this life, continue to live together in the spirit world? I received the following vision: In England, in the city of London, I saw a gentleman undergoing the metamorphosis called death. He had been for several years married to an uncongenial companion; they had frequently and severely injured and insulted each other; and were quite dissimilar in their temperaments, habits, attractions and desires. From the scene of this departure, my perceptions were directed to a dying Turkish lady in Constantinople, who, according to the Eastern custom of polygamy, had been a favorite

wife of the Sultan. The two deaths, or transformations, occurred at the same moment; and when the two spirits were emancipated from the body, and from the superficial restrictions of society, they ascended; and by the irresistible attraction of conjugal or spiritual affinity, and in accordance with the law of perfect spiritual adaptation, they approached each other, and, rapturously embracing, manifested the fullest realization of the beautiful fact that they were eternally ONE." Another special communication, in another volume, which Mr. Davis gives, shows that it was a most sensual embrace. And this is the teaching of *Davis*, who, my friend admits, is very high in the *relational* sphere, from which such communications would be expected, if any where, and who has given such evidences of his elevation as a spiritual teacher, that spiritualists have sent him forth as a *consecrated redeemer of the world!*

We have a similar communication from *Tom Paine*, taken from his "*Pilgrimage to the Spirit World*," page 15.

"Near the close of my earthly life, I fell into a swoon, and I saw what was more evidence to me of a future life, than all I had ever heard or read. I saw my wisdom isolated and torn in fragments. There came near me one whom I loved in my youth; one who was dear to me when I was in my years of prime; and who had cherished an attachment for me, which even death had no power to dissolve. She had passed away. I had wept over her grave. I had mourned her death as the severest of all possible calamities. We were united. Nothing but the form of marriage was wanting to make us one in the sight of the world. We were married; she was my idol." He then tells of her mournful death, her re-appearance to him in a vision, his own death, and their meeting in the spirit world, where he learns that though he had had many connections in this world, she was through all his spiritual wife, and was waiting till he should leave the body that they might be joined in matrimony in the ghostly land!

Now I will give you the ideas of a *spiritualist* upon that subject. I will not call it Spiritualism, for it is too good for that. It is from Aden Ballou. (*Mattison on Rappings*, page 239.)

"Comparatively few of the spiritualists have as yet become aware of this *Free-love* development; but it will soon be made manifest in sundry quarters. It will have something of a run, too. Mediums will be seen exchanging its significant congenialities, fondlings, caresses, and *indescribabilities*. They will receive revelations from high pretending spirits, cautiously instructing them that the sexual communion of *congenials* will greatly sanctify them for the reception of angelic ministrations. Wives and husbands will be rendered miserable, alienated, parted, and their families broken up. There will be spiritual matches, carnal degradations, and all the ultimate wretchedness thence inevitably resulting. Yet the very

persons most active in bringing all this about will protest their own purity, will resent every suspicion raised to their discredit, will accuse all who remonstrate against their course of doing so because personally low-minded themselves, and will stand boldly out in their real character, only when it is no longer possible to disguise it. *All this has commenced*, and will be fulfilled in due time."

Mr. Ballou follows this up with an earnest warning and exhortation against the abomination. But *no such warning comes from the spirit world*; this comes from a man in his sober senses, unaided by spirits; and he warns the world against the influences of those very spirits.

As to passivity, I need not follow the gentleman over his old round again. I have read (and it has gone upon record) proof that it is not a mere passivity of thought which is demanded, but of will and affection also.

I asked the gentleman the spiritual meaning of *hate*. He said it was *devilish*; but that is the same as the literal meaning, and the gentleman must affirm that Jesus taught men to become *devilish* toward father and mother, if they would be his disciples! The turn he gave it, as implying only a contrast, is his own gloss of the passage, but I am giving the interpretation according to his own definition of the word in its *spiritual sense*. His *commentary* is of no account in arguing what the *words mean* when understood *spiritually*.

He has made still another attempt to avoid the force of my quotations, by his old distinction between Spiritualism and spiritualists. If any thing could be settled this was, when we left it, the other day. He then gave his final affirmation that Spiritualism is the teachings of *all the spirits*. I have not read to you the opinions of spiritualists without notifying you of it. The communications are from *spirits*, are the *teachings* of spirits, and are therefore Spiritualism, by his own admission. Judge Edmonds does not pretend to speak for himself, but the doctrine is, that Bacon, Swedenborg, and the rest, speak through him. But now, when I quote what these spirits teach, "black spirits and white, blue spirits and grey," that "mingle, mingle, mingle," spirits of all grades, high and low; he tells us that these are only the teachings of spiritualists. He can only maintain this position by yielding the whole question, and admitting that the pretended communications are all a mass of imposition or delusion on the part of the mediums. In this I shall be happy to agree with him; but his Spiritualism, and its identity with Christianity, all falls through together.

I have been charged with giving low communications; where, I ask again, are the high ones?—those that are identical with Christ's teachings? Let us have them, or if you can not find

them, admit it frankly. I challenge the proof that my selections have been narrow or limited in their range.

My friend tells us that our sects and churches will be the same in the world to come, as here, and that we will seek our own denominations there, unless, perhaps, that machine "Saviour" from High Rock, that has been giving off its little "Saviours" ever since it was made, should convert us all to Spiritualism! Well, if we are to meet there in such form, we will give him battle upon these same questions, for I am very confident we shall not agree with him upon them.

We have now got along another day in our discussion, and let us see, if we can, how near we have approached a final settlement of the question. How much all that has been said about old maids, and matrimony, and keeping house, and mending stockings will help you in understanding Spiritualism, I can not tell. Mr. Ballou talks of disfellowshipping those who hold certain doctrines; but we have not even learned what constitutes conversion to Spiritualism, or whether any conversion is necessary, in order to be taken into fellowship. I apprehend that if they were going to take in a brother, they would feel his head, and after examining the bumps, would, perhaps, conclude that the cerebellum was too large, and that he must be put under such influence as would develop his coronal and frontal region. He might be put upon bread and water, and exercised with dumb-bells, to bring up his physical nature. My friend Tiffany might ask for his hand-writing, and putting the man's autograph against his forehead, oracularly exclaim: "I perceive, by the sublime science of Psychometry, that there is a great deal of human nature about him; he belongs to the first discrete degree; he has none but an objective God; there is no God in his consciousness; he is incapable of receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and must be left under the charge of Moses till he is fit for the spiritual brotherhood." Then Andrew Jackson Davis might come along, and being, perhaps, in the *pluperfect* state, say: "The person has not been educated quite as he should be. The perfect flavor of the strawberry has not been brought out by cultivation; but if he were put into a Fourierite institution, he might be developed, and come forth having the proper flavor, according to the laws of his being." And there might be a dozen more standards to be tried by, equally sensible. Amid the confused jumble of discordant opinions, what can you settle upon as Spiritualism, and how much has the gentleman aided us in determining what it is?

We have before us a great many things which I have presented as the teachings of Spiritualism, and contrasted with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. My friend has favored us with his peculiar metaphysics, and to-day we have had a specimen of the *phenome-*

as of Spiritualism—the first of the phenomena of Modern Spiritualism presented by that side in the debate.

[The woman again interrupts the speaker.—R.]

How far such a manifestation is to be relied on you must judge: she speaks for herself.

[Interruption continued.—R.]

It is certainly strange! You must see that it is identical with the phenomena and teachings of Jesus, and I fear my argument must be given up altogether!

But to be serious—how far we must go before the comparison between the systems can be thoroughly made, must depend upon my friend. Meanwhile, you must take into your minds, and think carefully upon the comparison I have been able to institute. My friend has arranged his philosophy with great appearance of order and method, but this is not Spiritualism. *That is to be gathered from the teachings of the spirits themselves.* Remember that admission of the gentleman's, and see when he lets the spirits themselves declare the lofty doctrines of the system.

Mr. Tiffany thinks Davis is only in the relational sphere; but Mr. Davis professes to know all about God Almighty, his nature, his substance, and every thing else. He professes to be in the very highest spheres, and now you are told he is only in the relational! How can you tell? He has been anointed and sent out as teacher and guide, and yet my friend here says he knows no God but an objective one, and is an idolater, like the rest of us! Now, I submit to every man's common sense, whether Mr. Davis has not quite as good a right to ignore my friend's teachings.

Philosophy and speculation are of no service in this matter; we have nothing to go to but the teachings of the spirits themselves, for the teachers like Tiffany and Davis repudiate each other. If I have brought out only the low manifestations, let him bring the low parts of Christ's teachings, if he can find such, and show the identity. Let him match my examples, in this way, sphere by sphere, up to the Divine. Remember that if you receive his reasonings, you are only receiving his dogma. In closing this seventh day of the debate, I again ask you to judge how far the gentleman has met the real issue contained in the question before us.

EIGHTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—My friend has once or twice made the remark that Jesus did not reason, but spoke "with authority." Whilst it occurs to me I wish to say that it is true enough, but I cannot see what use he intends to make of it. Would he infer that men ought not to reason, but should receive doctrines without understanding them? He even reasons about his own doctrines, and is certainly trying to reason about Spiritualism. If therefore he takes the position that reasoning is of no use, he appears inconsistent; if he does not take that position, his remarks on the subject have no point.

He gave us also a criticism upon my reference to the passage, "agree with thine adversary quickly." I did not quote from the Sermon on the Mount, but from Luke (xii: 58), and if the passage there means any thing, it can not have the meaning my friend gave it. The words are, "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite." Christ is talking of the principle of punishment, and the difference between those who knowingly and those who ignorantly transgress. He shows that the willfulness is what constitutes the guilt. This principle applies to all spiritual suffering, and the consciousness of *knowingly* violating the law, is the only possible condition upon which a spirit can suffer. This is the foundation of the difference between the feelings of regret and remorse. In the one case you blame yourself for not properly attending to the probable consequences of your act, and in the other, knowing full well the consequences, you have willfully done wrong. In the latter, bitter self-condemnation follows you. "Ye hypocrites," said Christ, in the verse previous, "ye can discern the face of the sky, and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time? Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" This you see is the very principle I was referring to—the judging correctly of ourselves. Then come the words, "When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate," &c.

He says I quoted wrong again, when I said that Jesus did not mighty works in Nazareth, because the people had no faith. My friend has contended that Christ's works were for a proof to

those that did not believe; but if that were so, Nazareth was the very place for him to work, that his miracles might produce conviction. I ask, therefore, why he did not work there, if faith on the part of the people was not necessary. Mark, in the 6th chapter says, "Jesus said unto them, a prophet is not without honor, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house. And he could there do *no* mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them." My friend has admitted already that the healing of the sick is not a part of the "mighty works,"—that it may be done by laying on of hands, without miraculous power. Persons are cured of fevers by those who, my friend would say, are possessed of the devil; but the power has been exercised in all ages of the world, by virtue of power in man. I have done it myself, many a time, without claiming peculiar power from God. I have cured of fever a person who had been confined to the bed several days. I did it in fifteen minutes, by the mere laying on of hands; but that was not a "mighty work." But all the passages carry the idea that the *lack of faith* on the part of the people of Nazareth had an effect upon Christ's work. Matthew says he *did not* work, and Mark says he *could not*. Jesus even said to individuals, "thy faith hath saved thee." The recuperative energy of the mind are called into action by the exercise of strong faith, and this produces the cure. I say, therefore, that if there is any meaning in these passages, I do not quote them so incorrectly, after all. It simply amounts to this: belief has a great influence upon the work wrought. It may as well be admitted first as last. He, and I, and every one know the truth of it, and if he has the Spirit of Truth in him, let him own it.

When I closed my last speech I was saying that when you judge of your own loves and affections by the standard in your own minds, you think yourselves better than you are. Job thought he was good so long as he knew God only by the hearing of the ear; but when he came to see God, he abhorred himself. My object is to call your attention to the fact that your standard is exceedingly low, and that when you come to know the Divine, you will put your hands upon your mouths and cry "unclean, unclean!" I take as examples, the affections you call pure, and show you how much of selfishness there is in them. I show that they have their basis in the expectation of some use to be derived from the individual beloved, and that the love ceases when this expectation is disappointed. The phrase "honey-moon" is a term of reproach; for it implies that a month's acquaintance of each other by a newly-married couple, will be sufficient to show them that they are disappointed in their anticipations, and blunt the edge of their affection. I threw this out to show how much that is called pure love is selfishness. Even the love of parent and

child is not free from selfishness. The parent's love for the child is greater or less according to the way in which the child ministers to his pleasure. The love can not be altogether overthrown, but its degree may be greatly varied. Parents will even cast forth their child from their door, sooner than let the breath of reproach come upon themselves. If a daughter has been unfortunate, instead of saying, like Christ, Go, and sin no more! they will cast her out and repudiate her. Is not this selfishness, of the blackest and most damnable kind? The parent is bound to educate, train up, and protect his child; and if the child becomes a wanderer, so much the more is it necessary to cast the arms of love about that child, and draw it back, if possible, to all that is pure and holy, instead of abandoning a lovely daughter, perhaps, to the lusts and villanies of a sinful world. Your social loves, also, are selfish. When they cease to be pleasurable, you abandon them. When a friend does not correspond to our expectations, or does any thing improper, we begin to hate. Our selfishness lies at the bottom of the heart, and when it is touched, love is gone. As Satan said of Job, "Put forth thy hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face." These are not trifling things: they are of great consequence to us. It shows that our best love is full of dross and impurity. Well might Christ declare that a man must love him better than father or mother, if he would be his disciple. Unless it were better than that, it could not approximate to the Divine. It is a general rule with men, that their love is selfish. Instead of delighting in goodness and purity, for its own sake, they delight in a friend for the advantage he may be to them.

I come now to speak of purity and lust. I can not speak before you boldly. Why? Because you blush: you show a sense of your own impurity. "To the pure, all things are pure;" but the moment we begin to talk of certain conduct, you turn your faces and are offended. It awakens impure thoughts and impressions, and we can not speak boldly because you yourselves are impure. The fact that the world will not allow us to speak boldly of the licentiousness prevalent in married life, shows that there is impurity within. My friend quoted a passage of Scripture, yesterday, in which it was said that though adultery was usually defined to be certain acts, *Christ* defined it to be a state of mind. How is it, that men think they can plead the marriage institution as a bar to a charge of lust, in the court of Heaven? How is it that my friend does not feel called upon to raise the warning voice, in his pulpit, against such things? Children are the sufferers by this state of things. They come into the world with a debased and lustful spirit, because they are themselves the fruit of lust. How is it, that men dare call down upon others the curse of Heaven for doing what they themselves do under the sanction of a mini-

ter's license? I speak of this to show that your standard is not high, and that you have no reason to wonder that pure spirits can not come down to communicate with you.

What is love of truth? You love sect, and opinion, and dogma, better than truth. I appeal to yourselves whether, in the progress of this debate, there has not been in your minds more of a love of sect, than of truth? You have turned a deaf ear to truth which seemed to conflict with sect;—truth which you could not answer. I affirm it, and you bear witness to it, that you have not in your bosoms the love of truth. You may think you have, but you do not test yourselves. The mind naturally clings with vigor to that which supports an opinion, and receives with reluctance that which condemns it. The Spirit of Truth requires us to receive *all* that is truth: to rejoice more at having an error overthrown, than at having a truth discovered. If we seek truth, we will not deny the first principles of truth and logic, and defend our denial. The very fact that we do so, proves that we are not lovers of truth;—that we have not the meek and child-like spirit which would make us receive truth with love and sincerity. It is not enough to strike down reason and make truth bow to our creeds; but we worship our dogmas, and bow before them as does the Mohammedan at Mecca. We have deified our sectarianism and made it our idol. If we ourselves were true, the great first question would be, What is truth? All truth is from heaven, from God; and harmonizes with all other truth. If a position is taken, and truth does not harmonize with it, it is because our position is false, and not because truth has become false; and when we see this, if we still maintain our position, we do not love the truth.

Now, he who will not come up and investigate with a mind free from prejudice, does not love truth. You should try truths by appropriate tests in their own department, avoiding all quibbling. Every truth which reason and experience demonstrate, must have its basis in the fundamental laws of the universe, and you should let it have free course. If, then, you allow your prejudices to govern you, you show a careless soul, which professes to love God and yet despises the truth. There is no one truth more sacred than another, either in the sciences, in morals, or in the Absolute and Divine. Each truth is as sacred as any other of its own sphere. When, therefore, we say we love truth, let us show that we love it for its own sake, and not for its use or advantage to us.

MR. ERRETT.

I think I shall have to help the audience understand the last remarks of the gentleman. I presume he wishes to reprove you

for laughing at the very respectable spiritual demonstrations we had yesterday; but if he wishes to do so, he should speak it out, without higgling. If he says the Disciples have not come here patiently and attentively, to hear him with perfect candor and sincerity, he says what is most unjust and ungenerous. They have come without a word of warning against my friend from their ministers and brethren, and, as far as it is possible for any one to hear with candor, they have heard him. If he does not refer to them, does he refer to the spiritualists who have come to the door of the hall to hear him, and then left, refusing to hear the other side? If so, let him make the application directly. But for myself, and those who may be considered my friends, I scorn the insinuation that we have shrunk from inquiry. We have never done it. We don't intend to do it; and if it is intended to intimate that we can not listen to those who oppose us, this whole community knows the charge to be false. Our doors and our pulpits are always open to those who would convince us of any error, nor do we knowingly close our ears against them.

In what the gentleman said concerning Christ's speaking with authority, you have an instance of his candor and fair argument. The point I made was not that you are not to reason because Christ did not, but that Spiritualism was not like the teachings of Christ because he spake and taught with Divine authority, whilst this system does not come in any such way.

Then we had up again the misquoted passage concerning the necessity of faith in order to the performance of "mighty works." In his book, which I quoted, the gentleman affirmed that Christ could do *no* mighty works in Nazareth on account of their unbelief, and since he founded an argument upon the *universal negative* in his quotation, I corrected him. I showed that one evangelist says, he did not *many* mighty works, and the other expressly mentions the miraculous cure of a few sick folk. The gentleman tries to avoid the difficulty by saying he has cured sick folks himself, and that it is no mighty work. So can doctors cure the sick; but does that show that Jesus did it in the same way? If Christ's works were such as the gentleman can do in support of his system, and the Mormons in support of theirs, what evidence of the truth of a doctrine do they furnish? Evidently none at all. But the gentleman has admitted that Christ's works *were* proof of his Divine mission; and *therefore* they could not be such as can be wrought to support contradictory systems. But I have shown this up once before, and should not dwell upon it.

He quoted Luke in support of his purgatorial system. I might show him that the words he used first came from Matthew, and that Luke's version was an after-thought, by which he fancied something might be made, since the quotation there stands in a little different connection. But I may turn upon him his own ar-

gement, and to him it should be a sufficient answer. He has told us Luke is only a compiler; Luke did not profess to give any thing but what he heard; but Matthew heard it all as it occurred, and he is the reliable historian, you know. Luke went by the board some time ago, when the exigencies of the case demanded it, and now he is trying to use Luke to overthrow Matthew! How are we to reason with the gentleman, when he argues in such a style, dodging about from point to point;

"Point Look-out, and Point Look-in;
Point no-point, and point again!"

He says such miracles are done every day. No doubt! I read an account the other day, in one of their books, which told how a Mr. Spear cured a sick woman, so that she did not die—for several days. She lived some eight or ten days afterward, before she died!

They consecrate their healing prophets, too, with remarkable ceremonies. I will read a little from the biography of Mrs. Mettler, who has been a noted clairvoyant physician. The woman being in the "region of Tranquillities," Mr. Spear made the following address:

"Father of Fathers, and Deity of Deities: thy wills be done on the earths as they are done in the Heaven of Heavens. This fondly loved one shall be consecrated to the Charities. Thou, henceforth, shall be called Charity: that shall be thy denomination. Thou shalt say to the sufferer on his couch, arise, and it shall be so; thou shalt say to the maimed, be thou whole, and it shall be so; thou shalt say to the blind, open thou thy closed eyes, and this also shall be; *thou shalt say to the dead, arise, and it shall come to pass.* Thou shalt pass through the humble vale, over the lofty mountain, over rivers and seas; and the elements shall be at thy command. * * Happy shall they be who behold thy sweet countenance. Blessed are they on whom thy hand rests. Receive, now, this blessed power. (*Here Mrs. M.'s hand was closed and breathed on; when it opened it was said:*) This hand shall be unfolded to dispense blessings far and wide. Blessings shall descend upon thee. In blessing others, thou, thyself, shall be blessed. Thou shalt go on, in thy mysterious way, dispensing blessings. It is done." This was all said while the speaker was on his bended knees. That was her consecration, and after the mummery was all over, an advertisement appears in the papers, that for *five dollars* you can get all the information you need, by calling upon her in Hartford, I think.

My friend has a very happy, and very convenient way of disposing of matters. "Now, then," he will exclaim, "if the gentleman has any love of truth in him, let him own it." What a

pity it is that the reporter can not take down the bluster and gesticulation with which the gentleman utters these fine passages, which so completely settle the case! It reminds me of a story about the advice once given by an old tavern-keeper to a young preacher. "Sometimes," said he, "when speaking, you will be hard run for something to say, and your ideas will be all gone. At such times, make as much noise as possible, and it will all pass off just as well. They will never know the difference." I should not wonder if my friend had stopped at that tavern some night, and been instructed by that landlord.

He spoke of the abuses of matrimony. I suppose he thinks we never heard of them before; but the indiscriminate manner in which he charges such things home upon every body is neither just nor in good taste. I have read some thing from spiritual books on that subject, and I can not say that I find them so superior in this respect. You have had some specimens of their morality, and I might give others, and show that they regard it as a very important thing that the ladies should have the privilege of "popping the question," as it is called. But as to the deep, solemn truths, concerning duties in this and all other relations, I find no signs of identity with the simple and severe commands of Christ.

I suppose you are getting along very fast in your knowledge of the identities between the teachings of Modern Spiritualism and those of Christianity; but as a slight aid, I would like to read a little from the spirits themselves, as bearing upon the question. On page 186 of "Light from the Spirit World," we read, concerning marriages between persons who are not congenials: "they are without the union which constitutes real marriage in the sight of God; and the connection formed upon such conditions is *no better than other connections which bear a more wretched name.* The conditions are precisely similar, with the exception that one has the approbation of custom and law, while the other has not. We say it has the approbation of law; but what law? A law of wrong; a law of human folly—not a law of God. It has no sanction in nature, but *its binding force is repudiated by the wisdom of eternity.*" Therefore, of course, all spiritualists may remember that if they do not like their present marriage connections, they are absolved from them by the laws of the universe! Is it any wonder that Mr. Ballou had to give the warning which I read yesterday? Spiritualists, it seems, have two comforts. If they get into *rapport* with the spirits, they will kill off their obnoxious husbands or wives for them; or if they really love, a Mohammedan paradise is ready for them, as it was for Tom Paine, or the Englishman and the Turkish Sultana I read of!

The gentleman has very frankly, to say the least of it, decided your characters for you, and told you what you are. I do not wish to boast of Christians; we have no reason to boast; but I

must say that the spiritual mediums I have seen do not stand higher, in my judgment, than others. The gentleman had better give us some loftier specimens than any he has furnished to the eyes of this people or this audience, before we take them as models.

The point of progressive inspiration was before us yesterday, and I wish to refer to a few of the spiritualists' "facts," in addition to those I have before offered, to show how spirits progress when they go into the other world. I will give some specimens of *spirit literature*, and not from the lowest spheres, by any means. I quote from "Light from the Spirit World," page 41.

"Worldly wisdom is but another name for folly. It is but another name for ignorance. It is but another name for shame. It is but another name for perversion of what God and humanity require. It is but another manifestation of will. *It is but another name for which no other name will give a correct vision.* It is but another name for vice. It is but another name for evil. It is but another name for spiritual wickedness in high places, both in state and church. It is the will of man, undeveloped, unenlightened in spiritual knowledge."

You must now understand what wisdom is, without question; but if that does not perfectly explain it, we will read this from the next page. "*It is wisdom in wisdom of wisdom in selfishness!*" That certainly is "top-loftical;" it caps the climax of worldly wisdom.

Here is another, from the 56th page of the same book. He is speaking of *doubts* and their *weight*.

"But they weigh! Alas! they weigh like rods upon a fool's back. They weigh like irons upon the feet of slaves; like shackles on the hands of victims; like mountains on the sides of streams; like famine on the mind of want; like curses on the brow of folly; like mildew on the face of despair; like darkness on the world of night; like peace on the world of hope; like joy on the soul of wisdom; like rainbows on the arch of heaven; like tears on the melting clouds; like light on the weary world of sorrow, chasing away the sadness of bereavement, and unfolding the doors of a building not made with hands, which no man can shut."

Now you know what they weigh! Here, again are some communications from the celebrated spirit center in Athens county: the Koons' establishment, where they have such wonderful performances that my friend called up some witnesses at Cleveland to prove what wonderful things they did in the dark, with only phosphoric light enough to make the darkness visible. They have communications with spirits far back of Adam, one of whom calls himself Master of Paints, and Servant and Scholar of God. Here is one of them (Pamphlet, page 52):

"It is a deplorable fact, that most men are led by the feeble thread of *second-handed* opinions of those more daring than them-

selves, of more subtle character, aspiring *succedaneums* who fearlessly draw up a force of *histrionic* ceremonies, so *mortiferous* in their character, by which they ingeniously continue to *hackle* the understandings of those considering themselves subordinates, and who, unconscious of their artful designs, give themselves no uneasiness in regard to their origin or utility. * * * May God open your understandings to a full conviction of what we desire to teach, and prepare you for more glorious teachings than we dare make manifest at this time, of the love and greatness of God,

Whose love and mercies cease not,
Whose power and might decrease not,
Whose laws and systems change not,
Whose endless worlds derange not,
Whose glorious beauties fade not,
Whose starry heavens decay not,
Whose gifts of mercies fail not,
Whose ransomed hosts can wall not,
Whose pearly gems do mar not,
Whose listless comets jar not,

but swiftly fly from system to system as contributors in the grand and sublime territories of God's universe."

Here is a poetic effusion from the same spiritual source (page 58):

"Transcended here in your midst,
Once more we here have joined,
While swallowed up in sports and feats,
To satisfy your mind.
But notwithstanding all our pains
That we do take to show
The mystical pre-eminence
Which laid your morals low,
We still are met with numbers, who
Refuse to hear our cry;
Who daily cultivate some show,
Repugnant to the sky.

* * * * *

While on this earth we daily find
The *quatrupple* of seven.
The beast that was, and is, and is not,

but is now fulfilled, whose eyes are upon each other, like the eagles, who, in flight, are constantly spying out their objects of prey, while at the same time, each is engaged in *piping* their *enchanted and idiomatical notes of hypothesis*, into the *jeopardized ears* of their victims, *by which means* each becomes enabled to *dim the eyes* of their prey, at the moment they are prepared to introduce their talons!!"

This you see is progressive inspiration, and you may understand what to expect as you pass along from sphere to sphere.

Once more on the 88th page, describing a particular condition of mind, a spirit says,

"Which condition is produced by the convulsed agonies of the mind, till some ministering angel speaks peace to their souls, and soothes their bewildered spirits into the balmy ocean of sovereign love, where they sail upon the electric wings of time, which are flowing with the sparkling and refreshing dews, which are shed forth upon them from the altar of God's love, until they are plucked away and removed from this earthly sphere, and brought forth as a precious gem and pearl to participate and mingle with the bright angelic hosts of heaven."

On the next page is a fitting conclusion to all these "facts," in another spiritual communication.

"It is to these facts that we wish to elicit the attention of the clergy, who have successively claimed *succedaneum* over a large portion of mankind, for centuries past, and have exercised false judgment upon the souls of men, for filthy lucre's sake, * * and upon whose heads they have successively wreaked their *stentorophonic* anathemas, under their assumed prerogative, by which each in turn has attempted to exhibit a false vindictive character of the God of heaven."

I sincerely hope the clergy will be "*elicited*," and that you all will comprehend the *progressive inspiration* of the spirit world.

MR. TIFFANY.

I have now, ladies and gentlemen, in the gentleman's last speech, a very beautiful illustration of the principle I was affirming. The point I was wishing to impress upon you was, that even in our highest loves, humanity is low and imperfect. Does my friend wish to deny this? I was bringing up illustrations which would appeal to your own consciousness, that you might examine your hearts and see if what I said was not true. I spoke to every soul within my hearing; as well to those who come to the door to hear me and then go away, as to the rest. Now had my friend been seeking to apply the truth in the spirit of truth, he could not have made such remarks as he did.

I said the question was whether our minds were pure; and we determine that question in accordance with the standard of purity we have within us. If our standard is low, we can not judge ourselves as if our standard were high. Hence, if we "compare ourselves among ourselves, we are not wise." I referred to the loves called conjugal loves, not to advise you to break your conjugal connections, but to make you understand its low character and elevate it. I advised you to take such a course that such as

expression as "the honey-moon" could never grow into use. If my friend thinks there is no evil to be apprehended in that direction, let him say so. Let him say, Peace; all is well: your standard is high enough! I referred to facts to show that the lustful in the marriage relation are as guilty by the law of Christ, as those who are not in that relation. So far as the opinion of the community is concerned, you may not be blamed, but in your own heart you are guilty. I brought it up that you might see if your standard is as high as it should be. I spoke of a prevailing evil, and invited every one to notice it and to labor for its removal. The fearful evidences of that evil are found in the ruined health and depraved characters we find in the world; and since it is all true, have I not a right,—is it not my duty to speak of it? Your welfare and mine, and that of future generations depend upon it. Must I be still because there is a fastidious ear which will be pained by it? If my friend had the spirit of truth, he could not turn away its force by applying it as he did, as if I had meant to advise you to go into "free love," which I call free lust.

It is not at all surprising that spirits should speak back such things from the spirit world, for they carry with them the character they had in this world. My friend need not marvel at these things. If he does, he will marvel as Nicodemus did when he was told he must be born again. If you desire any thing higher in the condition of your soul, either in this world or that to come, the foundation must be laid in your own soul.

I was upon the subject of the love of truth. I said that we, as a race, have not the love of truth we suppose we have. We love it because we can appropriate it to some use or advantage of our own: because we can make it sustain our prejudices and our creeds. This then is the point I wish to impress upon you:—*The love we call genuine love is in most cases a love of the uses of things and not of things themselves.* Hence it contributes to our selfishness. This test I wish you to try your souls by.

The next point I wish to call your attention to, is that we are as much mistaken in our opinion that we love justice, as in our belief that we love truth. What is justice? It is the sustaining a true and equal relation between one man and another. Pure justice is always the child of truth and love. Truth points out the true relation we sustain to our fellows, and love prompts to act in accordance with that relation. I refer now to a higher standard than that of comparing ourselves with ourselves. I wish to show you why the world is where it is, so that you may seize upon the new and higher standard of virtue, and elevate yourselves and others.

You think you love justice. Take your whole system of trade: it is based upon the low principle of parting with as little as possible and getting in return as much as possible. In commercial

matters, if you keep within the law against frauds, you are said to be just. But what is the truth? You are trying to grasp all you can from your brother, without giving him an equivalent for it. Hence it is that they who would be rich can not inherit the kingdom of heaven. "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven:" and it is equally hard for such a spirit as I have described, to come into that love of justice which is the type of all truth and love.

Looking at the world in this point of view, and seeing its low standard of love, purity, and justice, do you wonder that Christianity has not wrought its perfect work? Do you wonder that it has been dwindling down to mere form, when even religion is taught, not for its intrinsic worth, but for the use it will be to us? Don't you see that your standard is not right? The Bible is right; but your interpretation has put every thing below the standard, and that is the reason why true character is not developed. I have not taken the lowest classes of men; I have not gone down to the drunkard, the libertine, the debauchee; but I have taken your moral men, and shown you that you have lost the true standard which would fit you for becoming like Jesus of Nazareth. Is not this so? Is my picture overdrawn? Has the world arrived at that standard of truth, and justice, and love, which will enable it to receive the teachings of Christ in purity, so as to work out a holy life in the soul? Answer me in the spirit of truth?

I will tell you plainly what use I mean to make of this. My friend has not denied that spirits of the departed can have, and do have, access to men. They speak their lusts and passions, and perform in keeping with the character they possessed on earth. When, then, you look at yourselves, and pass judgment upon your own souls, in the light of the standard I have given you, remembering that in the other world you will retain the loves which rule you in this, you will feel like bowing your faces in the dust, and crying, Unclean, and like taking diligent heed to elevate your souls whilst you are in the body. There is no occasion here for arrogance or pride, but rather for being meek, humble, and earnest.

When we look at political justice and morality—what is it! We can celebrate the Fourth of July, and then go and pass Nebraska Bills, and shout Hurrah! This proclivity toward selfishness and injustice we find every where. If we go to a store to purchase goods, we like a little better to have the odd cent of change on our side. So it is in all relations of life; whereas, we should rather be the subject of wrong than be guilty of doing it to others. Now, do you wonder, since the spirit world is being peopled from this, and since we carry our characters with us—do you wonder that the manifestations which come from thence should be low, ignorant, and even foolish and absurd? Nevertheless, the truth stands before you; and if it is true, the only question with

you should be, What does the truth prove? Are these communications from the spirit world? Do spirits operate upon us? If so, what are we to learn from the facts, and what do they admonish us of? Are we not called upon to purify ourselves, and raise our souls above the influence of all that is low and vile? All evil can not prevail against us, if we take the proper mode of shielding ourselves from its influence. We can receive lessons from all that is around us: from the wise man and from the child, and even from the poor drunkard lying in the mire: for his deplorable condition is voicing forth truths, that may make us wise unto salvation, and he who is wise and truthful has an ear to hear the sayings, even of such phenomena.

I have shown you that our loves are selfish, and that even when men are working for the right and good, they often do it in a selfish manner. In this our debate, we should not argue for the purpose of beating each other, but to discover truth. We should not be employing our power to turn a point aside, but when a truth is presented we should take its decision, and abide by it.

Now, as the law of affinity, based upon character, is the great law which Christ proclaimed, we can find an explanation, in accordance with it, for all the phenomena and manifestations which come to us from the spirit world. They all have their place, and are accounted for by the characters and affinities which have been possessed by the people of this world. They may be very, very far from wise and holy, but we should, from the phenomena, learn the truth.

Anger can not exist in a mind formed according to the standard I have given you, for it can only exist in a selfish being. Take any occasion in which you can conceive an individual showing anger, and I will prove that he is selfish in it. If my friend should prove that God gets angry, I will prove that God is selfish; but I affirm that God is not, and can not be selfish, and therefore that he can never be angry. When we come to the subject of the vicarious atonement as we shall do, under the second question, I will examine this point in its full length and breadth.

"Whence come wars and fighting among you?" They come from this same selfishness; this desire to appropriate to ourselves all that we can, in spite of the good of others. Destroy man's selfishness, and you destroy the only basis upon which wickedness can rise. Christ, in laying the ax at the root of the tree, laid his doctrine at the root of this selfishness in man. All his teachings aimed at operating upon and destroying selfishness, so as to implant pure and holy love in the heart. Hence, you will find that in every thing he attempted, he aimed, directly or indirectly, at this selfish principle. Pure love will attract the soul to the Spirit of the Father, and we can see how much such an influence is needed by you, and me, and every human being.

What, then, is the great central truth of Christ's system? It is this: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Every other truth in his system refers to this. This new birth was to be a death of the old and selfish nature, and an implanting of the just, the pure, the good. To accomplish this great work of subduing the selfish nature, and developing love toward God and man, was the burden of his teachings. He had pure love; he was the incarnate wisdom and love of the Father, working out the only redemption that could be wrought in the human soul, to fit it for the society of his Father. Subdue self, and be established in the divine love—that is the great, the only work! Any system which conflicts with that, conflicts with the truths of Christianity, and denies its teachings and examples. As far as we fall short of that, we fall short of Christianity. Every thing about us teaches that; from the pebble to the stars; from a monad to the highest archangel—all demonstrate it. Spiritualism, in all its phenomena and teachings, demonstrates that great central truth, from which there is no escape; and if those that are in a low plane deny its truth, their very denial demonstrates the doctrine, for Christ taught that men can only receive truth which they are fitted to receive. "These things the world can not receive, because it seeth them not, neither knoweth them." (John xiv: 17.) Thus, all progressive development manifests the great law which Christ promulgated to the world.

Why could not the perfect demonstration of the law be given to Moses? Moses was not like Christ in character and wisdom. Why could it not be given to David? to Solomon? to John the Baptist? to Christ's disciples? The reason was, they had not in them that spirit, they had not that state and condition, which was necessary to enable them to receive it. God is here to-day by his love, his wisdom, and his power; but why do not you and I perceive it? Because we have not that purity of love, that love of truth, justice, and right, which we need. Because we ourselves do not ask from the soul for what we need. We ask with our lips, but only for the sake of the use and advantage which we expect, and not from any hungering of the soul after a higher life.

MR. KERRETT.

My friend has said a great many good things upon holiness, justice, and truth; and so far as he counsels us to receive it in the spirit of truth, I can not object to it. Still, I submit that it is somewhat out of place. We have all known, for a long time, how low and imperfect, how debased and unholy, the carnal heart is. The churches have not been ignorant of it; the ministers of the gospel have dwelt upon it. Indeed, the gentleman himself regards

the church as a go-between, by which those who are too debased to understand his high and sublime philosophy, may come up into the regions of decent morality, temperance, and virtue; and he has declared that for this good work, he would not destroy the church. We may do our work till humanity is prepared for the elevated teachings of Spiritualism!

But, seriously, have we known none of these things before? Is any one indebted to *Modern Spiritualism* for his knowledge of the wrongs and imperfections in the world, and in his own heart? Were we not familiar before, with a pure and holy standard of character, as presented in the life of our Redeemer? Have there never before been longings, and strivings, and earnest supplications for the overcoming of sin, progressing heavenward, and becoming Christ-like in spirit and character? And if there had not been, what is there in Spiritualism, in the name of goodness and truth, to inspire it in our hearts? I deny that there is any such influence in the teachings of Spiritualism. I have challenged the gentleman to show it there, and have proven that he gets all that there is pure in his teachings, from our own Christianity and the teachings of natural religion. In Spiritualism, you will find apologies for man's vices, such as are well calculated to make him contented in all wickedness and evil-doing, but no really regenerating influences. I say before heaven and earth, that if I had to depend upon Spiritualism for any aid heaven-ward or God-ward, I should be driven to absolute despair, and feel that the last ray of hope had died out forever.

I did not charge upon the gentleman that he wished us to go into free-love; but I charged it upon Spiritualism, and I affirm that I fastened the charge there. I showed that the tendency was just what Mr. Ballou said it was, and therefore there was a great necessity for his warning, and he breathed it out like an honest man. There are individuals among spiritualists, who are moral in thought and feeling, but they owe their morality to their early teachings in that Christianity which this new system would make us despise. To that Christianity they owe every thing which would make them hate the degrading and defiling influences about them. The gentleman himself owes his moral doctrines to the same source. But whilst I admit that he says many good things in morals, I must also declare that many of his speculations are altogether too fine spun for me. He may use that admission against me, to prove me anti-Christ, if he will. I frankly admit that, to my mind, all love necessarily implies a desirableness in the object beloved—an adaptation in some manner to the wants of *my* nature; and I love it because it is a good to *me*. If I love truth and righteousness, one of the reasons is that they are good for me, for you, for everybody; and, I ask, who is there could love them if he knew they were to be his everlasting foe, and bring

down upon him injury, wrong, shame, and suffering, for time and eternity? Could you then love them *for their own sake*? You love truth because truth is a good to you and others; and if you hate selfishness, it is, in part at least, because you see that it is a continued injury to yourself and others. It is impossible to separate these reasons from the mass of motives, and God does not command us to do it. I recognize no higher law of morals, in our relations to each other, than that rule of Jesus', "Thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*;" and I think we should have a very good world if men practiced that precept in its full meaning and application.

If the gentleman says that Jesus taught us to despise the use of things, he says what he can not prove. He taught the people to "fear Him who hath power to cast both soul and body into hell," and repeats his exhortation, "Yea, I say unto you, *fear Him*." Let it not be answered by the gentleman, that he does not agree with me as to what hell is. That is of little consequence: it can not be denied that it is an *evil*, and as an evil, he tells the people to fear it. He does not tell men to throw their own happiness into oblivion, in order to come into harmony with truth and righteousness; but when he tells us to put away that which would hinder our salvation, he gives as a reason that it is *better for us* to enter into heaven blind or lame, than, having two hands or eyes, to be cast into hell-fire.

I objected, at the outset, to the gentleman's notions of discrete degrees. The fact is, that self is carried over from one to the other. The second degree is no more free from it than the first, and there is no such line of distinction between the two as he would have us think there is. Until he excludes all human nature from his second sphere, he can not deny that motives influence choice in that as well as the first, and that whatever I choose, gratifies me in some way or other.

With regard to commerce, I can say without boasting that there is nothing new in what my friend said; for all the true principles which he referred to, are embodied in a commercial discourse I preached last Thanksgiving-day; and our community here, at least, are not unaccustomed to bear the duties of mercantile morality insisted upon from the pulpit. All of us have become familiar with those principles, but I do not think we shall be easily convinced that we have got them by *rapport* with him, as he says he got his "discrete degrees," and his *esse* and *existere* from Swedenborg.

But, after all, I must repeat that all this is not Spiritualism, but only the gentleman's philosophy—his dogma.

In like manner, what he said of political morality is equally old and well known, although undoubtedly not so generally acted upon as it should be.

What I ask is, Can you find any spiritual manifestations which have a tendency to make you love truth and justice more? Do you love them any more in consequence of such a demonstration as you saw here yesterday? That there is a great deal to be done to bring society up to the Christian idea, is painfully apparent. We have our work to do, under God, in raising men up, and we must not faint though we find it slow work. My friend will find it slow work, even with his fine philosophy. Even spiritualists are prone to take the road downward to hell, and my friend recognizes the necessity of sounding the note of alarm. Can we, then, find any purer aid in Modern Spiritualism than our own divine Christianity affords us? If we could, we might lay hold of it; but we can get no aid from that quarter—we can find no hope for the world in its teachings.

The gentleman says I do not deny that spirits can and do have communication with man, to influence him. I have neither affirmed nor denied upon the subject. I admitted angelic ministrations; but I denied that the angels spoken of in Scripture, as ministering to those who are the heirs of salvation, are disembodied human spirits.

We are asked whether it is not to be expected that the communications should be low, assuming his theory that these spirits were formerly inhabitants of earth. I don't know that we ought to wonder at them, but was not the time of Christ as selfish an age as this? Christ found it necessary to say, "How hardly shall they that have riches, enter into the kingdom of God." He drew the portraits of selfish men, with master hand, and they stand out before us with amazing vividness. They revel in their luxury before us, pampering every appetite, clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day. We can follow them beyond this life, and beyond the grave, and stand horror-stricken as we see them lifting up their eyes in torment. All these things he drew with more than painter's art, that we might see how low and contemptible a character the sensualist has. He told us also of him who would pull down his barns and build greater, and the purse-proud lord of rich estates seems to live before us, and we hear his self-satisfied animal nature exclaim, "soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry;" but in all this luxury the Divine vengeance is after him, and the fool's soul is required of him! If there was such selfishness in the world that there was a necessity of so powerfully preaching against it, how happens it that these low manifestations were reserved for these days? Why is it that an *identical* system, in these days, endorses as part of Spiritualism, the communications of beings whom Jesus would have spurned from his presence forever? Certainly our Christianity is no inferior standard, but incomparable above any thing which this Spiritualism can produce.

My friend says we can learn truth from every thing : from the drunkard as well as from those who exhibit purity and temperance. In one sense it is true. We can *take warning* from the drunkard, and guard against the vice which sent him to the gutter; and when we see all the impurity and vileness in Spiritualism, we can in like manner, learn to guard against every thing which can lead to such results. But does that make the system identical with Christianity! Are drunkenness and total abstinence identical in character, because the horror of delirium tremens warn us to keep sober? By such reasoning you can prove that the *disgusting* exhibition of any vice is *identical* with its opposite virtue! Yet this ridiculous fallacy is the whole basis of the gentleman's argument.

Affinity, he tells us, explains all these manifestations, low as they are. But I have demanded the higher ones. If these are all there are, in the name of heaven let the whole thing go till you can establish something better. Do not pollute the world with this vile trash, and then say coolly, You can learn from it, if you will; it teaches the same lessons as Christ taught! I tell you a thousand will be lured to destruction by the sensual pleasures of vice, where one will get your metaphysical mode of extracting good out of it!

The gospel offers us ministering spirits, pure as the heavens; it offers communion with the spirit of the living God; and shall we come down to share in the communications of spirits whose every word would cause a blush to mantle the cheek of purity? Lessons and warnings have, time out of mind, been given from our pulpits, showing the fearful danger of yielding to the sins of anger, malice, lust, pride, and selfishness, and men have been told of the danger of their being cut off from communion with the Holy One, and grieving away the spirit of God. These holy influences have by God's grace rescued many a soul from error, and made them bright examples of the power of God's truth to cleanse the heart. What does Spiritualism offer to allure us from such a gospel as this?

My friend denied that anger could ever be right, and yet we read in the 3rd chapter of Mark, that Jesus looked round upon the Pharisees with anger.

MR. TIFFANY. Is that a good interpretation?

MR. ERRETT. I believe it is; but I have not the Greek text with me. If the passage is not correctly rendered you may show it. It stands so in the common version. I quote it to show that there are circumstances when anger may be called for; but in all the ordinary course of mortal life we all know the necessity of overcoming all temptations to passion and strife. All Christians acknowledge the necessity of every man's turning away his heart from love of sin of all kinds, before he can enter into the kingdom of God. No mere form of worship, no baptism, no ordinance or

act of any kind can make a man a Christian, till he has put away selfishness, cultivated a peaceful and loving spirit toward his fellow, and yielded his whole soul to do the will of his Father in Heaven.

We who are called Disciples are being better understood by our brethren than we were formerly, and the idea that we trust in ordinances to save our souls is dying out of the Christian church.

MR. TIFFANY.

I was sorry to hear my friend say he ignored any higher love than that which pertains to self. If my friend has not been elevated to a higher sphere than that, I can say that I have. I know what it is to love truth and purity, each for its own sake,—because it is divine and holy. My friend takes the standard, Love thy neighbor as thyself; and I say that is by no means the highest standard.

MR. ERRETT. Not of morality?

MR. TIFFANY. Grant it may be of relational morals; but you admit then that there is a higher standard of spiritual love?

MR. ERRETT. We were simply talking of morality. Your examples were all drawn from the common relations of life.

MR. TIFFANY. I was talking of *uses*, and blaming that false love which rejoices only in the use of a thing.

QUESTION BY ONE OF THE AUDIENCE. Did you not admit, last winter, that in both the lower spheres, all choice and volition imply a *preference* of the thing chosen because it is a good to the *person choosing*; and does not that involve some reference to self in the choice?

MR. TIFFANY. Certainly. I was just about to come to that, and to say that when the *Divine* standard is received, all idea of uses must cease. In the third sphere, love becomes subjective, as God's is, because we become one with the Father.

My friend admits that we can learn something from the drunkard, but seems to think the lesson is, to avoid him. I say, go to him and strive to elevate him. We should be so fortified in truth, that we could, like Jesus of Nazareth, be able to sit down with sinners and eat with them. There is a great difference between associating by affinity with poor degraded creatures, and going to them as physicians for their sin-sick souls. The only redemptive principle in the universe is the Divine principle. The highest nature of man's own soul must be cultivated and unfolded until he is able to appreciate the glories to which he may rise, and of his own free will and pure love of holiness, cast off every weight and rise to the bosom of the Father. We must therefore seek out the poor degraded ones, and be ourselves ministering spirits to them,

holding the loveliness of truth and virtue before them, till their hearts warm with the love of purity.

If we do not attempt to receive truth faster than we are prepared to receive it, there is no danger of our falling into error. We must not think we can receive truth upon authority: we shall receive nothing but falsehood if we attempt to do it. No matter who utters it, we must perceive it and understand it for ourselves. The warning is to "take heed how we hear."

It is an admitted fact that communications with departed spirits are possible. When it is claimed that such communications were forbidden by the Mosaic law, there is an implied admission of their possibility. The fact then is agreed upon. How far the thing may be right, must be settled upon other principles. If it is true that spirits may thus influence us, does it not become us to know by what law we are subject to their influences? and do not these phenomena become part of the facts by which we are to be informed and know their influence? When my friend preaches that we are to resist the temptations of the devil, he admits that that spirit can influence our minds. Does he not admit, also, that the various phenomena of Modern Spiritualism exist as facts? If so, the laws producing their existence are laws which are a portion of the system of the Divine government. We have got to sift these laws and phenomena, and see what they prove,—what they demonstrate. When we have ascertained what they demonstrate, we have the teachings; and not till then. My friend insists upon adhering to the dogmas of individuals, and calling that Spiritualism. He would have you take the whole thing upon authority, whereas you should only take the laws which your own minds perceive to underlie the phenomena. This position has seemed to me like a quibble upon my friend's part, and I have constantly denied his right to take these books and call them the teachings of Spiritualism. The teachings of any individual are what may be learned from the phenomena he presents, and not from his dogmatism. I would have you do as I do. Throw away this receiving of truth upon authority, for that always leads the mind into error. Study the facts, and the truths will come into your mind as fast as you are unfolded, so as to be able to receive them. You must not turn your back upon small things. Suppose you were studying the laws which fashioned the systems of the universe,—you may see the identical law in the dew-drop which governs the whole. The phenomena are not so grand, but the law is the same. So, when I have discovered what the fundamental law of Christianity is, I take it and go forth into the spiritual universe, and demonstrate that all the phenomena refer back to that fundamental law and sustain it. Any effort to avoid this by showing that the dogmas of individuals differ upon the subject, is a mere quibble.

The fundamental law in Christianity is that the mind can receive nothing till it is developed to the condition where the reception becomes possible. I can only receive the things of the flesh, while I am in the plane of the flesh; and so of the planes of the spiritual and divine. Every phenomenon of Spiritualism and of Christianity is based upon this law of the receptivity of mind. Look at it in all its phases and bearings, and you will see that it is to mind what the law of gravitation is to matter.

Another great law is, that the mind can not be in two different positive conditions, at the same time. "Ye can not serve God and Mammon." We have determined that there are certain planes: when we are in one, we can not, at the same time, be in another. The plane determines our character; and by fully appreciating our position, we learn what step it is necessary for us to take next, in order to rise to a higher plane and higher character.

To enter the kingdom of God, man must rise to a higher plane:—he must be "born again." This declaration made Nicodemus marvel; but Christ gave it as a fundamental law, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom. We have had some talk about "guessing," and if I might use the privilege, I would guess that my friend understands *baptism* by being "born of water." At any rate, some so understand it; but I say it means no such thing, and will give some reasons for thinking so. First, I will give one in the shape of authority. Christ said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Now, by the same reasoning, that which is born of the water is *water*. Christ intended to teach that every spirit must have two births;—the fleshly and the spiritual. Angels, also, are subject to this law. For why should *we* be obliged to begin down here, in ignorance and selfishness, and develop ourselves up to knowledge and wisdom, to charity and to Divine love, if there is a shorter way for a soul to reach those heights? There is an absolute necessity involved in this course of things. If our existence did not commence here, we could never have become individual intelligences. In order to get individuality, it is necessary that we should have a natural and individual birth. We have to begin here that we may get the elements of self-knowledge, and all mental existence must begin in this form. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was as necessary in the garden as the tree of life. Goodness and wisdom were just as much manifested in the planting of that tree of knowledge, as in the planting of the tree of life. You and I must begin, therefore, where all must begin; where we have no knowledge and no love. Our individuality of being grows out of our development from that point. Then it is necessary that there should be a birth of the flesh, begetting its fleshly influences as it must under the great law.

Here, then, is individuality secured, and the next thing is to give true character to the new being. He must be ruled by the same love which ruled Christ; be born of the same spirit; be enabled to receive at the same fountain; so that he may in like manner be a son of the Father. Hence the two births are absolutely indispensable. The birth of the water to give individuality, and the birth of the Spirit, to give character. The term water is used, as being the most proper word to express a refined material existence. It is the most refined of the tangible, visible, material essences. Air is more refined and subtle, but it has not the same appearance of materiality about it; it does not address itself to our senses in the same way. These, therefore, are the two births, and there is no principle of philosophy which can give to them a different meaning. It is harmonious with nature, and harmonious with Christ's teachings. That which is born of the flesh is flesh: it inherits the nature of that from which it is born. That which is born of the spirit is spirit: it gets its mental, its spiritual character, by the spiritual birth.

Then taking the great law of the receptivity of mind, we find that in the natural plane, the mind can only receive the things of nature—of the flesh; and if we are to receive spiritual things, we must be in the spiritual plane; whilst, to receive Divine things, we must rise to the sphere of the Absolute and Divine.

Let us review again the three mental planes. First, is the knowledge of facts without perceiving their truths and relations; next, the sphere of philosophy and relations, where the phenomena are considered in their laws and relations, and the soul satisfies itself with inquiries as to the *how* and the *why*, both in morals and in natural science or in either; and lastly, the sphere of the Divine, where perfect love reigns, and God is all in all.

Man's development and affinity will be in accordance with his plane; and if he has not attained a point where he can receive absolute purity, truth, and love, he can only look at them in the finite and relational plane. If we understand that our business is to overcome whatever confines us to the natural plane, and that we can not progress in spiritual truth and love till we try to raise ourselves, we shall be induced to put forth strenuous efforts to attain that end.

If Christ was in so elevated a plane that he could receive truth direct from the Father, it was by virtue of the same law which governs all our minds. He was able to communicate with the Divine sphere because he had received the Divine birth which was necessary; and all the phenomena of his inspiration have their basis in the same law: That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.

ONE OF THE AUDIENCE. I should like to know, Mr. Moderator, what is the question under discussion.

MR. TIFFANY. One thing above all others I wish to see. I would like to see goodness of heart, if I can not see ordinary intelligence. (*Some stamping.*) I want no cheering.

MR. ERRETT. That is goodness of feet!

MR. TIFFANY. I want no goodness of feet, either, but of heart.

I was saying that God's communication of blessings is always according to the plane we are in, and that if we would obtain the blessings of a higher sphere, we must elevate ourselves to that sphere. The animal nature can receive the blessings fitted for its condition, the moral and relational can receive its peculiar blessing, but not till we reach the absolute can we partake of all the fullness of the Divine love.

These truths have to do with our present salvation. Upon the fundamental truths I have exhibited, are based all the doctrines needed to bring our souls to God. My friend complains that I have brought forth no new truths. I have not come to speak new truths. I make no claim to originality. I admit that these truths are old as the Universe; but I say they are not acknowledged and realized so as to work their proper work in your hearts, and therefore I come to point them out, and induce you to look at them, that the clear perception may grow up in your minds, and they become living truths to you. I ask you not to receive them upon my authority, but to examine them and see whether your own minds do not affirm that they are demonstratively true.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

Before proceeding to notice the last argument of my friend, I shall give a few extracts from the spiritual classics, by way of illustrating still further the progressive inspiration and cultivated powers of the inhabitants of the spirit sphere. I will first read a little from DR. CHANNING: you know we had some speeches from him last winter, through Mr. Lockwood. The Dr. has been speaking through Mr. Champion, of Nashville, Tenn., who is said to be the most remarkable spirit-medium of the age, and who has been endorsed by the Cleveland "Spiritual Universe." The book is called "Spirit Communion, by J. B. Ferguson." On page 65, Dr. Channing tells the spiritualists that "Doctrinal subjects, supposed by your opponents to be weighty in their bearing, should be suffered to repose beneath the shades that dim the memory with their perversity." On the next page he tells them, "We stand upon the brow of a high and majestic eminence, whose heights but bow in token of the majestic heavens that overshadow its tremendous base. A retro-

spective view presents every variety of aspect. We behold, far in the dim distance of the future, the miraculous stream of eternity. We say miraculous, *because it is fraught with every diversity of imagery*. We behold, upon its bosom, the cloud and sunshine of life. But our attention is arrested by the approach of many a frail barque, burdened with the cares, and toils, and tumultuous misgivings, that have clouded the brow and sickened the heart with its lamentable dangers. They have been borne on amid storms and tempests, but have, at last, one, but one, solitary hour of repose *beneath the umbrageous boughs of a sacred decree, inhaled, it may be, from heaven.* * * Man boldly looks forward, and what presents itself to his dim vision of the future? The mighty palisade of human rearing towers amid the heavens. *Its height and depth soars beyond the comprehension of man.*"

On page 68, we have the following coruscations of eloquence: "I have made this impress, that it may present a figure worthy of your contemplation. Then *let it sink deep into the profundity of thy highest ends.* Let not the cloud dim. Oh, no! For some gentle zephyr, wafted by holy hands, will dispel its darkness; and behold, what comes forth! A *meteor of endearing grandeur and radiant splendor*, to warm the once *doubting and icy heart-throb*, frozen by the countless wrongs of man to his fellow-man. For all shall yet see the gentle stream, whose *gurgling dew* will yet add balm to the suffering soul, and give growth to its most ardent achievements."

All of you who are acquainted with the chaste elegance of Dr. Channing's style may estimate the rapidity of his "progressive inspiration," if, by this time, he can write such ridiculous balderdash.

On the 78d page, he prophesies that "the mighty cataract of public opinion will *surge* on upon the mighty billows of time, until it shall *encompass all nations*, and all tongues shall sound the loud cymbal of man's redemption from the thralldom of bigotry and superstition."

On the 84th page, is a passage which carries abundant "internal evidence" of its author's identity. It reads: "Who forged the *chains that pained the beauties of love*, or the emblems of peace in thee, O man! Have the slumbering ages of antiquity been *resurrected and renewed*, to comport in unison with assumed demonstrations of power, to win man to God?" You know how often Channing used such a word as "resurrected!"

On the next page, he asks, "Is God still *building* on such *lascivious buddings* of depravity as your ancient records presents?"

On page 86 he says, "We propose to *strike* at the *fountain* of thought, and *regale* beneath its *intuitive lessons*. You *extract* the *bark of distrust* that *enshrouds* the *meditations of the Bible*, and you will have no facts left."

Well, that will do! You are, doubtless, charmed. I may as well advertise, now that you are prepared to appreciate it, that the spirit of Channing is preparing to give, through his medium, a new commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, to correct the theology of modern days. It is to contain criticisms upon the Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, and Greek, and this medium is to write it out!

I must now give you a poetic effusion from the spirit of *Benjamin Franklin*, and one from *George Washington*. I suppose they have not cultivated the muses much, and we ought not to expect them to do great things. The little similarities of style, I suppose, we may attribute to their being in the same "discrete degree." (Mattison, page 115.)

"The likeness of this portrait is to represent
The likeness of man when he dwelt here below,
But the likeness of the spirit you would like to know,
And this would be no more than I would like to show,
But the mind is not prepared, the likeness for to see,
Of spirits from the Angels' home as bright as we.—B. FRANKLIN."

The following is in *like* manner, under the portrait of Washington:

"When the likeness of this portrait you see,
Remember that it is to represent the likeness of me;
But the spirit in its brightness you can not see,
For it now is far above the brightness of thee.—G. WASHINGTON."

I think I could catch the inspiration of that sphere, and grind out machine poetry of the same sort, saying:

"The mind is not prepared, the beauty for to see,
Of such nonsensical pretense to poetry."

Our sages and heroes must be "progressing" indeed! Such communications put it beyond cavil!

The "Epic of the Starry Heavens," the gentleman called better poetry than Milton wrote. I will not say that it is all like some specimens I shall read, but I will let you judge if Milton could write such stuff, if he tried.

"Another scene is pictured on my brain;
A shower of golden rain
Calls me to outer consciousness again.
The former spell is broken,
Once more I am awoken;

I see the smiling flowers, and breathe the fragrant balms." Page 47:

Again, page 48:

"Pale rivers of celestial fire
Flow down into the natural sky, and roll
Around the world pure love spheres, that the soul

Can bathe in. These young infants they baptise
 In the auroral effluence of their skies.
 Each infant, now, clairvoyant, wakes and sings
 In the clear dawn, unfolding *sphere-like wings*
Of golden flame, instarred with beauty. Hark!
 Each infant spirit, like a *glowing spark*—
 A *star of love*, whose light is melody—
Sings, warbling in the ether calm and high."

Have you not a very definite idea of all that?

MR. TIFFANY.—I have.

MR. ERRETT.—Well, I have not the inspiration necessary.
 On the 49th page we find out how they learn things up there:

"We are rising, we are rising,
 To the God from whom we came;
 In our *innocent surmising*
 We have found his inner name."

"Innocent surmisings" are probably as correct teachers as
 the gentleman's "inspiration." Again, page 52:

"They sing amid
 The leafy covert, and from sight are hid
 By the *harmonious river of sweet song*."

Which you see is a novel mode of hiding. Still again on
 page 108:

"Yea, golden bands,
 Thy desert sands,
 Oh, Earth shall interfuse!
 And into thee
 From heaven shall be
 Impoured celestial *dews*
Of amber light
 And liquid *flame*,
 And these in turn shall be
 Cups lifted for
 The diamond rain
 Of immortality."

That's poetic surely! Dews of light and flame poured from
 heaven are to become cups to hold the "diamond rain of immor-
 tality!!" Well, that *may* equal Milton, in the gentleman's esti-
 mation: there's no accounting for tastes.

I will now turn to the gentleman's last speech. The gentle-
 man said he was sorry to hear me say what I did about self-love.
 I said I could not reach his ideas of ignoring self in our moral
 actions, and relational conduct: that the great law of *morals* is,
 Love thy neighbor *as thyself*. To live up to this law, I said was
 the highest form of morality. This he has admitted. Where
 then can he find fault with me. I mourn over the great display

of selfishness in the world as much as he can, and earnestly preach and teach that we may enjoy a *holy* satisfaction in *doing good*, instead of gratifying our appetites and selfish desires. That holy life would still be enjoyment, and the happiness would be a *motive* to choose that course; but there would be no blamable *selfishness* in it. We should have the highest type of morality. Beyond that, in the gentleman's theory is the Absolute, where personality and all objective action ceases. To that region his argument can not refer, and in yielding the point that self enters necessarily into all our choices in the lower spheres (which he did in reply to Mr. C.'s question), he has yielded the only point at issue.

But let us look at his personal experience a little. He said he had got so far as not to be influenced by self love at all. Yet he has never passed into the sphere of the Divine. How does this consist with his admissions? He said also, that he loves truth because it is divine and holy. But why does he love what is divine and holy? If what was divine and holy should continually injure, wrong, and degrade him, could he love it then? If he loves it at all, it is because, in its influences upon his mind and heart, it will work out the true ends of his being. He can not separate himself from the motives to love and to choose. What he chooses, he prefers; it *pleases him* more than the opposite; he *gratifies himself* in obtaining it. If he thus seeks gratification in doing good and cultivating the pure and holy in his nature, it is ennobling and right; but if he seeks it in such a way as to debase his own nature and injure his neighbor, it is selfishness and sin. This is the true distinction; but in either case it is impossible to set aside all influence from within, from ourselves—in our relational and moral actions. This must be the case as long as we have a consciousness of individual existence. What may be the case in that "absolute sphere," where his doctrine of "unity with the Divine" is not distinguishable from the Hindoo theory of absorption into Brahma, or annihilation, I will not pretend to say: I cannot follow him thither. If self is destroyed by the destruction of individuality, I presume there could hardly be any self love. In that sphere, where I am no longer myself, and no one has any longer a personal existence, the gentleman may fix his own theories; I will not quarrel with them. But if his system does admit any personality in the third sphere, all I have said of choice and self love, is applicable.

When he said we could learn from the drunkard, I admitted that we could learn our own frailty, and how necessary it is to avoid temptation to drunkenness; and I asked him whether he meant to argue that Spiritualism and Christianity were identical in the same way as this argument showed total abstinence and drunkenness to be identical in their "teachings." He meets it,

as he meets all argument. He says, "No! I say go to the drunkard; do not pass him by, but strive to elevate him." But where had I maintained the contrary?

MR. TIFFANY. I did not fix that meaning upon your language.

MR. ERRETT. What point is there in your attempted reply then? It is mere rant. No sane man will say we should go to the drunkard to listen to his blasphemies, and let him pour out his vomit and filthy abominations upon us! The duty of warning the drunkard of his approaching ruin and helping him regain his lost manhood—who has denied it? Now what is there in the case of Spiritualism that is analogous to this. I have warned you against the influences of these "spiritual circles" as more fearful than any of the malignant contagions which breed about the styes where drunkards congregate: so far there is some analogy. But does the gentleman claim that Earth is to send her missionaries to Hades to elevate the spirits there to the level of our own minds? What does he mean by the comparison, and what exhortation has he analogous to his injunction to "go to the drunkard?" I can not but regard this mode of talking, as an attempt to avoid the plain question I put concerning the nature of the identity between the systems.

But if he himself would go to the spirits in the other world, and labor among them, let him do so. Judge Edmonds has set the example, in acting as pilot to Paradise for the spirits who came from the wrecked Arctic. For myself, I humbly submit that I can find degraded spirits enough, in the flesh, to use up all my time and energies in working for their redemption and elevation.

If however, the gentleman takes the position that there is to be no communication with inferior spirits, but one which is active on our parts, and in which they are the passive recipients of influence, the whole theory of passivity goes by the board.

MR. TIFFANY.

If my friend was a little more familiar with the deductions from the principles he talks about, he would find that we have to do with spirits, even in heaven, and that Jesus' salvation reaches to every thing in the earth and under the earth. A soul, to be redeemed at all, must be redeemed by the same principle, be it rich or poor, high or low. If his Christianity is not for the redemption of spirits in Hades, it is not true Christianity; for I can inform him that Christ's redemption is as broad and universal as the universe itself. There is no spirit, high or low, that will not perform its mission and its part in the great work.

I did not delay upon the question of the selfishness which my friend attributes to all morality and all actions in the relational sphere because I supposed he confined his remarks to that selfishness which has reference to uses, and acts with a conscious view to the material advantages which one's choice may bring to him. The difference between the animal and the relational spheres is this: in the first, the standard of use is in ourself; but in the second, it is in our neighbor. In the first, we only love what will produce physical gratification in us: in the other, we love what will benefit our fellow man. In the latter case, there is no standard of use or advantage to *self*, which induces a person to adopt the benevolent course. But my friend does not seem to understand this. The idea seems to be inwoven into his philosophy, that every thing comes from the material: that even God is matter. His whole philosophy is turned round;—an inversion of the truth.

Why does a thing delight the soul? A piece of music charms and delights me: this does not arise from any *use* to me; but the first time it strikes upon my ear I feel exalted, and my soul thrills with delight under its influence. Where was the standard of use that led me to delight in that music? There is a fitness of things which appeals to my higher nature, and rises above the standard of use. Even in melody we notice an example of it. Take also the artist at his easel. He does not stop to enquire whether his picture will give him fame or not,—whether it is to be seen at all, or not. He follows an impulse which urges him to put upon canvass that ideal image which his mind revels over; and when a picture is painted from that inspiration, if I may use the term, then it is that the artist gets a painter's immortality. In such a case, genius glows upon the canvass: there is nothing stiff and formal about it; but the flame of inspiration is there. If my friend would look, he would find that there is that in every department of mind which rises above the standard of use. As I said before, the difference between the considerations in the natural and moral planes, is, that the standard of use in the one case is in myself, and in the other it is in my neighbor. When we are influenced to act from a consideration of uses, the delight is not in the act itself, but in the use. Separate the use from the action, and it pleases no more than any other act. The idea of action in the high moral sphere, is that in which there is no separation between the act and the use, but the act itself is its own immediate reward. If I meet a neighbor in distress and divide my money with him that he may purchase what he needs, and he then goes and purchases what hurts him, I have lost my use, if I set my heart upon his making a proper purchase, as the motive of my act. But if I regarded it as the simple outpouring of my benevolence,—my good will toward him, the gift itself was my delight

for its own sake. Now, can not my friend see the difference between the two actions? Does he say he can not love God except from the standard of use? He might as well love gold from that principle. If he does not see in God that which is intrinsically lovely, that which harmonizes with the soul as music does with the ear, I say to him, he does not perceive what truth, what purity, what love is. When a man would bring down the standard of love to its use to him, it is bringing it down lower than I am willing to admit that it should come. If I can not feel the Divine harmony pulsating in my soul, I do not know what harmony is. If my friend has not got to a point where he can love independent of the use of the thing, I say he has not got beyond the sensual sphere. I can appreciate and love truth, though I writhe in hell fire! It is nothing to me what may be my condition: the question is only concerning the revelations of truth and purity. I see their beauty, independent of all use, and I see that their adaptation to all uses that are good. If it requires inspiration to see that, I have inspiration.

I will now proceed to my argument, and give the principle by which I shall sum up, and bring all my propositions to bear directly upon the question. *It is that man can only perceive according to the unfolding of his understanding, and perfection of his love.* You may search where you please, and take any principle with which your past experience has made you familiar, and you will find the law to be universal. Man can only receive in accordance with his capacity, whether it be in his understanding, or in his affection. The difference between Jesus of Nazareth and my friend is in the condition and development of mind. Jesus received all that he imparted, as every other being receives what he imparts; only Jesus was in a higher plane than other men. All that is received, comes from the same parent fountain. Those who are in the dark and selfish plane, receive in that plane, according to the state of their understanding and loves. The rule is universal: all the difference between the lowest spirit that goes from this world to Gehenna, and the highest archangel, is in the plane of its understanding and the plane of its affections; and as that plane is elevated, so will it receive more largely of the things of the Divine. The doctrine, except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God, is not a fundamental one: it is only a great central truth having its own basis in the fundamental law which I have enunciated.

That law gives the explanation of the difference between the spheres of spirits, and shows that it is in the plane of their actions alone. Now when my friend admits that ignorant and undeveloped spirits communicate with those in their plane, he admits that every man will receive and communicate according to his plane. Communications will be according to the media through which they

flow. Through this law both my friend and myself must be unfolded. We must be born of the Spirit of Truth to receive truth. Now, if it be true that dark spirits communicate with those in their plane, the same law of affinity will make it true of every other plane. If my thoughts and aspirations go forth for truth and love, I am not hindered from communicating with spirits who have the same desire. If my wife and children are in the same sphere as myself, they can communicate with me, though they have departed this life. The low and vicious communicate by the same general laws as the high and pure, and if these last do not communicate with us, it is because we have not put ourselves in a condition to receive their communications. This is the great principle.

A principle is something more than a truth. It is that central and fundamental law from which every truth flows. The doctrine of affinity is the same in all spheres: it is the harmony of mind and mind in the same plane. But all truth, in any plane, flows down from the great fountain of truth and wisdom. If I am in a lower plane than that of Jesus, I only receive truth in accordance with the plane I am in. Christ promised that we should come into his plane when we keep his sayings, and do as he did. Then shall we have the same development, and come into communion with the Father, even as Christ did. All the communications ever received, from the merest rap, to the most Divine inspiration, are in accordance with the same law. It is the law by which ignorance is made wise and the impure lifted up to purity.

In speaking of planes, my friend said there was no marked distinction: that the selfish runs into the charitable. He has not been able to understand my distinction yet. The difference lies in the standard of *use*. My friend can not see any difference, but thinks it is all selfishness. There is a great difference nevertheless; and I am confident you can see it if he can not. I asked him to tell why there is a "third heaven" spoken of in Scripture, if there is no second, and whether there could be a second without a first, and upon what basis you can distinguish them. There are three: there must be: Christ taught so. He said, "first the blade," the mere form, "then the ear," that which was to bring forth the use, and "after that the full corn in the ear," which is the perfected fruit. Again he said the kingdom of heaven is like the little leaven in *three* measures of meal. What mean these *three* measures? This doctrine is like a grain of mustard seed, to my friend, the least of all seeds.

Our doctrine is beautifully exhibited as the "third great truth," in the "Epic of the Starry Heavens," page 131. I read it, not as authority, but as a fit expression of the thought. If my friend instead of criticising what he thinks "flat stuff," would study this

book, he would find a philosophy that is deep and beautiful, to those who have an ear to hear it.

" The third great truth I utter, yet shall be
The theme of poet eloquence, and sung
With harp, and organ, and the human tongue,
And melted in the universal sea
Of human nature, as a pearl in wine.

There is in every soul an inner shrine
Of love and wisdom, holier than ark,
Parchment, or written stone, or leafy bark
Inscribed with wisdom from the golden age—
A sunlike altar, an immortal page
Which God hath made to be type, record, shrine,
And angel-peopled home,
And paradise, and sky, and spirit dome
Of his essential Godhood. Evermore
The God whom all celestial hosts adore,
Is working there.

Were man the burning pit,
And his interiors hell, the Infinite
Creator not the less would stand therein,
With still, sweet music speaking through the din
Of all tumultuous passions, till the sea
Of the heart's madness and its agony,
Brightened beneath the footprints of his love,
Grew calm, reflecting heavens of bliss above.
In plainer language, doing all things well,
God's effluence doth in darkest natures dwell,
Speaking, imploring, blessing them by turns,
Seeking to cleanse the desecrated urns
Of thought and feeling, scattering fragrant dews
Of blessing, choice and frequent, and profuse,
On the parched desert of the worldling's heart;
Driving the money-changers from the mart
Of the interior temple, making whole
The sick, despairing inmates of the soul,
Cleansing the tainted appetites, revealing
A heaven of love for every inmost feeling
Outflowing even to the far extremes
Of outer sense, out-rolling glory beams
From the sweet love-sphere of his own pure nature;
Clothing each wasted breast, and mind, and feature,
With heavens of love, and light, and innocence,
Quickening the very nerves of outer sense
For melody, and sight, and living joy—

This work is God's employ.
There's not a pirate in the Indian Ocean
God dwells not in, with tides of pure emotion,
Seeking to hallow, sanctify, inspire,
And lift him from that hell of inward fire,
Whose scorching madness desolates, defiles,
Degrades his spirit.

In those barbarous isles,
Where gory cannibals lap human blood,
And gnash their teeth upon half living food
Of men and brothers, God is not afar.
He worketh there, as where the angels are,

Seeking to call from out these caverns drear,
Bright spirits, fitted for the seventh sphere—
Seeking to change the human wolves to men,
While angels breathe from heaven, 'Amen, Amen.'

God is no iron bigot, who beside
Some learned divine reposes, sleepy-eyed,
While the grave prelate misapplies the law
And testimony. No man ever saw
God in such pulpit, or such papal robe.
He holds creation as a hollow globe
In his right hand, or like a lily bloom,
Bathing it from the splendor of His eyes.
Creation, like a new-born infant, lies
Near to His heart. Sight, sense, the inward eyes,
The moral reason—all declare how dear
Creation is to the great Father Soul.
Its little pulses from His bosom roll,
O'erflowed and harmonized. Its lips are fed
From God, and on His breast it pillows its young head."

Now that is no mean representative of the inmost nature of the human soul, which is to become the representative of the divine love and wisdom, when man, in his external nature, shall have come into harmony with the laws of God's universe, so that his life shall harmonize with his own ideal of the right, and he shall have that perfect love which casteth out all fear.

My friend says Mr. Davis argues that man is not responsible, and should not be punished when he violates the laws of God and his duty toward his neighbor. If he would examine more carefully, he would see that Mr. Davis teaches that you and I should not treat our neighbor unkindly, but by all possible means warn him to turn from his errors; that God is not angry with him, and that, being subject to influences which determine what shall be his form of faith, he is not always master of his own actions. I had no influence in determining where I should be born; whether in this country, where I might be converted to what my friend considers Christianity, and be immersed in the river here, or in India, where I might be immersed in the Ganges, in my helpless infancy, and left to the tender mercies of the crocodile. These outward circumstances modify our belief, and it was to their influences that Mr. Davis was referring.

MR. ERRETT.

Whilst the beauties of the "Epic" are before us, I will call your attention to the fertility of metaphor exhibited in the opening lines, which the gentleman read.

"There is in every soul an inner shrine
Of love and wisdom," &c.

You will notice how arks, barks, parchments, and stars are heaped together, and then the "shrine," which is holier than all these, is declared to be,

*"type, record, shrine,
And angel-peopled home,
And paradise, and sky, and spirit-dome,
Of his essential Godhood!"*

Where can you find a like rush and crash of incongruous similes and inappropriate figures? Yet that the gentleman compares to Milton! I will leave you to judge that question by his own selection. As to its teachings and philosophy, if the gentleman will accept it as true Divinity, we will take it up and examine it.

With regard to selfishness, it appears that when we do a thing because it is of use, we are selfish, but if we do it without regard to use, it is not selfishness! By this doctrine, the man who gets "gloriously drunk," four or five times a day, without deriving one particle of advantage or *use* from it, is not selfish, though he knows he is injuring himself every time he does it! He simply satisfies the present craving appetite, and has no respect to any ulterior advantage, any more than the artist whom my friend described. One has a passion for liquor, the other for painting; both satisfy their passion, and, apart from the influence of those passions upon themselves and upon society, there would be no distinction in the character of the acts. But the satisfaction of an appetite or a desire is *a use*, in the proper sense of the word; and to make out a case, where a thing is chosen without reference to *uses*, my friend must give us an example, where a person does that in which he can take no personal pleasure, immediately or remotely, directly or incidentally. The conception of an artist, laboring as my friend would have him, without finding any use in his work, would imply that the labor itself was pain, and neither mental nor physical delight was found in it. But such a case is inconceivable. The fact that any delight is found in the employment shows that *self* is satisfied by it. This is not selfishness in the low sense, but it shows that self is not ignored.

If the gentleman says this is too utilitarian an age, we can agree. If he says men look too much, in their conduct, to the immediate return of good in the ordinary view of the case, we can agree. But if he gets such a sublimated view of things, that he demands choices, without any regard to our own good, then I confess I can not go with him. Whenever there is delight, no matter whence it is received, it is *our* delight, and *because* it is our delight, we take pleasure in, and choose, the course which produces it. He tells us that if he were in hell, he could still love truth and goodness. I ask, if truth and goodness had placed him there and held him there, then could he love them? The very concep-

tion is contradictory. He can only love and adore that which is good and beneficent *toward him*, and he, as well as all other men, will deny goodness and virtue to that which injures him without cause.

Now we will take up the argument where we left it this morning. The gentleman had said, that unless we receive the communications from the spirit world as truth upon authority, it will do us no harm. But it is already settled that if we receive any truth from the spirit world, we receive it upon authority. It has been admitted that the truth of *immortality* is only got in this way, if it is received by means of the spirit manifestations at all. They must also receive the principle concerning the spheres, their number, &c., in this way. I will notice, here, in passing, that while my friend has been talking about triunes of triunes, the three measures of meal, and the three heavens, he has said nothing about the *five* loaves and the *twelve* baskets of fragments. The spirits themselves come back, and talk about four spheres, and seven spheres, and nearly every other number. Whenever we receive any thing from the spirit world upon authority, we can not depend upon it, yet we have nothing but what comes upon authority. We may as well throw overboard all the spirit communications at once: indeed, I believe the gentleman would be glad to have them stopped, for they trouble him wonderfully, and he himself does not quote them, nor rely upon them.

I have tried from day to day to get the gentleman to define Spiritualism. We are come to the last day upon the first question, and you have not got it yet. He still insists that I have been reading the dogmas of individuals. I say it is not so. I have repeated a number of times, that I have read the spirits' words, unless Judge Edmonds and the other mediums have lied infamously in putting the communications into their mouths; which the gentleman will hardly affirm. He declared that the teachings of Spiritualism were to be derived from the whole mass of communications, and these are what I have been presenting, whilst he has been carefully avoiding them. He has been denying that what I presented was Spiritualism, in spite of his admission, and been giving you dose after dose of metaphysics. In his interpretation of Scripture, he jumps from letter to spirit, and from spirit back again to the letter, and you can get him to no point. I have not been obliged to labor out interpretations of what the spirits say; I have let them speak for themselves, and have not strained to warp them to my purpose. And now I ask if, for truth, excellency, and safe influence, you would put into the hands of youth, any spiritualist work that has been produced, and regard it either as safe, or at all to be compared in literary and scientific value, with works from the minds of men who are only in the normal state.

I must refer once more to the gentleman's argument upon identity. The teachings of Spiritualism, he says, are what all the phenomena teach, and the teachings of Christ are what all the phenomena of his ministration teach, and *therefore* the two are identical, because God's universe is harmonious, and all the phenomena in it must have harmonious laws! The dew-drop is governed by the same law as the Solar system, but is the dew-drop identical with that system? Here are different articles of furniture; but the gentleman dives down deep into the physical laws of the vegetable and mineral world, and shows you that the ultimate chemical elements are alike in both, and therefore this table and the benches are identical! He might argue for seven times seven days, and talk profoundly of the laws of electricity and magnetism, and all other laws, but he would never convince any person of sense, that a foot-stool and a wardrobe are identical.

If the gentleman had told us what he meant by Spiritualism, in his first speech, we might have met him at once on the question. He says the fundamental law of Christianity is that man can only receive according to the unfolding of his understanding and the perfecting of his love. But this is by his philosophy a *fundamental law of mind*, and takes in Mohammedanism and Mormonism, as well as Christianity. He could take up either system, and show that the same laws govern both, only, he would say, Joe Smith and Mohammed got their inspiration from inferior sources! *Therefore* Mormonism and Mohammedanism are identical with Christianity in their phenomena and teachings! I have asked the gentleman whether all his reasoning would not as well apply to these cases. He has claimed that it was a universal law of mind, and therefore it is not peculiar to Christianity; but whether you take a true or a false system, the law will apply to it equally well. By his reasoning, every system which has any thing to do with man's mental, moral, or religious culture, is identical with Christianity, because the laws of man's development are constant! Well, I am perfectly willing to leave the matter there.

If now we take the phraseology of the question, the absurdity of the gentleman's mode of arguing becomes apparent in another way. Identity means complete sameness; character, in reference to systems, must mean marks of peculiarity in the tendency of the teachings; but is it a mark of sameness when one system inculcates truth and the other falsehood? Again, suppose you come to hear such lectures as my friend gave this morning; much of it was good, and you listen and receive some of it, in harmony with the laws of mind—the ordinary psychological laws; at the same time some poor wretch in a grog-shop is listening to the impure talk of some abominably wicked heart. In these cases, the same law directs the manner in which the mind of both are operated upon; the principles applying to the reception or impartation of

thought from mind to mind are the same. Therefore the lectures of my friend, and the filthy communications of the bar-room are identical.

In Christianity we have truth from God the Father: in Spiritualism, there is no pretense that any of the communications come from the Father. The one, the heart can rely upon in all confidence as the truth—essential, and eternal truth: the other never can be relied upon as truth. As we have passed along, I have made many such points showing that there can be no identity, and the only shadow of a support which the gentleman can find, is the fact that there is a philosophy of mind by virtue of which all mental operations can be understood.

Again, My friend gave this as a principle of Christianity: viz., that you cannot be in different positive conditions at the same time. Is not that as true in any other system as in Christianity. It is evident that it is not a truth peculiar to Christianity, but another general principle in the gentleman's psychology. What then can be made of that point?

Once more, he says, Christ, in the highest plane, receives truth from the Father by the same law by which spirits of the low planes receive the truths appropriate to their spheres. Well, for the sake of the argument, suppose it were so—are the teachings of the two identical therefore? Had you any idea that this was to be his landing-place? this his conclusion? It is not the teachings and phenomena of the two systems which are identical, but the gentleman's philosophy concerning the general principles of conveying the two systems! Where did Christ say the mind can receive only "according to the condition of its unfolding?" I deny that he taught any such thing, or said any thing upon the subject. I ask the gentleman to put his finger upon the passage, and show it to us. It is simply his own philosophy, no matter whether it be true or false: I can not burden myself with a close criticism upon all the points of mental science he may raise, for they would only divert our attention from the real point in controversy. He philosophizes, and then, since his philosophy remains the same, all systems to which he applies it are *therefore identical!*

There is another point upon which I wish to say a word before closing my remarks. The gentleman has brought up the subject of baptism. I did not introduce it; but he called it up a day or two ago, and to-day he brings it forward again. He has made an extended commentary upon the passage, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." He gave an explanation which was most—I can not think of the word in one of the spiritual quotations I read this morning, but it was a great word—at any rate it was an explanation most satisfactory to himself. It was somewhat like

this:—If the passage were taken literally it would mean that water was born of water, but it was to be interpreted spiritually. When Christ said, “that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit,” the first part is to be taken literally, and the second spiritually! but when he comes to the declaration that it is necessary to be born both of water and of the spirit, then the gentleman says that water means the body! If you ask why;—Mr. Tiffany says so, and he knows.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend has a great deal of trouble to understand me, and either I must be very blind in my statements, or his notions of the use of language must be peculiar to himself. Now, if he had fairly represented what I said of baptism, I would let it pass; but he did not do it. I said there were but two births spoken of by Christ, and there are but two necessary for man. The one gives him individuality: the other gives him true character. I am sure my friend will agree that this is true, whether it is the meaning of the Bible or not. Christ did not speak of three births, but of *two*; and added, “that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.” I suppose that Nicodemus dropped the question of the water birth, not understanding it; at any rate he gave all his attention to the new birth. When a man comes to a conclusion, I would like to know the principles upon which he comes. By the water birth, I meant, as I said, the natural birth when man is born a babe. There was no occasion for my friend to mystify himself over it. Going down into the water at baptism may represent a death and resurrection, but it does not represent a birth. I do not think I ought to be considered presumptuous in saying so much.

The offspring partakes of the nature of the parent, both among men and among animals. It represents the parent in all departments of its being. When man is born of God, he will represent God in all departments of his being. This truth concerning a new birth does not rise to the dignity of a *principle*, as I said before; but my friend is continually confounding fact and truth and principle, so that half the time I can not tell what his replies mean. He raises a dust and fog about the subject, and that is all. Sir Isaac Newton noticed certain phenomena, and discovered the laws to which they were subject. The laws had their basis in a principle that lay behind them; and that basis was a principle, because it was a great central truth, of general application to many varieties of cases. So, Jesus of Nazareth taught a great variety of truths, and each of them had its basis in some ulterior principle. Before we can know whether his truths were like those

of any other system, we must get their basis and principle: then we can have little difficulty in harmonizing all the doctrines he taught. I have endeavored to lay such a foundation in your minds, that you can make your own deductions as to the truths I have advanced. I did not come out with all the truths at first, because I did not think you would understand me unless I should first go through with my fundamental propositions in order, and make the necessary deductions step by step, not leaving you to depend upon what I have said, but leaving you to make the application yourselves. I am ready to make, and am making, the necessary deductions, and he has commenced finding fault again, confounding phenomena and teachings, fact and principle;—saying that if I declare the law which governs the dew-drop to be the same as that which governs the planet Jupiter, I must also say that the dew-drop is the planet! I have said no such thing. I said there was an identity, if I may coin a word, between the *laws* controlling the phenomena. I said all the phenomena of spirits and spiritualists must be examined, if we would obtain the teachings of Spiritualism. Did my friend think he had only to get up with me and show that I could not reconcile all the teachings and dogmas of individual spirits and spiritualists with Christianity? No: we were to take all the phenomena and teachings, and by digging down into them, discover what the philosophy of the systems is, and so obtain their real teachings. If we pass over the world, learning nothing but phenomena, we accomplish but little. If I can not take in *all* the teachings of Geology, from first to last, in ascertaining what the teachings of Geology are, I can not talk about the teachings of that science. They are all open to me: I have a right to examine every grade of them; and though they have different ends and uses, when I investigate the principles, I find one law running through the whole. So with regard to the teachings of Jesus; they all ultimate in this central point, this great principle, that every mind in the universe can only receive of the wisdom or love of God and the universe, in accordance with the plane of its unfolding and development. In the natural plane, it can only receive natural things; in the spiritual plane, it can only receive spiritual things; and if it would receive Divine things, it must get into the plane of the Divine. Christ told man that he must come out of the natural plane, if he ever hoped to get into the Divine. The Jew was living in the animal plane, and yet put confidence in the rites and ceremonies of his church, hoping that by their aid he should reach the Divine; but Christ told him it was impossible, because that was not a plane where the Divine blessings could be manifested. The supper was prepared; it only remained for us to come to it. That was his doctrine. Man's blessings depend upon his own action and volition.

Now, I say you may take all the teachings of Spiritualism,—even the low ones from the plane my friend has taken—look up all that is ridiculous, and you will find the same great law at their base, as that which I have shown underlying the phenomena and teachings of Christianity.

In some of the books my friend has quoted from, I can find things of high and elevated character, although they would not agree with his doctrine, as we shall see when we come to the second question, to-morrow. I shall then make a more full application and investigation of these things. I have not been very rigid in my course with him, thus far. I have not insisted upon his admitting or denying my propositions as we went along, so that now the case stands about as it would if he had not been here at all, so far as my propositions are concerned. He has picked flaws in them, and tried to make some of them appear ridiculous, and that is all. He has not answered them. But I shall not let him off so easily to-morrow, and he shall admit or deny, and if he will do neither, I shall assume that silence signifies consent.

Then it stands thus: according to the plane of unfolding will be the magnitude of the miraculous phenomena, such as cures of the sick, &c.; for according to the plane of unfolding will be the individual's receptivity, and according to his receptivity will be his power of impartation. I may receive and impart nervous power so as to cure a headache or neuralgia, but if I am to exert a higher power, I must be elevated to a higher plane. If I am in the highest sphere, I can receive the divine power, and work with it, even to the making of a universe. In regard to the curing of diseases, I have known an instantaneous cure of persons who have been blind for years. I have known a case where a little lad, who had been deaf, was cured by simply putting the fingers into his ears. I have known a person, whose limb has been drawn up, so as not to touch the ground, for years, to be cured in an instant. These things have been done through pure benevolence, without charge, although sometimes individuals may be found, who, like Simon Magus, would make profit by it. Faith, or strong confidence, is necessary to these results. Its principle is that it gives intensity to the will. I am now speaking of faith in its outward, philosophical sense: in its spiritual sense it has vastly more significance. The faith of the individual has often as much to do with it as that of the operator, but not always. It was not always necessary in ancient times. This power is exercised through a medium now, as it was anciently, and the influence is the same now as it was then, whilst, in both cases, the manifestation will be according to the development of the individual.

We come, then, to this: that spirits, by the very law of their existence, have communication with our earth, and relations with it, according to the plane they occupy, without any respect to their

dogmatic faith, or faith of creed: that these spirits, holding these relations, associate with us according to the plane of our character, and exert their influence, either by word of mouth or by impression, upon the understanding—the highest form of communication being that of inspiration. Paul spoke of the variety of spiritual gifts, which all came from the same spirit. Some had the gift of tongues, some of interpretation, and some of prophesy; but the gift was according to the character of the medium. One might speak with tongues, but still be unable to prophesy. The gift of tongues exists now, as can be proved as demonstrably as any other fact. The gift of healing is possessed now. The gift of interpretation also exists. These facts are so. Dispose of them as you can. The gift of speaking in a tongue unknown to the medium when in a normal state, is one that prevails, in various degrees, according to the character of the medium. And if this be so, it is not straining a point to say that these phenomena of Christianity and of Spiritualism are identical, not in magnitude, but in character. The character is that by which we judge of a thing; if the thing is physical, it is that by which we judge of it physically: but if it is spiritual, the character is that by which we judge of it spiritually. Now, since all the phenomena of Modern Spiritualism demonstrated the great law that spirits do affiliate with individuals, according to their character, and the plane of their unfolding, it is proven that its teachings are the same as those of Christ.

Christ gave a test to the young ruler, to prove his perfection of character. It was to sell all that he had, give it to the poor, and follow him. In short, it was to abandon self, and prove, by his acts, that it was dead. He was found lacking when that test was applied; and would there not be a general lack, if that test were applied now? All Christ's tests were intended to try whether men were pure, and true, and just; whether they were in a higher plane of love, and able to see God in a higher plane than the moral one. You may have all the forms and ceremonies you please, but they will be of no use, and your trust in them will not help you at all. You must have a loving character, and be ready to meet the bridegroom, with your lamp trimmed and burning; not like the foolish virgins, with the form but not the life—the lamp, but not the oil—for when the bridegroom came, and found them in such a condition, there was no time for them to buy it. You must be ready to receive truth of a higher plane, or, when it is offered, it will pass you by, and you will go unblest. I have learned these same truths from my observation of spiritual phenomena, and though my friend can not see them there, the identity of the teaching is apparent to me, and I think it is to you.

The lesson we are to learn is, that the responsibility is upon us, and we are forbidden to trust in any thing but what will purify

the soul. No power in the universe can save you in any other way, or make known to you the joys of the redeemed in heaven. There is no other way than that Christ pursued—no other foundation than that he laid. He perfected himself in the Divine love: he overcame selfishness, so that when the prince of this world came, he found nothing in him; his personal will was lost in the Divine, and the prayer of his heart was, "Not my will, but thine be done." If we would inherit the same kingdom, we must do likewise.

[The Moderator here announced that the next half hour would close the debate upon the first question; and that in order to give the affirmative the closing speech, the time would be divided, and each speaker occupy fifteen minutes.]

MR. ERRETT.

We have an understanding of what the birth of the water is. It is the birth of the flesh, neither more nor less. Why then the choice of so different a term in so close a connection with the one first used? We have also another definition of Spiritualism. All the phenomena and teachings of spirits and spiritualists are now declared to be necessary to make up the phenomena and teachings of Spiritualism. Heretofore, as you will bear witness, the gentleman has been objecting to my introducing spiritualists at all,—now he brings them in, in the mass; and thus he changes his positions whenever he is pressed. He warned us at the outset that he was planting a terrible battery of great guns which should demolish me, and after that he was going to give us a full examination of the phenomena. Yet there is not a word about them until the last speech, of the last day of the debate! If the phenomena and teachings both of spirits and spiritualists must be carefully sifted, to discover the teachings of Spiritualism, I appeal to you whether these phenomena ought not to have been presented for analysis and criticism. Ought they not to be placed side by side, so that you could form some judgment of the identity of the systems? But no, the whole eight days are taken up by philosophizing and dogmatizing, and then comes a definition, and little or nothing more.

The gentleman very arrogantly says I can not understand his propositions;—his argument has proceeded pretty much as if I had not been here! You may judge of that. I am not afraid to have my course compared with his, and leave any sensible person to judge who has best met the issues contained in the question. I really thought that if we would understand the character of Spiritualism, it was necessary to have some of the phenomena and teachings of the system before us; but no sooner did I present

them, and even try to force them upon the gentleman's attention, than he begins to talk about the difference between principle, and truth, and fact! In like manner the phenomena and teachings of Christianity should have been produced, and a comparison instituted, if we would see whether the systems were identical. The gentleman was to show these things affirmatively; but how much of it has been done? He complains that I have quibbled:—if I have not treated all his arguments with serious respect, it has been because they were not deserving of it. It is not worth while to take a hammer to break an egg, or to bring out a twenty-four pounder, to shoot—not even a crow, but a mere scare-crow; for the gentleman's idea of *identity* turns out no better. I am willing to be judged by you as to my quibbling, for you know whether I am not in the habit of fairly and seriously meeting every straightforward and pointed argument with which I have to deal. I have not lived in this community so short a time that I need defend myself on such a charge.

The gentleman's positions are absurd ones, and I have tried to show it: that is my offence. He has taken the position that a hickory stick is as good as the name of Jesus of Nazareth to cast out devils and perform miraculous cures! He has placed the miracles of *Mormonism* upon a level with those of Christianity, and every argument which tends to prove Spiritualism identical with our holy religion, does as much for Mormonism and Moham-medaniam! Am I wrong in meeting such positions with the ridicule they deserve!

We have been philosophized, almost to death, but now at the very last speech, the gentleman, on his own sole authority, without a name or any circumstance of authentication, tells over some wonders which he says are the "phenomena" of Spiritualism, and by these he would show that Spiritualism is Christianity! This is the way he redeems his promise to give a *thorough* examination of the phenomena, as soon as he had laid down his "fundamental propositions!" He tells us with the utmost assurance, that it is a matter of common occurrence for the blind to receive their sight, the lame to walk, and the deaf to hear! This is his *investigation* of the phenomena! and even this in the last hour when I have but fifteen minutes to reply!

He took the position that the angels spoken of in Scripture were all disembodied human spirits. I denied it and invited him to produce the proof of his case. Has he done it? Yet he comes in at the end with a cool assumption that these things are all so; and by thus begging the question as to the phenomena, and assuming "identity" to have such a meaning that the existence of any contradictory systems of thought, any where in the universe, is a natural impossibility, he declares that he has made out his case!

If now, the gentleman wishes to close the debate upon the

proposition, I am perfectly willing to leave it where it is. I will not tell what I have done or not done. I will only say, as the gentleman is to close, that I feel the utmost confidence in leaving it to the sober and dispassionate reflection of the people, to judge from the facts given, the references, the reasonings and arguments, whether the gentleman has affirmatively established the truth of his proposition, that the phenomena and teachings of Modern Spiritualism are identical in character with these of Jesus of Nazareth. I have not the slightest fear of the result, in the mind of any honest inquirer.

MR. TIFFANY.

I will say to the audience that I am very sorry if my friend is taken by surprise in my speaking of the phenomena of Spiritualism.

MR. ERRETT. It did not surprise me at all !

MR. TIFFANY. I am happy to hear it. I had supposed that the question itself presupposed the existence of the phenomena as they were understood to be before the world ; and especially did I suppose so, when he came in to show that Spiritualism is Modern Necromancy.

MR. ERRETT. I said it claimed to be Modern Necromancy.

MR. TIFFANY. I stand corrected. I supposed also that he was affirming what he read from the books to be real phenomena, although of a very low character. I certainly thought he meant to admit the phenomena. I did not suppose he would make me get out a *subpena duces tecum* to the spirits to bring their testimony. We had no arrangements for compelling their attendance ; so that I very innocently fell into the mistake of supposing that he yielded the question of the phenomena.

What I understood was this ; that my friend and myself were to discuss the principles involved in the doctrine of the intercommunication of spirits between this world and the spirit world, and that the truths and principles that we could learn from the admitted phenomena were to be investigated and discussed, to see whether they were the same in both systems. Now, if we can ascertain the principles, it is better than that we should take up each phenomenon by itself ; just as in studying history, you can more easily understand the subject by making yourselves acquainted with the principles of history. I supposed we were to grapple with these phenomena in their teachings and philosophy, and not to take them simply in their literal appearance, like children. I made my arrangements to do this. To find these principles and apply them to the teachings of Jesus, not upon a superficial view, but by a deep scrutiny of the truths involved. If we confine ourselves to the mere letter, we shall be led astray. We must find that which gives character, and determines the meaning

of the phenomena in each case ; and I knew I could demonstrate that the philosophy was the same in both cases. I knew that if evil spirits communicate with earth, they do it upon a certain principle, and that that principle must be the law of affinity. I felt confident I could make my friend admit that that great law of affinity must lie at the basis of all such communications. That law is sustained by the whole philosophy of mind : it is the same great law that Jesus taught, when he said, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Then I had no hesitation in saying the phenomena and teachings of the two systems were identical ; being received from the same great source of power, and being embodiments of the same great law, viz., that if we would commune with spirits of a higher plane, we ourselves must rise to that plane. Therefore all these forms and ceremonies which my friend observes and teaches as essential, have nothing, in reality, to do with the principles which Jesus taught—nothing to do with that salvation which is to take place in our own souls and minds. I come not here to argue upon the mere surface, but upon the principles underlying Christianity and spiritual manifestations. We owe it to ourselves as intelligent beings, to investigate and ascertain these laws and principles ; to learn where it is necessary to erect bulwarks against such influence as demons and lustful spirits may have over us, and how we must protect ourselves against them. To do this we must investigate the phenomena and find the indication and demonstration of the law. That law we discovered to be that we could only be protected by cleansing ourselves, by overcoming our own passions, appetites and lusts ; by coming up into a higher plane where we should love our neighbor purely and sincerely, and renounce all our anger and malice. It was necessary for us and for the world to know, that if we would see God, we must be born of God. These are the things I have been bringing before you.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish to know how much time the gentleman intends to spend upon the second question, that I may calculate accordingly. I received no notice whatever of the gentleman's intention to close up the first question to-day, till I heard it by common rumor, a few hours ago. I had a right to expect some conference on that matter.

MR. TIFFANY. I am not conscious of giving my friend any cause for irritation, or of keeping from him my intentions. If he comes to the point at once, a half hour will be enough to kill his arguments upon the second question : if he does not, it may take a couple of days.

SECOND QUESTION:

Is the denomination known as Disciples, anti-Christ, in faith and practice ?

Affirmative, TIFFANY.

Negative, EBBETT.

NINTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—We take up a new subject this morning. The proposition which I affirm is, that the particular sect, known as Disciples, is anti-Christ in faith and practice. It is not difficult to understand what this proposition means, and, as a foundation for my argument, I wish to call your attention to one thing, which we have spoken of before, namely: the difference between an existence in fact and in perception. Another thing, following from this, is that that which exists is only known to us as it is by some means transferred to our consciousness. In certain planes we know of existence only by manifestation. Hence, I wish to refer you to a principle with which you are already quite familiar, viz., that in the plane of perception we go behind sense, and infer the existence of principles. Whatever is perceived by reflection is perceived inverted or reversed. Here is a law manifested in the lowest material plane, which yet is worthy of our notice, for it is a law of the universe. For instance, if I hear a sound by reflection, the sonorous body is located, by my mind, in a direction opposite to that in which it really is. If I look into a mirror, and see a landscape, I see it by reflection, in a different direction from that in which it is. It requires, in me, an act of the mind to correct the idea. I must do it by a higher sense than that which reveals the phenomena. Hence, I must refer to other things than those given by my physical senses. The first conclusion of the mind, as it looks from a low plane, is, that vital force is a result of organisation; that mind is a mere phenomenon of matter, and that a gross materialism is the only true philosophy. We learn, hence, the rule of manifestation, that our first impression makes us invert the truth, and that we must come up into a higher plane, or, basing our philosophy upon an inverted truth, it will be false, and we shall build

up a wrong system. Hence, it is very necessary for us to distinguish between what we know by perception, and what we know by simple sensation. The law is universal, and we must keep it in mind, during our investigations, that there is a marked difference between existence in fact and in perception.

To proceed: I say the whole doctrine of materialism is based upon this mistake; the mistaking the manifestation of a thing for the thing itself. It is the province of the mind always to make the inversion I have referred to; and hence every doctrine built upon this error will land us in discord and confusion. I shall have occasion to show that this mistake lies at the basis of many erroneous systems of philosophy and theology.

I commence now with the first proposition in regard to those matters which are made symbols of the actual and real in man.

FIRST. All external language, all figures of speech, all parables, all types and symbols, all forms and ceremonies, all outward representations of thought, feeling, or emotion, are only valuable as they are necessary or useful to convey to the mind correct perceptions of facts, truths, or principles. That is the only value there is, or can be, in them. Mark this proposition well, and be sure you understand it.

Hence, when a fact, truth, or principle is perceived without the use of these figures, they are no longer valuable, and even become the means of leading the mind into error. I do not wish to argue that—it is self-evident.

SECOND. All forms or ceremonies which are observed with a view to affect the Divine mind, in the state of its being or condition, or with a view to affect the Divine mind, where the nature of that mind is not perceived, are worse than useless, and tend to lead the mind into error.

In regard to the truth of this proposition, there need be but little said. The question of use must have reference to man, and man alone, as a rational and immortal being. So far as the Divine being is concerned, that question can not be raised; for He is perfect in his being, and nothing can be added to him, or taken away from him. That only can have a question as to the use, which can, in some way, be benefited by the use. If, then, we assume that God is infinite and perfect in wisdom, power, goodness, justice, mercy, and truth, it is evident that no new thought can be suggested to him, no new impulse awakened in him. The question of use, then, can only have reference to the finite and imperfect being, who may receive what he did not before possess, and be perfected in that knowledge which was before imperfect; so that if we adopt any form or ceremony, its value must be measured by its use to man, and not its use to God. If we continue to use any thing which is no longer valuable to us, we neither improve our wisdom nor our affections. If an individual has in his

mind the thing which a form or ceremony is intended to represent, it is a mere waste of words and time, to give a figurative expression to it. For instance, an individual is presumed to understand baptism before receiving the ordinance. If he is going out to be put under the water, he must be able to perceive the use of it. It must add something to his knowledge and wisdom, or to his love and affections. If the ceremony does neither of these things, the description is as good as the actuality. If there is not that in the act itself, which could not otherwise be communicated, it is not necessary; and if its tendency is not to awaken an impression beyond what any description could do, it is not useful.

Here another principle of mind comes in, viz., that where the mind is diverted from the reality to the representation, the tendency is to call the mind away from the use and center it upon the form, and this is but an incipient stage of idolatry. Just in proportion as the mind attaches itself to the form, is its strength withdrawn from the spirit. The use of idols was thought to be good to a certain class of minds, but the idea of the heathen in worshipping the image of wood and stone is a false idea. The spiritual idolater carves his idol in his imagination. The Indian who buries a warrior with his tomahawk and bow, his gun and knife, does not suppose that the warrior takes these to the other world, but that each has a spirit, and that these go with him, and he uses them there, as he had used the physical weapons here. Idolatry does not consist so much in the carving of the image, as in the false conception of the mind, and its evil is in the effect it has upon the idolater himself. The Catholic church says its pictures and relics are useful; that they do not worship the image, but only use it to draw the mind more forcibly to the reality it represents. The tendency is, however, to make the mind drop down to a lower state, forgetting the reality and worshipping only the image which is before the eye.

I hold in my hand the Bible. A person would hardly suppose the Bible could become an object of idolatry, but it is such. A man may say it is the word of God, and you must receive it as such; but many do not distinguish between the truths which are to come into the mind by perception, and the mere historical facts, and so they fall into a worship of the book itself, and bring it into courts of justice and make men put their hands upon it, and swear by it. This is idolatry. I speak of these things to illustrate the injury of teaching forms, and continuing them after the use has ceased.

Hence the observation of any particular day as being more sacred than another, and one to be kept with more devoted attention to God's service than another, tends to weaken man's feeling of obligation to use all his days in doing good and purifying his heart. I am not in favor of taking away the Sabbath, or of dis-

regarding its use, but I am opposed to teaching that it is a day set apart by Divine command, as a formal occasion for formal worship. The soul that regards the day should regard it and every other day "to the Lord." It is just as wrong to exercise an unholy and impure affection upon the Sabbath as upon any other day, but no more so. It is just as proper to speak unholy words upon that day as any other. It is also as proper to perform any work that necessity or even convenience may require, upon that day as any other. An idolatrous regard for the day leads to evil. It makes man think that God has a claim only upon one seventh of the time. Let me be understood; the objection is not to devoting this day voluntarily, to the elevation of our minds, morally, spiritually, and religiously,—I advise it and urge it, but not as a command; I urge it as a thing useful, and teach that the violation of the day is not done by breaking the outward form, but by the indulgence of any unholy feeling or thought.

Hence, such external and formal prayers as look to the influencing of God, who knows what we have need of before we ask him, should be entirely banished from the mind. We must not think that God is any way disposed, on account of our prayers, to do what he would not otherwise do. But I ask, nay I demand, that every soul shall pray, and pray continually; not with a view to affect God, but to affect himself.

Hence, if we would develop the mind in harmony with truth, we must make this distinction; that when there is a use and influence in a thing, it is ourselves that are to be influenced, and for ourselves that the use exists. Any thing which contradicts this, is not in harmony with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

Hence, the idea that *baptism* is of any vital importance, is one which is idolatrous, and injurious to the minds of those who hold it.

Hence also, a special meal, called the Lord's supper, used merely for the purpose of fulfilling a command, or even of awakening sympathies and emotions in the breast, has a tendency to lead the mind into error. If it is made a symbolic meal, to represent the sufferings of Christ as a vicarious atonement for sin, it leads the mind in a wrong direction; but if we use it as a mere representation, as Christ taught it, teaching that as the food nourishes our mortal body, so does his life and death nourish our souls by being incorporated into us, making his wisdom and love a part of us,—in this case its use is beneficial. It then teaches that both physical and spiritual food can only nourish us, by becoming assimilated to our system. Any thing which makes the mind take a lower view than this, tends to idolatry. When a man takes physical food, as representing the life and love of Christ, and takes into his soul the truth and love, then indeed is he eating the spiritual body and blood of Christ. This should be done day

by day, and that which sets it apart as a formal ordinance, reduces and lowers the standard. We need nourishment constantly. We feel hunger and thirst every day. So in the true state, we feel spiritual hunger and thirst, and we should daily feed ourselves with righteousness and love, so as to supply that demand.

MR. ERRETT.

We have before us this morning, Mr. Moderator, a very grave proposition, and one which affects the religious standing and character of an entire religious denomination, numbering two or three hundred thousand persons in the United States, beside the great numbers in other lands and the isles of the sea.

There was once a law in operation (perhaps it is out of date now), which said, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor; but even in the low state in which we are, I think the gentleman should be careful that he knows whereof he affirms, and see that he does not violate that old law.

He offered to discuss the question whether the whole Christian church be not anti-Christ,—he says he is willing to do so now, but delicacy forbids me to assume a championship which other denominations might be unwilling to acknowledge, and I shall only answer for ourselves. He has spent a half hour, and he told us at the close of yesterday's debate that that would be sufficient to dispose of our right to be called Christian. My brethren, do you feel "killed" after this half hour?

I must refer to the gentleman's course with plainness. We had a question before us for eight days: during all that time I was endeavoring to get the gentleman to define his terms, and give some outline of the course he meant to take. A true logician will explain his terms, and define them accurately as he goes on. He will do this, even if he has no opponent; but when, in debate, it is demanded at his hands, he is under the most solemn obligation to do it. Every law of propriety and courtesy calls for it. But no! day after day for eight days he refused to give any definition of Spiritualism, or a word about the phenomena embraced by the question under discussion. Not until his last full speech did these very essential things receive any attention! Meanwhile, if I offered specimens of the phenomena as they are detailed in books of all kinds belonging to their party, these were rejected or admitted, just as the occasion served. I was thus forced to take such a course as seemed to me best; and having met and, as I believe, completely refuted the fundamental propositions upon which his system of metaphysics is based, I solemnly protest against his using the time of this new debate, in a mere application of those exploded propositions. His distinction between truth and

fact would expose him to contempt, in the mere literary point of view, before any proper tribunal in the world. Let him send those formally-drawn propositions to Yale or Harvard or Princeton, and see if they would not excite the contempt of every competent scholar. He was forced to admit that, by his principles, no one can reason about God, and now he comes on with a round of propositions concerning infinity, omniscience, omnipresence, &c! What is he trying to do? To prove the Disciples anti-Christian? If he proceeds as he has commenced in his first speech, it only amounts to this; that he will be trying to prove somebody, *anti-Tiffany!* Has the gentleman any means of knowing what the faith and practice of the Disciples are? If so, let him show it, and then proceed to show that it is anti-Christian; but I earnestly deny his right to use me and the Disciple church and this audience, as a means of getting his crude, ill-digested, and exploded philosophy once more reiterated before the people. I demand a standard of the doctrines of Christ, and of the doctrines of the Disciples of the present day; and then we can compare them. If he wants time for a discussion of the laws of optics and acoustics and what not, he may have my time and count it in with his, till he gets through with it, and makes some application of it that may call for an answer. I do not want the gentleman to give us any more of his promises to attend to these things "when he comes to them," when he gets his "batteries" planted and ready to fire off. He was eight days planting his batteries before, and they ought to have done execution, but when in his last half hour, he came to the *firing*, what did we hear? *Fizz*—nothing more. Is this what we have to wait for? Which of all the things he was going to "come to," did he reach? Go back in your minds and recall them. We supposed that in the end, he would really raise some standard by which we might judge, but nothing of the kind was done.

Now, after eight days of such discussion, scarcely any thing will astonish us, or we might reasonably be amazed at his disquisition to-day upon echoes and reflecting mirrors; topics appropriate enough for our school-boys, and which they could discuss quite as learnedly.

In the course of the past discussion I have collected a few ideas of the gentleman's views: such as, that he does not believe the apostles were inspired, in any such sense as the Christian church hold that they were: that he has little respect for Luke's, or any other narrative of the history of Christ and the primitive church: that he has a horror of water baptism amounting to a spiritual hydrophobia, and yet contradicts himself on the subject: that he prefers an ordinary meal to the holy ordinance of the Lord's supper: that he does not approve of verbal prayer, except in the case of some very poor, low beings, who can not appreciate

any thing high or true. Apply all this to the questions under discussion, and 'what relevancy or applicability is there? If he really means any thing but the merest trifling with us, I demand that he shall give us full and fair definitions of his terms that we may know what is the faith and practice of the Disciples, what is Christianity, and wherein the one is the opposite of the other. Candor demands that he should show what he is driving at. In the other discussion, did he not know as well what Spiritualism was on the first day, as after eight days? and would it not have been more honorable to give it? And then he had the assurance to say he thought the phenomena were admitted, when you all know that at an early day, I extorted from him the promise that he would give them a thorough examination when his "fundamental principles" were laid down! Are we to be treated in the same way now? Again I demand his definitions. If, by Christianity, he means the jargon of metaphysical crudities which he has been pouring out for eight days, I tell him at the outset that I feel nothing but contempt for it. Whatever of good morals there was in it, I recognized; but taking the whole as an attempt at a philosophical system, I must declare that I have not one particle of respect for it. If now, there is nothing to do but to prove that I am anti-Tiffany, he may take that for granted at the start. We glory in *that*, and would think it a foul shame upon us, if it were otherwise. He may assume that we stand opposed to *his* views of Christ's character and mission, of the apostles' inspiration, of the reliability of the Scriptures, and his general views of Christianity as he has shown them to us. Let him assume all that: we grant every word of it. If he wishes to show that our views are opposed to the principles of optics, I do not know but I may go into that for amusement's sake.

If I ever take an affirmative position in a debate with the gentleman, he may depend upon my defining terms, and giving an intelligible explanation of the questions as I understand them: and I will not wait till the last speech in the discussion for it, either. I would be ashamed to have it known that I was concealing a proposition or a term.

I speak thus because I feel that I owe it to you and to myself to expose the course the gentleman has taken. He has gained no advantage by it: I am perfectly satisfied with the result of the first discussion; but the *attempt* to manage in the way he has, deserves none the less reprobation. I can not consent to such a waste of time in the discussion of the present question, for no good can be accomplished. He should begin in a different way. The simple issue is, The teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and the faith of the Disciples—are they in conflict? His philosophy has certainly had room enough already, and at any rate, there is no place for it in the present issue.

hen, then, he gives me something to do, I will go at it. Having nothing to meet, I have spent my time in referring to what are fair rules of general discussion and candid debate. I am not in the affirmative, and having nothing to answer, will give the gentleman the remainder of my time, in the hope that he may be able to give me something to do by the time he finishes his next speech.

MR. TIFFANY.

I regret that my brother Errett is not more amiable this morning. I gave him notice at the outset that I did not regard the teachings of spiritualists as Spiritualism. I said you must take all the phenomena in their length and breadth, and judge from them what they teach. I do not feel convicted of carrying the debate on unfairly.

The present question is, as he says, whether the faith and practice of the Disciples is anti-Christ. Now I suppose their *practice* refers to their adherence to forms and ordinances. I have learned something of their *faith* from my friend, in the past discussion. I suppose they believe in a vicarious atonement; they believe a water baptism by immersion to be divinely commanded and to be necessary, and that it must be in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They believe in the duty of eating bread and drinking wine at a formal occasion called the Lord's Supper, celebrated in commemoration of the death of Christ, and having, as I suppose, something to do with the salvation of the soul.

* The propositions with which I commenced were very simple ones, and I only referred to natural science by way of illustration. I argued that forms and ceremonies were only important as they contribute to our knowledge and wisdom and the purification of our affections. This was given as a standard by which to judge of all ordinances, and I think it was something to be either admitted or denied.

I affirmed that Christ never used water baptism; that it was not his baptism. It never was declared to be such, either by Christ himself, or by John the Baptist, his precursor. His baptism was a baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which he could hold communion with the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the development of his character and mind. I affirmed that when Christ said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," he had reference to the baptism of the Spirit, and not of water. My friend denied this, in the other discussion, and said that the apostles must have the gift of the Spirit before they could baptize. John had no power to baptize with the Holy Spirit: he said he could only baptize

with water. In all this, it seems to me that I am pursuing a legitimate and straightforward course, and one that requires to be met. If my friend says that the practice of forms and ceremonies does not tend to turn the mind away from the Spirit, and absorb it in idolatrous worship of the form, we will discuss that point, and try to arrive at some conclusion in regard to it.

The Disciples believe that the Bible contains God's word, and that the Bible is to be understood by the natural understanding, without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the mind of the reader to interpret it. As a contrast to this I have a *third* proposition.

The doctrine that God has communicated to the world all his will with respect to man, and caused it to be attested in such a way that the natural mind can not err in understanding it, and has withdrawn the Spirit, so that it is no longer necessary for the understanding of spiritual truth, is a false doctrine.

We had some controversy about the literal word and the necessity of a spiritual influence to understand it: my proposition on that subject is the above. My doctrine is, that Christ taught that the literal language, as well as that in which parable or figure is used, could not be understood until the Spirit of Truth should instruct the disciples into the truth. When he asked why they could not understand his speech, he said it was because they could not hear his words. They heard his *literal* words, and understood that they must eat his flesh and drink his blood, literally, and a portion of them were offended and went away.

Truth, as distinguished from scientific and moral, can only be given to the mind by the inspiration of the Spirit. If inspiration, therefore, was necessary to enable the apostles to understand what the teachings of Christ were, when he was with them, it must be equally necessary for us. If they could not understand Christ's doctrine without the aid of inspiration, neither can we hope to do the same. Whoever contends that the inspiration of the Spirit was to be withheld in any age of the world, denies Christ's teachings, and denies that which our own understanding demonstrates to be true. The reason Christianity is not now the living Christianity that Jesus taught, is owing to the fact that they have left the Spirit, and adhered to the literal word, holding the form and rejecting the Spirit. The Christians of modern times have been doing the work the women went to perform at the sepulcher:—to embalm the cast-off body of their Lord. They have not received the truth in its spiritual sense, nor understood that their Redeemer must be a living Saviour; that Christ's life must become their life, his blood their blood, his death their death. He overcame no portion of his animal nature but what must be overcome by them. His cross is of no further value to them than as its destruction of the fleshly nature has been wrought in them.

I shall now come to the doctrine of a *vicarious atonement*. The doctrine that Jesus died to satisfy Divine justice is a false doctrine, and anti-Christ. It is contrary to any thing Christ ever taught. I will arrive at it from several points of observation, and show that it is as false and heathenish as any dogma ever held by any pagan nation on earth. So far as modern Christianity makes Jesus a vicarious sacrifice, for the purpose of reconciling God with man, it is utterly false and heathenish. I will prove it by an appeal to truth. It is objected that I appeal to philosophy; but true philosophy is truth, and all truth is harmonious, and if the two conflict, it only shows that we have not got the truth.

Atonement signifies being *at one*; a state where there has been a difference, but it has ceased. If used with regard to the understanding, it means that the understandings concur and agree, which were before at a difference. If it refers to love, it means that the difference in affection is gone, and the two are now in harmony. It is only in the theological sense that atonement signifies the payment of a debt. Something is always involved in a reconciliation. If two individuals are in a state of disagreement, there is a cause for it, and before there can be an agreement, that cause must be removed. If there is a lack of harmony between God and man—in character, or in any other way—that cause must be removed, and the atonement has strict reference to removing that cause of disagreement. Now, man is in a state of disagreement with God, and with whatever is perfect, true, just, and pure. Therefore, before he can harmonize with God, that which makes the difference must be removed, and the one who is in the wrong must be set right. God is not in the wrong, but the wrong is on the side of man. That which constitutes the difference must, then, be taken away from man, else man can not be in a state of harmony or oneness with God. All the cause of this inharmony is owing to the impurity in man; God is pure, but man is impure; God is perfect, but man is imperfect; God loves, but man hates. The thing, then, is for man to be reconciled to God. The system by which this is done is the system of the atonement; the sacrifice to be made is that which makes the difference between God and man. The sacrifice must be in man, and on the part of man, and not in God, or on the part of God. God has no sacrifice to make, but every thing of that kind must be done by man. Whoever teaches such a view of the doctrine as implies a change in God, teaches that God is imperfect. Truth can not change without becoming falsehood; perfection can not change without becoming imperfect; order can not change without becoming disorder.

The religions before Christ, represented God as a God subject to anger, and whose blessings or curses came, according to his casual state of mind. The Jew had such a God; indeed, the false idea prevailed, the world over. Christ wished to correct that idea.

He taught that the Father did not need to be changed, for the only difficulty was in man. Man was selfish; he must overcome his selfishness and lust: he was unfaithful; he must become faithful and true: he was unrighteous; he must become righteous; and when he had become faithful and righteous, just and true, he would be in harmony with God. Christ says, Love your enemies, for God loves his; and, If ye do good only to them that do good to you, what do ye, more than others? do not even the publicans so? The idea that God blesses or curses, according to the state of his volition, is a false idea. God causes his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and this is simply a figurative expression of the manner in which he bestows *all* his blessings. The man who lives in the sunshine and the shower, lives in them independent of his character. He receives the blessings of the natural plane, but he can not pass beyond natural things till his heart is unfolded and elevated. Natural blessings are transient, and the only enduring treasure is that which is laid up in the immortal and imperishable. Any other hope is built upon a false and sandy foundation, and when the winds of heaven and the rains should beat upon the house, it would fall, and its fall would be great. But if you build upon the firm foundation of spiritual truth, then let the winds of heaven come! let the rains fall! let the floods dash upon the house! it will not come down, for it is founded upon a rock! You must, then, forgive your enemies, as God forgives his. If you forgive, you come into such a relation that you can be forgiven. Not to forgive puts you in a frame of mind antagonistic to God. Therefore, as you hope to harmonize with God, love all, forgive all, and bless all! Just in proportion as you thus overcome self-will and lust, so do you approach in character to the Divine Being. If you have an offering to make, and there is aught between you and your brother, the first thing to be done is to put your mind and affection right, be reconciled to your brother, and then you can come and receive the divine blessing. Every doctrine Christ taught had reference to man's overcoming his selfish affections, so that he might become the child of the Father. He said nothing about the justice which demanded His death as a sacrifice; the condition of oneness with the Father was penitence and contrition for sin, and the putting it away. Then the Father would meet the prodigal a great way off, and fall upon his neck, and bless him. Christ only taught that it was necessary for you and me to be true, just, holy, and pure. Then, when from our hearts, we could forgive our enemies—when, from our hearts, we could bless all about us—when our only desire was, that the richest of heaven's blessings might be poured upon them—when we felt no disposition to smite him who had smitten our cheek—when we had no disposition to revile those that reviled us, then should we be indeed the children of God, and receive the blessings

of his love in our souls. Christ devoted his life to working out this problem for us; his whole life was devoted to it, and it was thus that his life becomes our salvation.

The world has long been in ignorance, in gloom, in passion, and in lust; and as the Father sent him into the world, so he sends us into the world: not to be called priests, and pastors, and bishops, but in our individual capacity, as men, to sustain, illustrate, teach, and enforce these great and holy truths. When the spirit of Christ is upon us, when we have been immersed in that spirit, when our souls have been immersed in the fire, and our dross burned away, when the Prince of this world cometh, and finds nothing in us, then shall we be joint heirs with Christ to that inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. Christ's death showed with what perfect self-forgetfulness and zeal man must seek the kingdom of God. So far as our love and desire to bless is concerned, we must be no respecters of persons. We must go down into the dens, and eat and drink with the lowest of mortals, not to partake of their sins, but to breathe a refining influence upon them, and purify them. When it was necessary for Christ either to deny the truth his life had preached, or to lose his life, he went calmly to the judgment, and thence to the gibbet, exhibiting the same love and truth, by breathing blessings upon his murderers, showing that in all their malignity, their buffetings, their reviling, their wagging their heads, saying "hail, King of the Jews," and, "Thou that saved'st others, save, now, thyself," in all this they could not ruffle the calm, loving spirit within him, but he died as he had lived. If the Prince of this world had had any thing in him, it would have risen and showed itself. But no! In his divine love and forgiveness, he breathed forth his dying prayer for them. Is there not much in his death? and did not he die for you, and me, and the world? Did he not teach us how to live and die, so that we might become one with God; harmonizing with the Divine Father?

MR. ERRETT.

We have not yet learned a single word, Mr. Moderator, as to any standard of judgment to be used under the present question; and now, if I assume that we are to appeal to the Scriptures, it will go on to the last speech, and then it will appear that the gentleman would not be judged by that standard.

MR. TIFFANY. I have said that the standard to which every man is to appeal, is in his own consciousness. You may have all the books in the world, and yet you must judge by your own consciousness after all.

MR. ERRETT. Now we understand it! In *Mr. Tiffany's con-*

seriousness the Disciples are anti-Christian in faith and practice! Who cares for that? How can the *audience* know any thing of it, if it is to be proved to them? I demand an answer whether we are to take the Scriptures of the New Testament as a standard.

MR. TIFFANY. I have said that I regard the teachings of Jesus Christ as pure truth, and I suppose they must be found in the New Testament. The question is whether you or I have the correct understanding of that book: that is to be decided between us.

MR. ERRETT. Very well! then the New Testament is to be the last appeal in discussing this question; he is to prove his proposition from these Scriptures, and you are to judge which of us interprets them correctly. We have, now, something to go upon, and if the gentleman flies from "literal" to "spiritual" meaning, that spiritual meaning is to be *proved*, and any thing about optics or mental philosophy will be gratuitous: that will be understood.

The gentleman says, verbal symbols, types, figures, &c., are only safe as they convey truths to the mind. About that, we will have no controversy: it may be regarded as settled that when they fail to convey truths, they are of no service. He then took up forms, and said their only value was in their use, and, unless they are of some use, they are to be discarded. We had some discussion about *use*, yesterday, and I understood the gentleman that the Christian plane is beyond the use of *any thing*, either to ourselves or to our neighbor; but we must take delight in things for their own sake. I do not see why that doctrine does not include forms as well as every thing else. Others may seek a different inspiration if they please; but if these inspire our hearts with delight, it would, by the gentleman's philosophy, be so much the better, and show a character entirely above the ordinary plane. To say, therefore, that we are not to regard a thing as of value, except with regard to its use, is to contradict himself, and throw us back into the selfish plane.

He says forms can not be of any use to God, if God is infinite; but if this is to be settled by philosophy, I tell the gentleman he has no right or power to reason about God, for he has laid down the principle that the moment he begins to talk of God, he makes him an objective being, and the whole process becomes idolatrous. His philosophy is so contradictory that he can not establish a single point in that way. It is not worth while *for him*, therefore, to talk about God's omnipotence, omnipresence, and infinity, for the moment you think of His being *any thing*, that moment you objectify him. I do not care how much you may strive to reason correctly, it does not help the matter any, but only makes it worse.

But if it is to be settled by Scripture, we read various passages which attribute pleasure or displeasure to God ; such as "with such sacrifice God is well pleased," and, "This is my son, the beloved, in-whom I am well pleased." There are some things, therefore, with which God is well pleased, and there are also some things which are an abomination to him : all things are not alike to him. There is also a conception and feeling in the Divine mind with regard to truth, which does not exist with regard to falsehood. There is an approbation of one, and a disapprobation of the opposite ; indeed, we can form no conception of a God whom we can trust, except he approves justice, and truth, and holiness, and disapproves all that is contrary. If there is established, therefore, by Divine authority, an ordinance and appointment, no matter whether it be baptism or any thing else, and it is urged upon man's obedience upon the one part, it is not a matter of indifference with the law-giver whether it is obeyed or disobeyed. Christ has said, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." The command was to believe and be baptized, and hence, to obey was right, and to disobey was wrong. To say otherwise, would be to confound all right and wrong, and to stultify all the moral rules of the universe. If we make God a subjective God, known only in consciousness, there is no reasoning about the matter ; but if the gentleman comes out into the field of reasoning, he cannot deny the position I have taken, viz., that there is a Divine pleasure and displeasure, Divine approbation and disapprobation.

My friend says again that he denies that Christ practiced water-baptism. Yet he has said he still admits and holds true all he published in *Tiffany's Lectures*, and I have already given you an extract in which he expressly declares that water-baptism was "*used by Christ*." He speaks of it as connected with the entrance upon a life of love and righteousness, and beautifully typifying the change of heart. After such an admission, unretracted and unexplained, I do not feel called upon to *prove* that Christ taught the use of that ordinance ; but the gentleman is bound by his own admission made in words as clear and emphatic as he could utter. How he can contradict himself as he does, he may explain if he can ; I called your attention to this matter in the other debate, and it remains where I then left it. It will not do to say that the world has advanced since the time when Jesus was on earth. The advancement has not been of a kind to alter the necessity for a change of heart. The mass of mankind are now, as then, dead in trespasses and sins, and the work of the church of Christ is to bring man out from this condition, and persuade him to enter upon a life of love and righteousness : to "break off their sins by righteousness, and their iniquities by turning unto the Lord." When they have determined in the love of Christ to

leave their sins forever, they have then come into a situation where it is right for them to be baptized; and if it is right that it should be done, it can not be right that it should be neglected. It was right in the estimation of Jesus, and the same reasons for it remain in force. To attempt, therefore, to make out that it is anti-Christian, when Christ himself, by the gentleman's own showing, practiced it, is what I humbly submit it is not in the gentleman's power to do, to the satisfaction of an audience possessed of common sense.

I am as much opposed to an enslavement to mere form as the gentleman can be, and if he wishes to make the impression that in our church or any church in this town there is a base obedience to form, without reference to what is taught and typified by it, every one of us here know that it is not so. There may be cases where individual members of churches require admonition on this point, but that the church is in fault in regard to it, we deny. If he means to assert that we believe immersion to profit any thing, of itself, we deny that also. A man may be immersed five hundred times, with no benefit whatever, though the fullest form of the outward rite be observed. Baptism as a religious ceremony may be performed without profit, if the hearts of those who receive the ordinance are not right. I insist, however, that when Christ commanded the believer to be baptized, he referred to water baptism. I have already challenged proof that He meant a baptism of the Holy Ghost. I said there were but two cases of baptism of the Holy Ghost. My friend then referred to the 19th chapter of Acts, and I still defied him to show a single spiritual gift, growing out of that baptism, if it was there recorded; for he had declared that such gifts followed that baptism in other cases. I call his attention to the same points now, and hope he will come up to them.

Every reader of the Scriptures knows that water baptism is the ordinary baptism there spoken of, and that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a special application of the term. It becomes a man who affirms the contrary of this, to establish the position well, since he contradicts the interpretation always agreed upon, from the apostolic days to the present. I noticed the fact also, that the special baptism, that of the Holy Ghost, is not *commanded*, whilst the general and ordinary baptism is. To command a person to be baptized with the Holy Ghost when there was none to baptize him, would be to place him under the obligation of an impossible duty! Christ's command is one which men can submit to and obey.

The gentleman told us this morning, that as mediums, the apostles could baptize with the Holy Ghost. I deny it, and demand the proof. He said again, that spiritual gifts followed the laying on of hands: I admit that, but I deny that the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost came by the laying on

of hands. It came from God by Christ's own promise, and no man baptized them with the Holy Ghost. Therefore, when the Scripture says, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and again, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," it involves a *command* which can be obeyed, and can not refer to a baptism of the Holy Ghost, which comes by no command. I am not responsible for dwelling so long on baptism, for the topic was forced upon me.

Jesus said this spirit should guide them into all truth and bring all things to remembrance, whatsoever he had taught them. He told them to tarry in Jerusalem till they were endowed with power from on high. He said he would send the Comforter, the Advocate, to them, when he went away to his Father, and that unless he went away the Comforter could not come. That promise was fulfilled: we can show when and where it was fulfilled, and they began to teach the truths of Christ's gospel under the influence of that spirit. The gentleman says that baptism involved the communication of no spiritual truth. Let him call it what he pleases, but in Christ Jesus and him crucified, *we* have spiritual truth that can thrill our hearts with joy and gladness forevermore! They are spiritual truths which have awakened spiritual life in the hearts of countless millions, who in this life turned from sin to righteousness, and have now gone home to glory! Let him say there is no spiritual truth in it! He may call things by what name he pleases, but in the consciousness of ten thousand times ten thousand, there has been a new birth to spiritual life followed by so happy an experience of that holy peace in God which flows like a river, that though he should argue for ages, his reasonings could not rob their souls of it!

Now, this spirit which was to guide the disciples into all truth, taught Peter to baptize with water baptism. He did not do it as his own work, upon his own authority. He did it in the name,—the gentleman says that means "by the power,"—and let it be so; he did it then *by the power of Jesus Christ!* He said, when, sent of God, he found the family of Cornelius the centurion were baptized with the Holy Ghost; "Can any man refuse *water*, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we (Acts x: 47)?" He was speaking under Divine inspiration, which at least must have given him all the truth he needed for that occasion. He said it in such a way that none can doubt that the Spirit which sent him was responsible for his teachings. So it was with the other recorded cases. You all know how Philip, being filled with the spirit of God baptized in the *water* Queen Candace's Eunuch, when he confessed that he believed on Jesus Christ as the Son of God. So it goes in all the history. I need not quote

the passages which show that water baptism was practiced by the apostles, in the name of Jesus Christ. Every reader of Scripture knows them, and the most ignorant can not be made to believe that any other mode of baptism or any other interpretation of Christ's command was believed in by the apostles; much less can the gentleman impose any such conclusion upon an audience who are well instructed in the Bible.

MR. TIFFANY.

I am glad to have my friend walk up to these questions. He has confessed that forms, in themselves, are of no use: it is only as they are the means of conveying to the mind a higher conception of truth, and awaking the soul to a higher love of truth, that they are of service. He now justifies them on the ground of a command, and that command, he says, comes from Christ. I will review his argument and then go on to the question concerning the atonement again.

He refers to Christ's words in only two passages where he says baptism was commanded. He says the gift of the Holy Ghost was promised, and it came. The baptism of the Holy Ghost conferred gifts, and receiving of the Holy Ghost conferred the same. It would appear by the 19th of Acts, that the *receiving* the Holy Spirit produced the same results as to gifts in *that* case, that what my friend calls the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost did in the prior case. There must be a wonderful difference, then, between the two. The baptism which Christ directed, was to be followed by spiritual gifts, and if the gifts did not follow water baptism, it is pretty good proof that it could not be the kind of baptism which Christ referred to.

My friend has also admitted that there were a great many truths which the Spirit of Truth did not lead the apostles into on the day of Pentecost. It only led them into some truth. We do not know precisely what it led them into, but we know that it was not till some ten years after, that it was brought to Peter's mind that God was no respecter of persons, although he was baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. If, then, the measure of truth which the apostles then received was so limited, my friend can not claim that they were very highly enlightened. There stand the facts, and you can not refer to Peter as being absolute authority on that point. It is evident that many misconceptions of truth were in the apostles' minds, and that even after the day of Pentecost they thought that Jesus was to be proclaimed as a Messiah who was to come and reign as a temporal Prince. Tell me, if you can, what evidence there was that Peter regarded the

slightest part of the ceremonial law as abrogated. Show me wherein his religious ideas had been in the slightest degree changed. Go along his course for ten years, and see if any of his Jewish ideas of religious faith and practice were changed. The fact, therefore, that the Jewish rites and ceremonies were continued, is just as great evidence that these were to be continued as a part of the Christian system, as that water baptism was. I say, it was long after this before they began to see the uselessness of the ceremonies of the Jews; and I refer my friend to Mosheim's history for proof that the ceremonies of the old law were practiced by the Christian church till the time of the persecution under Julian, and even then only a part of the church abandoned them. Let my friend explain these facts; if he says the apostles were enlightened into all truth, let him show wherein it consisted. If Peter taught any thing, he taught that Christ was still to come back and be a temporal Prince. There is no more proof of a change in that opinion, which it is admitted he held before Christ's death, than there is that he changed in his religious opinion as to ceremonies. We do not exhibit the spirit of truth, if we refuse to take these facts into our account in interpreting the Scriptures.

Christ's baptism was called a baptism of the Spirit; and the mere fact that the disciples continued water baptism among other forms, does not show that Christ commanded it. The gentleman has admitted that no form or ceremony is valuable except for its use, yet he insists upon the necessity of practicing this particular one. When you put these things together, and admit that baptism is of no value in itself, while at the same time you insist upon its practice, when the same end would be as well subserved without it, is to call the mind away from that which is essential to that which is only formal and ceremonial. Again, all that Christ said upon the subject was said before the gift of the Spirit, and therefore before the full opening of the new dispensation. To refer to it, therefore, as binding upon the church after the new dispensation had come, is unphilosophical, and unwarranted by any principle of criticism.

There is one thing my friend has often referred to, and made a way of escape out of many difficulties. He says I have declared that we can not reason about God. I said we can not reason *of* God, but we can reason *about* God. In the sphere of manifestation, God comes within the reason; the sphere of consciousness is not in the province of the reason. I can talk of God in the sphere of manifestation, and not mistake that for essence. I can have in my mind the absolute, and distinguish between it and the finite, and I can talk about the finite as being the manifestation of the infinite, and not make finite the infinite. Truth is a manifestation of the Divine, and not the Divine himself. So justice, purity, and love, are manifestations of the Divine in the outward

and relational. Jesus of Nazareth, as an embodiment of truth, wisdom, and love, was a manifestation of the Divine. He was the Word, the Father manifested to the world. Every truth is manifested from God, whether it be moral, scientific, or any other. To my finite nature they manifest God, and, coming within the sphere of my finite nature, I can reason about them, perceive them, and perceive that they harmonize with the absolute and perfect. I can affirm of justice, that it has its basis in the absolute and Divine. If I disregard truth, and justice, and purity, and righteousness, I place myself in antagonism to the Absolute. These are all manifestations of the Father in the relational sphere, and just as we perceive them, do we perceive the manifestations of the Father. In rejecting truth, we reject the manifestation of God. In the finite sphere, we only talk of God in his manifestations, and we must talk about him so as not to contradict his infinity. We can not bring God down into the finite: when we attempt to do it and give him form, we make him objective and limited. If I am asked what we shall do to "work the works of God," I answer, be true in every relation; receive all truth with a free and truthful spirit; be just and pure, and you will have fulfilled all you can in this finite sphere. But you must not conclude that this is the Absolute; that the infinite Father, to speak figuratively, does not dwell beyond. On such a subject I am almost afraid to use words, for you are so in the habit of using them literally, that you may misunderstand me. You pitch into the surface only, and into the surface, in the strict sense, which allows it no thickness.

My friend may admit or deny that God is omnipotent and omnipresent. Although I exist, I do not restrict the omnipresence of God, and although I have power, I do not restrict his omnipotence. I have no difficulty in perceiving that the fact of my existence and yours is in harmony with the Divine infinite existence. What I mean to say is, that every manifestation of God must harmonize with his essence; it cannot conflict with his infinity and perfection, for then it would not be true. My friend goes on to build up his theological schemes, as though the infinite had come into relation to the finite. I can contemplate justice, and truth, and righteousness, but while they are manifestations of the Father, I am not obliged to say they are the Father. I can look upon Jesus of Nazareth, as an incarnation of truth, and justice and love, and say that in him the Father was manifest, and yet not say he was the Father. I may take truth into my soul, that by it I may grow up to have higher manifestations of the Father, and that when I rise to a place where the Father can be revealed to me, he may be made known to my soul. I surely can do all this without denying His infinity. But the moment I make the Father an individual, I make him finite, and

become an idolater. We can only worship God in spirit and in truth, by yielding obedience to all truth, by receiving and confiding in all truth, justice, and love; but the moment we fall into an obedience of forms, we begin to lose sight of the Spirit, and come into the condition that the Jew was in, when he thought man was made for the Sabbath and not the Sabbath for man. Men too often place these institutions above themselves, and bow before them as their Lords and masters. Whenever we have reached a point, therefore, where they no longer are necessary to illustrate purity and teach us truth, the use is a mere formality, and tends to lead the mind into error and idolatry, becoming thereby mischievous in its consequences.

I will now proceed with other propositions on the subject of the atonement. I have presented to your understanding truth of which you can perceive the force. My friend talks as if there were truths which man may trample under foot with impunity: as though he might turn his back upon truths which his own judgment affirms, and follow a mere form. I want my friend to understand that in trampling upon truth, he tramples upon Jesus of Nazareth. When he violates the principles of truth and love, refusing to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, he does it to Jesus of Nazareth. So if he tramples upon truth, mental, moral, or physical, he tramples upon all truth and the author of all truth.

The point I was making in my former argument was, that Christ is not a vicarious sacrifice, to satisfy the Divine justice. I now come to speak of the nature of sin. I start with a proposition my friend can not deny. It is this; *Omnipotence* can not be frustrated, and the laws proceeding from omnipotence can not be suspended, but they must and will ultimate their perfect work.

Hence, God's laws can not be broken in respect to their or His government. Let the soul quarrel with that as much as it may, it is truth, and God's truth. The mind can not harmonize with any thing if it will not receive the truth.

Hence, if sin be a violation of God's law, then in regard to God and his government, man can not sin.

Hence, if man can not sin against God, he is not answerable in his own conscience for violating the law with respect to God.

Hence, sin can not be made to appear where no evil consequences can appear.

Hence, as evil consequences of sin can not be made to appear with respect to the Divine government, man can not have remorse for affecting the Divine in any way.

Hence, repentance and sorrow can only have respect to those who are injured. Sin can only exist in respect to that which can be affected by it, and sorrow for sin, with its regrets and remorse, can only exist with respect to sin and its effects.

Hence, man can not have remorse and self-condemnation for any effects sin may have upon the Divine government or upon God.

Hence, if God has not been injured in his being, frustrated in his will, defeated in his plans, or obstructed in his work, man has nothing to mourn over, so far as God's will and government are concerned.

Again; man never intended God an injury, and never did him any, and consequently can not have any remorse or regret, so far as injuring God is concerned. Hence, sin must have respect to the finite and imperfect; and this will lead us to the nature of sin, and its consequences.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish, Mr. Moderator, to get along in as orderly a way as possible, and notice matters as they are presented. First, I wish to say, that in admitting the gentleman's propositions as to figurative language and symbols, I understood him to speak of them only as signs of ideas used to convey knowledge to the mind. When he understood me as admitting that *religious ordinances* had no other signification, he understood me as meaning a great deal more than I intended.

In speaking of our reverence for the Bible, he does not state our position as it is. We do not reverence it as a mass of paper, type, and ink, but as a book of truth—truth from God. I am not alarmed lest a too great reverence for the teachings of the Scriptures should be fastened upon us, and we thereby be proved anti-Christian; but I rather fear the danger we are in of reverencing the Holy book too little.

The gentleman would not be understood as arguing against the Sabbath, but he would not keep it as a day of holiness and make the other six, days of sin! But he can not pretend that this last doctrine or practice is taught by the Disciples or by any Christian church. If there are persons who are not as good upon the six days as they should be, it is an abuse and perversion of what they are taught from the pulpits. Such an argument does not touch us therefore, and I may pass on.

Neither would he be understood as arguing against prayer; but he thought that *verbal* prayer was generally idolatrous, and to pray with any idea that God is to hear and answer your supplications, is anti-Christian! We had this argument before, and little needs to be said. I will only repeat the remark, before unanswered by the gentleman, that Jesus *did* teach his disciples to

pray and to say, "Our Father who art in heaven," &c., and this He did when, as yet, they had very imperfect views of the Divine character. Therefore to pray verbally is neither idolatrous nor anti-Christian, unless it be anti-Christian to follow Christ's own teachings. He taught his disciples to believe that their Heavenly Father was more ready to give blessings to those that ask him, than an earthly parent is to give good gifts to his children. He taught them the necessity of earnestness in prayer, by the parable of the man who went to his neighbor at night to get food for a visitor, and by his importunity obtained that which his friendship could not induce him to bestow. The gentleman may find fault with Jesus for teaching such things, but that is not now the question. My only argument at present is that it demonstrates that we are not anti-Christian. Christ likewise told the story of the importunate widow and the unjust judge, to teach "that men ought always to pray and not to faint," and if my friend makes our following such precepts a proof of anti-Christian practice, we give him all the advantage of our assertion that we glory in it.

With regard to baptism, the gentleman argued, that because there were certain gifts mentioned in connection with the baptism commanded by Christ in the apostolic commission, that baptism could not be a water baptism.

I answer, there is nothing said about the signs following the baptism. It says, "these signs shall follow them that believe." The narrative is by Mark (Mark xvi.), remember. We find in the context the *unbelief* of the disciples several times mentioned and dwelt upon. When Mary told them of his resurrection, "*they believed not*;" and when the two who had met him, came and reported the fact, "*neither believed they them*;" afterward the Lord himself cometh to them, "and upbraided them with their *unbelief* and hardness of heart, because they *believed not them* which had seen him after he was risen." Immediately in this connection comes the commission, with the promise of the blessings and gifts upon their trustful believing hearts, when they should have faith in him without sight of his risen body. He taught in this way that their unbelief must be abandoned, that they must not be doubting, but believing. "So then after the Lord had spoken to them he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." It was, therefore, a special promise made to the apostles, and the whole force and meaning of the passage grows out of the frequent prior reference to their stubborn unbelief. There is nothing at all said about its connection with baptism; the connection of the signs is with faith alone. That point of the gentleman's argument fails.

He says the *baptism* of the Holy Spirit confers no more than was conferred by what is commonly spoken of as *receiving* the Spirit. But if it were so, what would that prove? If I send you fifty dollars by the hand of a friend, and another fifty by mail, does the sameness of the amount in both cases prove that the amounts were both sent in the same way? The fact is, however, that the same blessings were not conferred in both cases. The baptism of the Holy Ghost marked out the great truth that both Jew and Gentile were equal participants in the kingdom of heaven. It was, as it were, a certificate from the Almighty to break down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and make them one in the church of Christ. It had a particular meaning in the reception of the Gentiles into the church, and a special meaning also at the forming of the church among the Jews.

My friend refers again to the transactions of the day of Pentecost, and declared that Peter had not the slightest change in his views of Christ and his kingdom. I ask you to go back to the 16th of Matthew, and see how Peter *rebuked* Christ for his prophesy of his death and resurrection, saying, "be it far from thee, Lord! this shall not be unto thee." He then supposed Christ would establish a temporal kingdom, with great pomp and power, and to hear him talking of death and resurrection excited him to resist~~ance~~, so that Christ had to say to him, "Get thee behind me, adversary! Satan!" But on the day of Pentecost, that same Peter preached that very death and resurrection of which he had said, "Be it far from thee, Lord!" the very resurrection, of which, before, he had no conception at all. All the time Jesus was with them after his resurrection, He was instructing them in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, as is declared in the Acts (i: 3), "To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs; being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." From the fact of their asking, "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" it does not follow that their ideas were fixed upon a carnal kingdom, for they then knew of his death and resurrection.

As to any change, at *any* time, in Peter's views concerning Christ and the spiritual nature of his kingdom, there is evidence that he did not materially change after the instruction he got at the transfiguration, immediately after the things narrated in the 16th of Matthew. In his second epistle (i: 16), he refers back to that time, as the time when he was an "eye witness of His majesty," and heard the voice from heaven saying, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased." So in his first epistle (iii: 21), he refers to water baptism as he did on the day of Pentecost, and compares it to the salvation from physical death "by

water" in the days of Noah, saying, "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." In this manner he refers to the type as found in the deluge, and makes his ideas of water baptism, as held by him in his old age, clear beyond controversy. I say again that he preached the same gospel at the house of Cornelius, as he did on the day of Pentecost. With all the special preparation for the work which he had received, so far was he, at that time, from changing his views of baptism, that, after the Holy Spirit had been poured out, he asked, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" This, you know, was *after* Peter's ten years' experience that the gentleman talks so much about. If then the matured views of Peter, held by him when full of inspiration from on high, and taught by him at all periods of his after life, be an anti-Christian view of baptism, I can only say as I said before, I glory in it.

The gentleman referred to my remark upon his consistency in reasoning about God. You will remember that I affirmed that his philosophy made it impossible for him to reason about God; he denied this, and then went on to show that he might reason, not about *God*, but about the *finite manifestations* of God! Well, he may reason about justice and righteousness, in the "first discrete degree," where he makes men remain (for you know he asserts that there is not a Christian upon earth): he may reason about what man can do, and what the manifestations of God can do; but when he pretends to reason about God Himself, he turns his "*batteries*" against his own philosophy, which has been given to the winds, and in spite of his terrific threats, I stand here yet. He may spend "seventy times seven" weeks, talking about the absolute, and not one of his audience will know any thing more about it than he did before. I do not believe there is a sensible man in Warren, who will say he has my friend's—what? Not idea, but—*consciousness* of God. God exists in our consciousness! but is God himself conscious? does He love? does He desire? does He purpose? Is there a consciousness of any of these things with God? If not—if there is with him no purpose, no direction, no plan, no volition, no action, why! all there is left of God will neither do him, nor any one else, much good. If you can draw the line between that and downright Atheism you are welcome to the task. I can not. When you have cast away the idea of a God who loves or hates, plans, purposes or wills, a God who is conscious and intelligent, you have cast away all the idea of God in which I can find any consolation or comfort, and leave no God that I can obey or look upon as the ruler of the Universe.

Again, the gentleman says if you use forms which do not con-

vey any idea to your mind, they are worse than useless; but if you can get the idea from them, they are still of no use. What then is a form good for? for he admits that they may be good for something. This thing of forms and symbols is closely connected with the philosophy of mind. Figures and types are interwoven into every language, and although we may get an idea of a thing without a form or figure, we get a great advantage from the greater clearness and vividness of ideas which we get by the aid of the form. How often do our most elegant and finished writers make use of metaphor, simile, trope, and parable, not because the idea can not be conveyed without them, but because the idea obtains a life-like clearness through their use. For this reason, forms and figures are not to be ruled out of existence, even if they are not absolutely necessary to give us an idea which we seek. The Saviour had reference to the philosophy of our nature and its wants when he made use of forms in word and in act. I ought not to have to explain this here, for it is all taught in our elementary school books. If it is simply a *slavery* to form which my friend attacks, he does not touch a single religious denomination among us. He has not convicted any particular church of such slavishness. As to the form of baptism, the gentleman has so fully admitted its utility, in his printed book, that it needs no defense. If he says it was only useful, in a "John Baptist dispensation," he does not help his argument, for he puts us all in such a dispensation, *anyhow*, and the form must then be useful.

He exhorts us to show our religion by attending to the poor and distressed: though not aware of the particular occasion for his exhortation, I will take it in kindness and lay it away for use. But if he meant to insinuate that our church does not admit the necessity of benevolence, and its urgent duty, not because he exhorts it, but because it is a fundamental principle in Christianity, he must be exceedingly ignorant of our belief.

The matter of inspiration I should think my friend would be sick of. In all his attempts to show that the Scriptures recognized his doctrine that the same inspiration is needed to receive as to impart truth, he has failed. Passage after passage has been taken from him. If he did not hear the passages I quoted, he can not hear at all. The report will show numerous ones. I will merely submit three considerations for the gentleman: **FIRST**, If it takes the same inspiration to hear as to speak, it is altogether superfluous to speak at all.

MR. TIFFANY.

I will begin where my friend left off, and go back through his speech, so as to take it in order. In reference to Jesus' using baptism, I say he did not institute it at all. He found it as he

found the Passover. He practiced it as he did the Passover. John the Baptist commenced it before Jesus came upon the stage. It was neither *His* institution nor *His* practice, any more than his eating the Passover and going up to Jerusalem once a year, made *these* his institutions.

My friend says the signs were not to follow baptism, but *belief*. Let us see: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned, and these signs shall follow them that believe." Well, who were those that believed? Is it not those that were *baptized* that were referred to? Now if baptism is at all necessary, the signs must follow the baptism. This method of separating belief and baptism for one purpose, and connecting them for another, does not seem very logical.

As to the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the signs which followed it, you will see by the passage in the 10th chapter of Acts, that it was while Peter was yet speaking that the Holy Ghost fell on the family of Cornelius, and "they of the circumcision," knew that it was the Holy Spirit,—how? "*For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God.*" This, then, was the *mark* by which they knew it was a *baptism* of the Holy Ghost. Turn now to the 19th chapter, where my friend says it was the *gift* of the Holy Spirit and not the *baptism*, and we read that "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and *they spake with tongues*, and prophesied." The same signs were given in both cases, but it is in the latter case, a different thing, and a different gift! Well, my friend may use it in whichever way he pleases. I might show that Peter spoke of the *gifts* of the Spirit coming upon the Gentiles, in giving his subsequent account of what my friend chooses to call the baptism; but I think the matter is sufficiently before you.

In regard to Peter's receiving his inspiration concerning the nature of the kingdom of heaven, while he was upon the mount of Transfiguration, my friend's mode of interpretation in this case is in accordance with no common rule. One thing is certain: that after that transfiguration, we find him looking for Christ as a temporal Prince and Saviour. The argument will not bear criticism.

My friend is obliged to admit, that on the day of Pentecost Peter's information on the subject of Christ's mission was very limited, and that it was ten years after, before he had his first intimation that the Gentiles were to be received into the church. Therefore Peter is not authority upon the question of baptism being an institution of Christ. It is not true that Peter or any of the apostles supposed for years and years that the Jewish ritual was to be done away with. They came into it by degrees. The history of the church, as given in the Bible and in ecclesiastical

history, agrees in this. I did not come here to prove that my friend is anti-Peter, or anti-Paul, but anti-Christ. If he claims the benefit of Peter's rule as to baptism, he must first establish Peter's inspiration, and to take his authority before doing so, is not logical. The promise of Jesus being that the signs should follow the believer's baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost being the only one which was in fact followed by the signs, it is conclusive that that must have been the only one to which Christ referred: there I leave the matter again.

My friend says he does not reverence the *form* of the Bible, but its truths. Where does he find those truths? Evidently in his own understanding of the book. Therefore it is his understanding that he reverences, and what is not in his understanding that he does not reverence. The book, then, is infallible truth to him, just as far as he is infallible in his understanding of it. He can not avoid this conclusion.

He tells us baptism of water was a command, but baptism of the Holy Ghost was a promise. But, "be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," was also a command. It was a command to go on unto perfection, and in like manner might the baptism of the Spirit be a command, when the soul has reached a certain point.

I shall now proceed with my remarks upon the finiteness of sin. My proposition, which I hope my friend will either admit or deny, is that Omnipotence can not be frustrated, but every law of God will work out its perfect work, and nothing in the universe can stop it. I affirm without hesitation that *an omnipotent law can not be suspended or violated*; that no law of Omnipotence can in any manner be suspended or violated. My friend should distinguish between the law of God in his government, and his law in my physical being, my spiritual being, or any other finite being. That is said to be the highest law of any existence, which tends to produce the highest destiny of that being. Any action which violates the law of one's physical being, is a sin against that being. I have certain laws of life, and they, if observed, will continue me in health; but if I violate them, I lose my health, and have sinned against the laws of the harmony and health of my body. In this case, the sin takes effect in my body, and if I cause the effect to extend to others, I have sinned against them to that extent. If the sin results from a selfish and corrupt intention on my part, it extends to my spirit as well as to my body, and I have sinned against a law of the unfolding of my spirit, the law which would bring me in harmony with truth. If I teach others error, and lead them into falsehood, I am an instrument of their sinning against their being; but if I do not affect them, either in body or mind, I have not committed any sin against them. If I have not affected my mind, or violated the laws of my mind, I have not

sinned against my mind. Sin is manifested to others and to the world, by its consequences. Hence, the penalties of sin have strict reference to the consequences of sin. If I sin against my body, the penalty is upon my body, and if my spirit is affected by the penalty, it is proof that, so far, I have sinned against my spirit. If I sin against my neighbor by injuring him or bringing him into danger, I have also sinned against my mind, and if I have not done it willingly, I shall only feel what we call regret; but if I have done it willingly, I have laid in my soul the foundation for remorse. All the penalties visited upon the mind come in the shape of remorse, regret, or self-condemnation. Suppose I intended to do one of you an injury in property, such as letting down the bars and driving my cattle into your corn-field, my sin against you is evident; but if the cows do not happen to go in, I have sinned against my soul in violating the laws of my own spiritual nature. If the injury did not occur to my neighbor, I did not sin against him, and have no restitution to make; but I have sinned against my own soul, and must pay the penalty by remorse. In this case, what is demanded is repentance and sorrow for sin, and when these have washed the sin away, restitution is made, peace of mind returns, and the sin is removed. When all this is done, the harmony of God's universe is no longer jarred. But if the sin extends to my neighbor, so far as only to disturb his peace of mind, and his confidence in my justice and goodness, self-condemnation takes place, and repentance and restitution both become necessary. I must ask my neighbor's forgiveness, and seek to be restored to his kindness and confidence. This explains the nature of such sins, and their remedy. In like manner, if I sin against God and his government, I am answerable for it; but I must be able to injure him, or violate his laws, before I can commit a sin against him. I can not cause one of his laws to be suspended, or in the lowest degree hinder the omnipotent power with which his government will move right on, though it crush me or my neighbor. I might have sinned against my neighbor or myself, and the evil will be as extensive as is the relation which is violated: when that is restored, all is restored. Now, until the relation can become infinite, I can not sin against the Infinite. Under the economy of God's government, every one who would come into life must have every hard and unkind feeling put away from his bosom, and, as Christ said of the repentant Magdalen, the one that hath much forgiven loveth much.

God's universe must result in the highest good of all this creation, and all pain and evil which now flow from the laws of the Divine government, must, in the end, redound to the highest good and happiness of all; otherwise, his government would be imperfect. The idea that the power which blesses is a different one from that which curses, is a singular one, and one which is very

untrue, with regard to the Infinite and Divine. Suppose I put my hand into the fire, and am burned: by what law do I receive the injury? Has the fire acquired a new law and power? No; but I have taken upon myself a false relation. It is the same power which would bless me, if I were in a true relation to it, which now curses me, when I am in a false relation to it; and just as it is fitted for blessing, so will be its proportionate power to curse. We are not to look for a Devil, to account for this evil. There is no evil in God's universe, but what flows from false relations between finite beings. There is not a pain, or throb of body or spirit, but comes by virtue of a law, designed to work out, and which will work out, at last, man's highest good and perfect destiny. The very remorse in my breast, when I do wrong, is a law within me, telling me that my rights must harmonize with every body else's rights. The very pain I feel is but an admonition that I have departed from the true path, and come into a false relation to my highest good and true destiny. It is figured by the flaming sword in the hand of the cherub, guarding the tree of life. That is the economy of pain. I feel sick; it admonishes me that death is at work in my system. The sentinel says, all is not well. It is the warning voice of the cherub with the sword. I feel wounded when I injure my fellow: it is owing to a similar cause. It tells me that I have departed from the true relation to him, and violated some principle of truth, justice, or right. But evil does not reach the government of God; it extends only to the finite and relational. Therefore, when I was inquiring, this morning, what was necessary to make us harmonize with God, I said we must come up out of our selfishness, and our appetites, to repent of evil, and do works meet for repentance: when this is done, and we love all mankind purely, then we are in the way by which we can begin to harmonize with God, and with His divine truth and purity. Now, if my friend says that man can commit an infinite sin, by sinning against an infinite God, I deny his doctrine. If he should say it is necessary for God to make an infinite sacrifice, I answer that no such doctrine can be true, nor is any such taught by Jesus of Nazareth. Again, there is no principle of justice in the idea of one man's suffering the penalty incurred by another. Justice is a relational quality: it is the child of truth and love. It is the same the world over, and must everywhere harmonize with truth and love. Now, there is no principle of justice by which an innocent person can be made to suffer for a guilty one. Do you say, Justice is done, in such a case? Done to whom? To the innocent being, or to the guilty one? The fact is, the principle of justice is not involved in the idea of a vicarious atonement.

Therefore, I say in regard to man, that he should become true, and pure, and good, and then, and only then, he will harmonize with God.

MR. ERRETT.

Before we proceed to the question of the vicarious sacrifice, I wish to make a few remarks upon matters not yet completely posted up.

Jesus did not institute baptism, the gentleman tells us. Well, who has said he did. I argued from the gentleman's printed admissions, just as I should have done in regard to the Passover, if I had found his admissions on that subject. To turn off to the question of the original institution of the ordinance, is a mere shift and evasion of the point I made.

I asked the gentleman to show the audience that any gift of the Spirit followed the baptism mentioned in the 19th chapter of Acts; for I assert that there is not a word concerning any gift, till after the *laying on of hands*, and I asked if there was any laying on of hands on the day of Pentecost. The one was immediately from God; in the other, the gift came by the laying on of the apostolic hands.

I understand my friend to take the position that whatever Peter said on the day of Pentecost, was upon his own responsibility entirely, and not by the inspiration of the Spirit of God: that he had only the *spirit of power* on that day. We are to believe that all that was said was mere human wisdom, and human imagination, from first to last, on that day, and nobody knows how long after. This is said, not only in the face of the unanimous assertions of the apostles and the continued belief of the church, but notwithstanding the early prophecies pointed to such a time as the inauguration of the new dispensation, and the glorious introduction of the Lord's kingdom. The prophesy of Isaiah plainly seems to point to such a time, when it says (2nd chapter), "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and *all nations* shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and *the word of the Lord* from Jerusalem." But no! says my friend; Out of Zion shall go forth *Peter's opinions*, and the fallible word of *Peter* from Jerusalem! Well, believe it who can! the matter is before you. I only hope you will remember, as the gentleman has requested, that it is not anti-Peter and Paul, but anti-*Christ* he is to prove us; and in that connection bear also in mind that Christ said to the same Peter and the apostles, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained" (John xx: 23), and "He that heareth you, heareth me; he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me" (Luke x: 16). The fact, then, is that the man who rejects the teachings of Peter

and Paul, rejects Christ, and *he* is anti-Christ. So John said, "He that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us. *Hereby* know we the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error" (1 John iv: 6). Yet here is a man who does not pretend to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, ignoring Peter and Paul, and claiming to know all about the matter himself! If he can decide upon the matter, let him; but I must say that it appears to me the most extreme arrogance in a man, not a Christian, not inspired with the Holy Ghost, as he admits, to stand up and judge the inspiration of Peter and Paul, whom he confesses *were* baptized with the Holy Spirit!

The gentleman says we reverence our idea of God, not God himself! Well, by this theory, when a little child loves its father, puts its little arms about his neck, and kisses him, it loves, not its father at all, but its *idea* of its father. That is no doubt a very profound philosophy, and I hope you are enlightened by it.

Now we pass to the death of Christ and the sacrifice for sin which Jesus "offered in his own body on the tree." There is no question that Christ died in a peculiar manner, and that he himself had some striking ideas of the peculiar relation of his death to the world. He said of himself, "I lay down my life for the sheep." He did not say he devoted his life to their good, but "I *lay down* my life." He did not die as a martyr dragged to his stake, but he said, "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again;" this he said before he ate that Supper which he instituted with special reference to his death. At that Supper he also said, "This is my body," not, *worn out* for you, but, "*broken* for you," and "this is the new testament of my blood, shed for many for the remission of sins." This is the teaching of Jesus himself, whom my friend admits was emphatically and eternally *the Truth*. Again he taught, that "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up," and still again he declared, that He, the only begotten Son of God, was *given* by the infinite love of the Father, "that whosoever believeth on him *might not perish*, but have everlasting life." I might multiply such passages to almost any extent. He said, "and I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me: *this he said, signifying what death he should die.*" There can be no escape from the conclusion that Jesus approached death under very peculiar circumstances. When he anticipated it, he said, "my soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." For some reason, great sorrow, grief, and anguish, were stealing over his heart and weighing down his spirit so as to force out the utterance of those words, "my soul is *exceeding* sorrowful, *even unto death!*" He went away by himself to pray, and he prayed a prayer that was very peculiar: "Father, *if it be possible*, let this cup pass from me!" Oh! there was peculiar bitterness in that

cup, or it would never have wrung that expression of agony from his Divine heart! it would never have caused the sweat "as it were great drops of blood" to fall from his brow, as if under the extremest torture! The sacred historian tells us that "being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly;" prayed a *verbal* prayer, and said, "O my Father, *if it be possible*, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done!" What means this shrinking and agony? It does not look much like the joyous and triumphant march of a martyr to the place where he rejoices to bear witness before the universe, that his faith in God makes him rise superior to any fear of what man can do unto him! There was something in that death that made the poor heart of Jesus of Nazareth shrink as it had never shrunk, and as the heart of even the humblest follower of Jesus need never shrink from death. No! it was not like a martyr's, a brave martyr's death! He prayed *three times*, and gained the victory so that he was willing that the will of God should be done. We are gathering up the historical facts, now; and we love to linger around those scenes. Many a poor contrite heart, in ages to come, will linger over that scene in the garden, wondering that love could be boundless enough to induce the Son of God to endure all the agony of that midnight hour, when naught finite but the moon and stars looked coldly down upon him, and when devilish craft and malice were arraying themselves for his destruction! They will wonder over that marvelous display of Divine suffering, when the philosophy of my friend, with all its pretense, shall have been forgotten, along with the babbling spirits from whom he professes to have learned it.

Upon the cross He died, and as his life flowed out, he uttered that terrible cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" That cry, no follower of his, however weak and feeble, need ever utter! It need never be wrung from the lips of any disciple of his, upon any bed of death, no matter how fearful! That last pang came upon him alone! He was forsaken! Somehow, he was forsaken! With that fearful cry nature strangely sympathized: the sun was darkened, the earth rocked, the rocks were rent! That cry echoed away down among the tombs of the buried dead, and they started from their graves! At the portals of their sepulchers these anxious inquirers had long time stood, to ask if, indeed, a morning should dawn on the night of the grave, and spring once more revisit the mouldering urn! but they had been mocked by the grim silence of their tyrant. But now there was commotion! the graves opened! Surely it was a strange death! a strange death!

Let us gather up the facts still later. Having arisen from the grave, He instructed his disciples concerning that death, "That thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third

day : and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv : 46.) It was, somehow, necessary that that death should be, or those legions of angels, whom he declared were at his command, would have been sent to rescue him from the agony and the shame. Still another fact is connected with this. The apostles whom he authorized to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, did make this a special and prominent part of their teaching—that Christ died for our sins. By this faith we are saved. Christ died for our sins, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scripture. Such prominence had this doctrine, that Paul said he was determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified; and although Christ was then, "to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness," as my friend would now make him, yet was he, "unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God!" All the philosophers of that age, and the would-be philosophers of this, can not alter these facts. They will go the way of all the other "wise and mighty" ones of the world, and when my friend dies, and his philosophy dies, Jesus will still be the same almighty Saviour. It is my happiness and honor to stand and preach Jesus Christ. I expect still to do it, and I expect to find an *objective* Saviour in the heavens, where I humbly hope to go, and before him I will bow, and cast my crown, if crown be given me, and in his praise will I lift up an immortal tongue, and breathe an undying song. This is the great doctrine the world needs to learn—the doctrine of salvation through a crucified Saviour. In this breach we will stand till death : there will be no flinching here! Of that Saviour, Peter said that "His own self bare our sins, in his own body, on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." (1 Peter, ii : 24.) "For Christ, also, hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." (1 Peter, ii. 18.) Paul said of him that God "made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Corinthians, verse 21.) So Philip, filled with the spirit, found the Ethiopian reading that beautiful passage from Isaiah : "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned, every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isaiah liii : 5); and Philip "began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him *Jesus!*" He showed how he was bruised, and how upon him was laid the iniquity of us all. The Ethiopian heard, believed, and went on his way rejoicing. These are some of the facts as we gather them up from the Scriptures themselves—the facts in the teachings of

Jesus himself, the facts in the death of Jesus, the facts narrated by the Apostles, as they went out, guided into all truth by the Spirit of Truth. These are the matters now before us for consideration. My friend would have you understand that such a faith is false, heathenish, and idolatrous. He is going to apply his philosophy to this, and prove that our faith in Christ's atonement is baseless. He may do so; but it will make little difference with you, to whom it is a settled matter that Jesus is *the truth*.

My friend may argue what can or can not consist with the justice of the Infinite, but it becomes him to be exceedingly cautious how he affirms concerning the Infinite. He should remember that there is danger that "fools may reach where angels fear to tread."

The gentleman has admitted that we must be careful how we dogmatize about principles, which are the highest and most divine forms of truth (Cleveland Debate, page 36), and it becomes him to take the warning to himself, in talking upon the question of the atonement.

The *fact* is that Jesus died, the *truth* is abundantly proven that he died for our sins, and the ultimate *principle*, that by which such a sacrifice became possible in the Divine government, is that about which the gentleman has need to take warning, and not dogmatize rashly. His own philosophy takes this view of the case, if there is any consistency in it.

MR. TIFFANY.

I have nothing to do, my friends, with the keeping of your judgments and consciences, and have no admonitions to give you. I have no promises to make to my friend, whether you will believe or not believe what I say in regard to my own consciousness of the Infinite. But in the matter before us, he has no occasion to fear lest we should reason of the Divine. My friend is trying to teach us something concerning *our relations* to him who died for our sins, and this brings us into the sphere of the relational, where we are responsible for the right use of our intelligences with regard to all that we may examine.

You may be sure of one thing; the truth will always harmonize with the Absolute. Therefore, when it comes into the sphere of relation, which is the sphere of investigation, it is our duty to investigate it, and that upon such a basis that all its parts will harmonize together and with all other truth with which we may be acquainted. My friend has presented Jesus of Nazareth to you as one who died for the sins of the world. He does not claim that He was God; but is cautious not to say whether he was or

not. One thing is certain: He was not God; for he said upon the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" There was something left there which was not God. That is among the facts of the history which my friend must take into his account. Therefore, whatever we may say, we must not say that Jesus was the individual, personal, Deity. The agony and darkness into which he came when he was forsaken by his God, proves that he himself was not God. That person, Jesus of Nazareth, was a finite being, and as such, sustained relations to man: what he did, therefore, and what was done to him, had reference to him as a finite being, and brings him into the sphere of relation and rational investigation. I shall be very cautious in reasoning upon this, as I am upon every other subject, yet I shall reason upon it fearlessly, and earnestly, and honestly.

I will take up the passages my friend quoted, and offer some remarks upon them. First, he quoted "I lay down my life for the sheep," as if, in laying down his life, a debt was to be paid. Now, Jesus taught his disciples that in obedience to the principles upon which he laid down his life, they must lay down their lives too: that nothing must come between them and the application of the principles of that system: that whosoever would lose his life for His sake should save it. For his sake, meant not for his personal sake, but for the sake of him whose life was the embodiment of Divine truth and love in this sphere.

The great struggle in the garden to which my friend has referred, was the last struggle to overcome his self-will, and lose all sense of individual, objective will and love, in the Divine. In that last and severest trial, he showed forth to the world what a conflict every individual must have with self, and what a victory he must gain. It was a severe trial. Its amount of agony was so great that "he sweat as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground;" but it was in that trial, more than in all other ways, that his entire fidelity and unflinching devotion of soul was shown. He did lay down his life for the world: he did bear upon his innocent head the sins of us all. Had he been guilty of every crime man could commit, had he been subject to every punishment sin could subject man to, he could not have been worse treated. The iniquities of those that plotted and compassed his death, were inflicted upon him as though they were his iniquities, and though he had done nothing worthy of death, the cry of the cruel mob, was, "Away with him; crucify him, crucify him!" And when the question was asked, "What evil has he done?" there was no other reply than "Away with him!" and they followed him with their malice, to his last dying gasp.

In that dying example of Christ, the world is taught how every one must sink into the Father's will, if he would be perfect. The same salvation must be wrought in us that was wrought in him.

In that way he laid down his life for the sheep ; but there was no deep malignity to be satisfied, no arbitrary punishment to be put upon him.

Let us turn to my friend's theory that in the deep purpose of God, the innocent had to suffer for the guilty, to give God satisfaction, and glut his vengeance for sin. Look first on this picture and then on that, and tell me, when you contrast the theories, which most becomes the character of the all perfect and good God. The idea of punishing one individual for the sins of another, is so utterly repugnant to our sense of justice that every heart shrinks from it, and we never can be willing to take salvation upon any other terms than that the punishment of our sins should be upon our own heads, unless we are so far down in the plane of selfishness that every spark of noble justice is dead within us. Now, God has made a universe, and, in their ignorance, the people whom he has created have run into sins. But it is not enough, my friend declares, that they repent, that they become pure : that is not enough—God says, my laws have been violated and trampled upon, and the penalty shall be paid. He is like an earthly father whose younger son has violated his commands. The father says he must suffer the penalty of his disobedience, and he is about to inflict the punishment upon the child, when the elder brother comes and asks, Is there no other way in which your justice can be satisfied except by punishing him? The father replies, No, blood must flow ! the law has been broken, and blood must be paid ! But, says the brother, will not my blood do? The father grimly says, Yes ! blood is what I want, and it makes no difference whose blood. Some one must suffer ; but I care not who. Well ! the son goes forth and the father puts the stripes upon him ! the blood does flow ! the great drops roll down to the ground, and the son finally sinks in agony and dies ! Then justice is satisfied !

How do you like the picture? Embellish it as you will, it is the stubborn state of the facts. Looking now upon the two pictures, which, I ask, most accords with our moral sense? Which most accords with our sense of justice and right? Which most accords with our notions of the justice and dignity of the Omnipotent and Omniscient God? Put on what coloring you will, the vicarious atonement involves the principle I have illustrated. Now, to tell me that Jesus Christ meant to attribute such a character to our Father in Heaven,—to get up a creed that puts God in such a light as that, I say is false and blasphemous ! No being, except a grossly selfish one, could reverence such a character as that. You would despise it in an earthly parent. What ! are we to be like God, to love our enemies, and yet demand blood before we will forgive?—restitution in blood? I say this abominable doctrine has no foundation in any thing Jesus ever taught. Were

God as good as Christ, he never could require the innocent to suffer for the guilty: he never could require blood to flow for sin. Sin can not reach God, if God be Omnipotent. Man cannot sin against God: he cannot suspend God's laws. Sin has only respect to man in his relations to his fellow and himself. That Lamb of God which bore away the sins of the world, is a Lamb of God in some other sense than that to which my friend has referred. I grant that you may dress up a picture so as to hide the principle under the coloring, but any soul which has a love for purity and holiness, will revolt at the truth as soon as it is seen. Tell me God is such a God, and I can not receive him. No! when we find that, looking at this question in the light of Jesus' teaching upon the subject, you can reconcile every word with the honor and glory of God, without accepting so revolting a theory, what is the use of throwing in such a moral monstrosity in your doctrine concerning the character of God? My friend has drawn a very pathetic picture, but does it leave any lasting impression? Does it awaken any deep impulse of the soul? Is it not rather a mere fugitive feeling which is gone as soon as the description is done, leaving the revolting doctrine really contained in it as bare as I have described it? In the name of God, I protest against such doctrines! Christ's life, as well as death must be represented in us, if we would be truly born of the Divine Spirit.

Again, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." I understand Christ to mean by this passage, that he was to be elevated as a means of giving us life and light, so that we, beholding the pre-eminent glory of His character, might be attracted into the course He trod, and drawn into the plane He occupied.

"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." Of course this can not mean that the wheat must absolutely die, before it germinates. It means that the body of the grain gives up its life to form the life of a new blade of corn; and the figure shows that the animal nature must be put off, the animal lusts subdued, and a new life in a higher sphere put on. Unless this is done, you can not have the life of God in you. So when the body dies, the spirit does not go into the grave, but only the body.

"My soul is sorrowful, even unto death." So it was, and with good reason. There Christ was, surrounded by his enemies, the malice of wicked men plotting death against him. The last struggle with self was upon him; the hour was coming of that last baptism, and he cried "How am I straitened till it comes." For a time he prayed from his own individuality, his distinct will, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," till at last gathering up his soul's strength, and freeing himself from his distinct will, he said, "Father, *not my will, but thine be done.*"

Then he went forth to be glorified ! then the victory was complete ! And I tell you, it will be so with us when we can come to that resolve, and putting away the last vestige of self, say, "not my will, but thine be done," in the full meaning of the words. Then can we also say, "Now is the Son of Man glorified." He could come out then and face his enemies ; he could stand his trial ; they might put on him the crown of thorns ; they might nail him to the cross ; they might mock his dying agony with vinegar and gall ; but like a true hero, he overcame death and conquered the power of sin ! Then it was, that as the darkness of the malign influence which was killing him, came over him, he cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me !" Had not his spirit been closed against these dark and malignant influences, he would have received, even into his own soul, something of their discordant spirit, but as the darkness closed over him, he cried, "My God, my God," and his soul went forth to Paradise, beyond their power.

"Thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day : and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." My friend preaches repentance and remission of sins, and makes the repentance and Christ-like life, a condition of the remission. This is the theory, but what is the practical effect ? If you do wrong and sin against your neighbor what does he tell you ? Why, that what you lack, Christ has made up : that He will administer to you an abundant entrance into his kingdom, provided—what ? that you shall be perfect ? No ! the practical doctrine is that you may be something less perfect and holy than Jesus Christ was, and that you can enter heaven by some other way than living His life and dying His death. Men in the church will talk hard against their neighbor, and sin against him, yet it is not taken as evidence that their names are not written in the book of life. This, I say, is putting the standard too low. The idea of putting in the sufferings of Christ or any other being, to make up for what you lack, is a false and absurd one. You must pay the penalty of your own transgressions. You may deny this, but conscience will speak it out, and affirm that if you expect to enter the kingdom of heaven without living such a life as Christ lived, and loving your enemies as he loved his, you will be fearfully mistaken.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish to say, while it is fresh in your minds, that the last remarks of the gentleman, as intended to have a bearing upon the teachings and practice of Christians, are entirely false. He

ought to know better than to say that we teach any person that he can have the benefits of the Christian redemption, without a repentance and turning from sin as thorough as any the gentleman teaches. Every person knows that it is utterly false, and that the Christian church had all that he knows of repentance, restitution, and reformation of life, long, long before he or his philosophy had an existence. Yet the church has taught more. It has taught that *all this* is not enough to give us justification before God. Is it then indeed so, that all the churches of Christ are such dwarfish specimens of morality, that he stands as a giant among them? No! Christian morality has been both purer and humbler, and the heroes and martyrs of the church could spend a life of self-denying labor for the good of man, and at last count their righteousness as nothing, and attribute all their hope of glory to the ineffable grace of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord! Knowing this, we can not help feeling that it ill becomes one in the gentleman's position to come here to chide the church. All that the world knows of purity and moral greatness, it finds springing up around the cross of Christ, and the church has no fear of a comparison with any known religion, with any tribe or nation which has scorned the gospel, or with any sect that countenances such denunciations of the doctrine of Christ as those you have heard this afternoon.

Historically considered, the church has been the cause of all the great moral movements, and religious revolutions and reformations, which the world has seen. Take the great revivals of religion under Wesley and Edwards (and I mention them that my friend may have an opportunity for a lecture, a loud lecture, upon the evils of religious enthusiasm), and you will find they were the means of awakening tens of thousands from the stupor of a sinful life, and turning their hearts away from the vices and the carnality of selfishness, and making them begin a new life. The preaching of the *cross of Christ* is identified with all these movements; but my friend might preach a doctrine like his, from now till doomsday, and he could not make a revival under it. I talk not of extravagance and of blind excitement, but of bringing men in great numbers, to a confession of their sins, and a hearty repentance and reformation before God, having broken away from the power of lust and sin. All these things are connected with the doctrine of the *cross of Christ*. This scoffing at the cross is no new thing: it was scoffed at, and stumbled at, in the days of the apostles, but its influence still lives!

I do not wonder that the gentleman denies the possibility of sinning against God, since he makes him a being without thought, without plan, without purpose, without will, and without government. But in this discussion he has accepted the Scripture as the ultimate appeal, and he must abide by it. Jesus prayed upon

the cross, "Father, forgive them!"—what means that prayer to the Father? If there was no law of God broken, what was there for God to forgive? If a man had sinned against his neighbor, my friend teaches that he should repent of it, and be sorry, and that would end it. What need, then, of God's forgiveness?

When my friend comes and tells you that it is the orthodox doctrine that God is blood-thirsty and revengeful, and that he demands his "pound of flesh" to glut his vengeance, he utters a false slander upon the church, and I challenge him to make good his position by showing that such is the teaching of orthodox churches; and if he does not do it, he must stand convicted of bearing false witness against his neighbor. I assert, and I invite criticism, that there is no Calvinist so rigid but that he believes it was the *love* of God which induced him to form the glorious plan of man's redemption, and that it was *because God so loved the world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. The LOVE OF GOD is the very basis of the whole scheme of salvation, and the gentleman's statement is a most outrageous misrepresentation of the doctrine of the church, from the days of Christ, downward. I know what I say, and say it knowingly. There are speculations in the church which I may not approve; there are speculations on this very subject, which I do not approve; but there is nothing which will bear the phase the gentleman would, for his own purpose, put upon the matter.

The salvation of the soul rests upon its personal attachment to, and faith in, Christ as a Saviour who has been slain, and rose again, and by whom our peace is made with God; and there is nowhere, I repeat, any such abominable doctrine taught, as that which is here charged upon the church in such a wholesale manner.

I beg leave to notice another point in this connection. In my friend's illustration he says the son that has sinned, repents of his sin committed against his father. I suppose he means to say that it was right for the son to repent, and that he should not ask forgiveness till he repented; that repentance upon his part was a duty, and the father had a right to withhold the pardon till he had repented. I say I suppose this is the gentleman's position; but, for the sake of fixing his position, I ask him to tell us, definitely, how far he accepts it.

Again: he said *atonement* means *being at one*; I beg leave to say that he has not got the whole of the Scriptural idea: *atonement* means *making at one*, and the terms *purchase*, *ransom*, and *redemption*, are all frequently applied to it in Scripture. It is also said, "He made him to be *sin* for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." It was by the cumulation of such passages that I proved the atonement to be much more than the gentleman would make it. If every

man is bound to do for the race what Christ did, then any other man may be our Saviour. Paul did this work; therefore, by his theory, Paul also is our Saviour.

MR. TIFFANY. He did not do it as well.

MR. ERRETT. The difference is in degree, then, and we may believe in the name of Paul *a little!* He is a less Saviour, but still a Saviour! The Scripture turns out to mean that it is not in the death and resurrection of Christ that our faith is to be based, but that Peter, and Paul, and James, and the whole throng of saints and martyrs who have lived lives of truth and died triumphant deaths, are our Saviours also.

It is not as a martyr's death that Christ's death is pre-eminent for devotion to truth and a willingness to suffer for it. I ask careful attention to this, for many who do not sympathize with my friend's philosophy, have mental troubles with the doctrine of vicarious atonement. If you look upon Christ simply as a martyr, and his agony as the natural struggle of a soul facing death's terrors, I say that thousands have gone to death more bravely than he! They have gone without flinching, without groaning, without trembling, but with their faces beaming with joy, that they were thought *worthy* of the martyr's crown! Little children have looked on and seen their fathers and mothers torn limb from limb by the wild beasts in the Roman amphitheater, and in the very midst of the terrors of the spectacle those little children have been threatened with the same horrid death unless they would deny the name of Jesus; but they bravely confessed their faith in His cross, unblenched by the howling beasts and howling multitude, and met their death with peace! Mothers died, torn from their children's arms! Families embraced each other, the devoted one joyously saying, "*Crowns* are to be distributed to-day, and I go for my crown!" But JESUS trembled in the garden, and breathed out his soul with a bitterness of mental agony that never rested upon a martyr's heart! There was something there which was not in the death of martyrs! There were ingredients in that cup, more bitter than ever were put into the cup the martyrs drank! How is this? My friend's philosophy does not explain it; for even with his ideas of Jesus' inspiration, He was in too lofty a region to be troubled in soul and assailed by spirits of darkness. We should expect, by that theory, that the affinities of his nature would have brought around him the brightest and purest of all the angelic host. Was not his love pure, and his affections holy, even if his physical nature was prostrated by pain? What means the gentleman by saying that foul spirits could darken his soul, and make their cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me!" *Martyrs* have sung songs of triumph in the flames, and never cried in the anguish of their soul, that God had forsaken them, but rather forgot their enemies' tortures in their bright visions of

Paradise! How is this? If a glorious death proves the Saviourship, there have been thousands who were greater Saviours than Jesus! *Ah! there were considerations in that death, not found in the death of martyrdom!* This conclusion is forced upon us by the facts, and my friend can not get away from them. Thousands who have passed through death have not known the darkness which weighed upon the Saviour's soul, and *to us*, it makes those scenes especially holy, to reflect that He made the road all brightness to them, by making darkness of his own, and bearing their sins upon the tree, so that they might *not* have to cry in the hour of mortal agony, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me!" No, no! The facts of His death, are not to be accounted for, upon the supposition of a martyr's death.

We have had no explanation of the language of our Lord at his last supper. In passing, I wish you to remember that His words were, "This is my body broken for you," and, "this cup is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." My friend's idea of these things seems to me trivial. He calls the wine a type of the blood, and the blood a type of physical life, and that a type of the character and moral life, and so you are taken back from type to type without end. No such interpretation can stand. The whole connection of the Saviour's language shows that he did not intend to symbolize the energies of life, physical or moral, but to typify the pouring out of his blood upon the cross. The pure in heart and spirit, who occupy a plane quite as high as my friend, have acquiesced in that interpretation from Christ's own day to this, and that should be some evidence at least, that it is the true interpretation. Christ did not bow for the first time to his father's will, in Gethsemane. He had obeyed it all his life through, driving back the tempter with the sword of the Spirit, and never swerving from his course through all the insults and ignominies a wicked world could heap upon him. But at the cross and in the garden there was other weight added to his burden. To do the will of God never before cost him what it cost him then. My friend can not avoid the admission,—*He was bearing the sins of the people*, and that was what bowed him down, and forced out those bloody sweat drops of agony!

My friend quoted the words "Now is the Son of man glorified," as being said by Christ as he came from the garden. He has mistaken the time entirely. I will read the words, and, I think, from the specimens he has given you, you will conclude that you are quite as competent to interpret as he, either in literal or figurative interpretation. (John xii: 23.)

"And Jesus answered them saying, The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth

alone : but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. If any man serve me, let him follow me ; and where I am, there shall also my servant be : if any man serve me, him will my father honor. Now is my soul troubled ; and what shall I say ? Father, save me from this hour : but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name !” Then in the 81st verse he adds, “Now is the judgment of this world : now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. (This he said, signifying what death he should die.)” The narrative then passes on through several breaks, and not till some time afterward did the feast of the Passover, or any of the subsequent events take place. Judge then, how reliable our friend is as an interpreter of Scripture.

TENTH DAY.

MORNING SESSION.

MR. TIFFANY.

Mr. Moderator, Ladies, and Gentlemen:—According to his high in wisdom and goodness, man portrays the infinite understanding. Hence, we can judge of the high of a man's condition by his portraiture of God. Brother Errett says we must have an objective God to love and worship, and that we can not love and worship, except objectively. His God is an object standing before the mind, and hence he must have a *finite* one, and I suppose he so teaches and believes. He says he must have a *changeable* God; that is, he must have one who can hate as well as love, and that too in accordance with outward influences acting upon that God. The blessings or curses of such a God will, of course, be in accordance with his love or hate; that is, He acts from motives having an origin outside of himself. He affirms, or argues, that God must have the ability to determine and will according to circumstances; and consequently, that he must will and act with respect to those circumstances, *in time and space*; and hence, in his Divine procedure, He is not in all respects eternal and self-existent in his will, understanding, purpose, and action. He affirms that God is the subject of influences outside of himself: that his laws can be suspended, hindered and broken by man; and hence, that God is the subject of outward power which flows into and disturbs his Divine mind. Consequently, God has been coerced into certain measures by these mishaps in his government, which compel him to a certain course of conduct, in order to remedy these mishaps. Consequently he is not omnipotent, for there is a power which disturbs him. So I suppose my brother preaches, and so I suppose he believes. He argues that this God has such a character that he can be pleased to see innocence suffering for the guilty, the penalty of sins committed by them; and that such an administration of the Divine government is in harmony with the Divine justice, goodness, mercy, and love! So he teaches, and so, I suppose, he believes. Hence, his system of faith denies all the perfections of the Divine being, and makes God finite in his wisdom, action, power, and goodness; makes him selfish, seeking his own glory as the highest end of his being and action; making a universe for that purpose, cursing every thing which obstructs that end, inflicting pain and not remitting it, but putting it upon the head of the innocent, rather than not have it inflicted at all. Such being the portraiture of the infinite God,

according to my friend's standard, we will look at the standard by which he fashions this objective God.

He says man can not love, except upon a selfish basis, and can only love according to the perception of the use of that which is to be loved, and that there is no such thing as a spontaneous love, self-oblivious and Divine: that the use originates the love, and not the love the use. Hence, he can not love God, but only the use of God! There is nothing yet born into his nature or consciousness that harmonizes with God; that begets a spontaneous outpouring of love; that is universal and perfect. There is not a oneness of soul with God, and harmony that rises above the use, and leads the heart to take its pulsations from the Divine. Man can love himself independent of his use; and that is the quality of the selfish man, that he does so love himself. Man is required to love his neighbor as himself. Now, as he can only love that which is lovely, according to its use, he can only love God according to his use. Hence, the idea of loving God supremely has not entered into the conception of my friend here. He can not love truth, justice and purity for their intrinsic nature,—for the absolute Divinity in them;—but can only love them in their use. Hence, all perfection is in its use, and use having respect, in its ultimate standard, to self, my friend thus justifies selfishness in man. God can not be all in all to him, therefore, and he has no conception of the higher love to which man may attain. He thus confesses that he has not the love of God, the infinite, the perfect, the absolute love in him; that love which is spontaneous, and goes forth with its own divine quality and energy. His love is in subjection to his understanding; his ideal, he images in his mind; and his God is an imaginary God. Hence comes an occasional exhibition of irritation, of unkindness, of temper; that feeling of "Raca," though not uttered: hence, also, the boastful and vain tone of remarks addressed to the passions and sympathies of his audience, without meeting the points that ought to be met: hence, also, the mistaking of sympathy and emotion for religion, and the contemplation of forms and ordinances as of value to appeal to the sympathies and emotions of man, supposing that they call into mind the religious sentiment. Hence, also, his defense of those things called "revivals of religion," which always, after they have passed by, depress the soul. While the excitement is on, the individual undergoing the revival has his highest selfishness called into action, and calls it religion; but the excitement passes away and coldness and drought succeed. This always has been, and always will be the case, where you mistake sympathy and emotion for religion.

Hence, he rejoices at the infliction of a penalty upon the innocent for the guilty, and feels joy that innocence has stepped in to bear our guilt and let us go scot-free. His ideas are not

based upon the Divine harmony and order of things, but upon the standard of use, as tried by self-love.

Hence, he has an idolatrous attachment to forms and ceremonies, because they appeal to self-love; because, at seasons, they cause the tear to flow, and the heart to throb; but when the season is passed, the person settles back to his ordinary selfishness again, yet if you touch the form with rude hand, he will cry, "Ye are taking away my Gods," ye are taking away my religious hopes and expectations, my Saviour and my salvation, by taking away my religious forms and ceremonies! Hence, undeniable truths are avoided, because to admit them would be to deny and overthrow his creed; or if attempted to be met at all, it is not by truth, but by authority. He resorts to authority to prove certain contradictory truths, not seeming to know that all truth is a unit and proceeds from the same Divine and perfect fountain, and that if any thing, in any one's creed, can not harmonize with it, it is and must be false, no matter by whom it was spoken.

He does not need the proposition that there can be no infallible communication where there is no infallibility on the part of the communicator and on the part of the receiver of the communication also. Communication means, what comes from one and proceeds to another. All communications must be tried by the standard within our own minds. Yet the gentleman sets up the authority of individuals as infallible, and so seeks to evade the point. He assumes the infallibility of persons known to be ignorant and imperfect. He assumes the infallibility, and argues upon the hypothesis of the infallibility of those who confess that they only see, "as through a glass, darkly." He makes their words his standard, even when interpreted by a literal interpretation, and will not permit a key to be used which harmonizes the whole and makes all harmonize with every other truth. He does this to defend doctrines which are of themselves horrible, making sin fundamental in the Universe, having its basis in the Divine and absolute itself; making the goodness of God turn to hate, and the harmony of the Divine bring forth discord. Passing over the method by which Christianity is to be harmonized with universal truth, he makes it at war, not only with other truths, but with the truths contained in its own volume, trying to enslave the mind by the words, "thus saith Peter," or Paul, or Moses; giving authority instead of truth, and the names of men instead of sound arguments appealing to your own consciousness.

Now I say, my position is this, that the system of philosophy which I have attempted to unfold before you, will harmonize all truth in the Bible, with itself and with all other truth, natural or moral. There is not in the wide universe of God, a single phenomenon which it will not harmonize with the wisdom, the power, and the goodness of God, and with the teachings of Jesus of Naz-

areth in that sphere which is a middle passage between earth and heaven. That system of philosophy and science which will not take in all truth, and harmonize with all, is a false philosophy. I care not if it will take in nine-tenths of all truth; that is not enough. If there be one truth with which it will not harmonize, it is false. There must be such a key as will harmonize all—all its own parts with itself, and itself with all other truth. The Bible must have such a key, or it cannot be true, or become truth to man. My friend in proceeding with his argument, has been obliged to assume as a premiss, that we can not treat God as infinite, being finite and imperfect ourselves. But he excuses himself by arguing that I have said we can not reason about God, for it would be to bring him down into the sphere of relation: we are not bound, therefore, to shape our reasonings so as to harmonize with the infinite, the absolute, and the divine! We are not bound to shape our love so as to harmonize with the love of the Infinite! I beg leave to suggest to my friend the difference between loving a being, and loving his character. The very plan of criticism I laid down was to show that we loved not the affinity of character, but the affinity of use. So much for his positions.

I wish my friend to understand that the soul affirms that there must be something self-existent and eternal. There must be such a being; One that had no beginning, and can have no end. The soul affirms that it must be so. There must be a self-impelling power somewhere, that depends upon no power back of it to move it, and all laws in the universe must be representative and negative, with respect to that power. There must, then, be an Infinite Being: the soul affirms it, reason says it can not limit Him, and intellect says it can not define Him. Here, then, deep down in the soul, is the affirmation that God is infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent.

MR. ERRETT.

I notice one thing upon my minutes, Mr. Moderator, which was not spoken of yesterday, and in regard to which I wish to say a word or two. It was the gentleman's statement concerning the observance of the Passover and the law of Moses by the apostles and the early church. In answer to it I shall only refer the audience to the 15th chapter of Acts, and to the epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, *in extenso*. I am amazed that any one could make such an assertion before an intelligent people, in the face of the renunciation of the bondage to the Jewish law, which everywhere stands out upon the pages of the New Testament. The gentleman's assertions are absolutely reckless.

You will remember that last evening I asked the gentleman to

tell us, this morning, whether his God had any personal consciousness; but he has not said a word on the subject. I asked him, also, a question in regard to that stereotyped speech of his, concerning the atonement, which you may find in his printed book; I wished him to tell us whether, in the case he supposed, the father was bound to forgive the son if he repented, or before he repented. We have no answer yet. He will probably attend to it "when he comes to it." I most positively denied that the statement he made of the common doctrine of the atonement was true. I proclaimed it false, and defied him to show, from any authentic source, that such was the belief of the churches, or any one of them. This he has also found it convenient to pass by, and has spent his time in the most vague generalities and sweeping assertions about my belief and my exceeding low condition.

I refuse to admit his definitions and propositions concerning the Infinite, but I equally refuse to admit what he says are the necessary results of a denial of those propositions. I deny his right, under his system, to reason about the Infinite at all. How does he know any thing about it? He says his soul itself affirms it; yet we find atheists in the world: we have those who affirm that matter is self-impelling. If that affirmation of the Infinite really be within the human soul, how is it, that with all his labor, no one can get an idea of the Absolute? I have affirmed, and affirm again, that his system plunges us into atheism. His God has only the immutability of a stone;—no thought, no love, no plan, no purpose, no action; and I have affirmed that the moment he affirms that God thinks, purposes, plans, or acts, that moment he denies his philosophy. You had no right, by his philosophy, to think of God while he was talking of him; for, in so doing, you objectify him, and become idolaters! Now, to make such a philosophy the standard by which to prove us *anti-Christ*, is, as it seems to me, entirely beyond the realms of sound logic.

I must refer to some other things the gentleman has said. He declared that I spoke of the authority of persons not inspired: I thought we started from the admission that Jesus Christ was THE TRUTH. I then proved that Jesus declared that whosoever heard the apostles, heard him: whose soever sins they remitted were to be remitted, &c. Then, whatever might be their fallibility in other respects, when they asserted any thing as religious truth, they were speaking by Christ's own authority, and with all the infallibility of THE TRUTH himself. In answer to this argument, you have the gentleman's declaration that I speak by the authority of uninspired men!

I will now quote some passages of Scripture which attribute pleasure and displeasure to God. Isaiah liii: 10—"Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him." 1 Cor. i: 21—"It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Col. i: 19—

"For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness dwell." See, also, 1 Cor. x: 5; 1 John iv: 9; 1 Thess. x: 4; Hebrews xiii: 21; Luke xii: 32; Ephesians i: 5; Romans viii: 8. I might quote them to almost any number.

The gentleman may think it unkind and severe for me to speak of his philosophy as I do, but when he bases it on assumption, refuses to answer objections, and unhesitatingly puts down into a low animal sphere every one who does not accept it, he deserves rebuke. I apprehend that those who were baptized of the Holy Ghost and anointed of God, had as correct a philosophy as it is possible for my friend to attain; and if ever there was matchless arrogance in man, it is found here, in the denial of all philosophy held in the world heretofore, and the setting up of a claim to be the key of all truth and a greater revelation to the world than any made by the apostles,—setting up his claim for a system not yet submitted to the test of criticism, and no where known and recognized as philosophy among competent scholars. This system is to explain all truth, and harmonize every particle of it. It contradicts the apostles, but that only shows the apostles' ignorance; and with an air of the most intense self-satisfaction it seems to ask, If there be any thing, this side the throne of the Almighty, greater than *Joel Tiffany*, where shall it be found? I am under no obligation to stand here and meet with grave deference and profound respect, a presumption like this. The naked presentation of his system before the community is sufficient to give it its proper place in your minds. A fair interpretation of the New Testament was to be the standard to which we were to appeal in this discussion, and I have given you abundant proof of his inability to interpret, and his unwillingness to be judged by Scripture.

Let me refer now, to some of the passages criticised yesterday. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." You will observe that it was when the serpent was lifted up and the people looked to it, that they were healed. So Christ says of himself, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me. *This he said signifying what death he should die.*" It was to be the looking to the cross of Christ in faith, which was to save the soul, and you have his declaration, interpreted by John, whom the gentleman pretends to respect, that he referred to his death and the particular manner of it, in what he said about being "lifted up." Now, *judging by the Scripture*, the acknowledged standard in this debate, what support has the gentleman's whim that the "lifting up" was only the historical exhibition of Jesus' life to the world? What has he done toward explaining this Scriptural argument? Yet he talks of my evasions!

Remember, also, that this Scripture argument has been so strong as to force not merely the orthodox church, but all schools

of Unitarians and Universalists, to admit that there was a peculiar connection of Christ's death to the world's salvation. The gentleman can find sympathy in his views on this matter only among the most open and scoffing infidels. There have been men in every age who have denied *the truth* of the doctrine of the atonement, but none have hitherto been hardy enough to take the gentleman's position, and make a serious pretense that it is not to be found in the New Testament. It never occurred to them to find the "key" of all harmony in throwing away every thing they did not like; to repudiate Luke if he contradicts their dogma; to deny inspiration to Peter, if he stands in their way; to say that Christ's Messiahship was such a thing that Paul also could be a Messiah! A fine *key*, truly!

The faith of man in the death of Christ has been acknowledged by all religionists who call themselves Christians, of every class and every sect. They have been forced to admit the doctrine of the atonement as a *scriptural* doctrine, in spite of the very manifest tendency of the *philosophy* of some sects, to lead them in another direction. Such a consideration as this, forces me to consider it boundless assumption for any man to stand up now, and unqualifiedly and egotistically to affirm that he, *first of all men*, has discovered the meaning of the Bible! If skill in interpretation depends upon purity of heart, the church can point to those who, on bended knee, have sought God in sincerity, and followed Him humbly and meekly all the days of their life. If it depends upon brightness of intellect, she can point to those who, to say the least, may very favorably compare, even with my friend. And now, if eighteen centuries have failed to give light upon these matters of mere interpretation of a book, what confidence can any person have in such assumptions as are here made? It comes from him, supported only by a course of metaphysical reasoning which has been broken in upon again and again in the course of this discussion. Yet you are to believe that my friend only has got the "key" to unlock all the mysteries of the God-head, and that too, although he can not tell you that his God has an individual consciousness, he can not present you with a God that can think or act!

I wish to present another idea. It is that this idea of vicarious sacrifice is found everywhere in the world, wherever there is a system of religion, true or false, wherever there is worship of any God, true or false. There is something in it that meets the wants of human nature; something that humanity, weak and perishing, can lean upon; something which the soul can trust; something that all the world cries aloud for, and will cry for, in spite of the gentleman's philosophy. There may be eternal mystery connected with it, yet, so far as the fact and truth are concerned, they are in the Bible most clearly and pointedly affirmed. As the doctrine is there

presented, the mind can easily receive it, and the promises connected with it are just such as the weary and sin-sick soul has need of.

The *tendency* of the doctrine has been attacked; but I affirm that history proves conclusively that wherever the denial of the doctrine, as the gentleman denies it, has spread at all, it has produced misery and despair, and infidelity and immorality have followed in its train. The world has been familiar with these scoffings at the cross for thousands of years: it is no new thing that it should be "to the Greeks, foolishness." The infidels of the school of Voltaire, assailed it with a wit and a ridicule incomparably superior to that of my friend; but what was the result? Did they make the world pure, after ridiculing such a "selfish and animal" doctrine?

I wish to read, now, another passage, and though the gentleman may rail against "quoting authority," I am willing before any sensible people, to put *Paul* over against *Tiffany*. I read from Romans iii: 19, &c.

"Now we know that whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore, by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law."

Such was the teaching of the apostles with regard to the death of Jesus Christ for sin, and here they laid the basis for a hope of salvation for those who believe in His name. They did not hope to pay for the sins of the past by diligence in the present, but by faith in the sacrifice of Christ. The believer was to receive salvation, not upon the condition of perfect obedience to the law, but on account of his reliance upon Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for sin, and thereby he was to be accepted of God as if he had not sinned. This could give no license to sin, for hearty repentance of past sin (which is a condition of acceptance), can not possibly co-exist with a sinful will and intention in the present.

We have before us, therefore, the facts in the life and death of Jesus, as we gathered them up yesterday; we have also the declarations of Christ himself, and of his apostles when they went out filled with the Spirit of God; we have the promise of forgiveness and justification most emphatically connected with the death of Christ; and in view of all this I claim that, the Scriptures being our standard of appeal, it is abundantly proven that the orthodox view of the doctrine of the atonement is that which Christ himself intended to teach, and therefore can not be anti-Christian.

MR. TIFFANY.

In support of his position, my friend affirms that the idea of a vicarious sacrifice is found among all nations. I affirm it; but it is because, wherever you find man, you find *selfishness*. The idea of an angry God is found among all selfish beings, because they portray God according to their own idea. The selfish man tries to shirk off his responsibility upon the head of some one else. Herein is just the difference between Jesus' religion and that of the pagans. I suppose he does not claim that the dispensation of the Jews was established by Divine authority, for he has admitted that it was a selfish dispensation. Christ has shown us that this sacrifice, either of a beast or a man, was not the way to rid ourselves of sin. These sacrifices belong to the worship of the "out-court," and it is in this "court of the Gentiles" that we set up our idols. Our lusts and selfish desires are the real sacrifices that need to be slain upon the altar of our affections, so that the very fundamental principle of self-love shall be overcome; that self-love shall be offered up on the altar of a purified heart; and that we may see that these outward sacrifices were only consonant with the selfish nature of man. Christ's intention was to bring the kingdom of heaven, not without and over you, but within your soul; in the true "tabernacle that the Lord pitched," and not in a temple made with hands. Come into the inner temple, and call away your attention to that which is true, and just, and pure! Take your selfish lusts and affections, slay them, and make an offering in righteousness! The tribe of Levi is not to furnish you priests, but in this sacrifice you are to be priests yourselves; the offering must be made in your own hearts! That is the difference between the doctrines of Jesus and those of paganism, and of every other false religion.

My friend says the doctrine is deep and mysterious. Then, I ask you, do you know you have it? How do you know you have the key of the kingdom? The true key will unlock these mysteries, and show what the sacrifices were.

He talks of the morality of his system as superior to that of the world! I utterly deny that it is so. I appeal to Warren, and every other community, if it is so. I will not argue it, but bring it before you, and ask you to judge between the morality of those within and those without the church. The boast is like that of the man standing in the temple, and thanking God that he was not as other men. I stand not here to boast, but to tell facts and truths, and if they bring scorn and contempt upon my head, what of it! You may blast my reputation, but you can not pollute my character! You are welcome to attack my fame: I have invested no capital in that perishable thing, reputation: I have invested my capital in my character! I want to know that my soul is true and pure, and that I speak truth, and then I stand fearlessly, and throw that truth broadcast upon the world!

The gentleman says that those who have held kindred philosophies to mine, have rejected the Bible, because it did not harmonize with their views. It is the very thing I am showing the means of avoiding. It is because they never saw the meaning of the Bible, except as it is taught by those who presented it as a dogmatic system, descended from the Jewish religion. I stand here to show how it is that all truth harmonizes with my philosophy, and, in the light of it, becomes harmonious with itself.

I affirm that the soul declares the omniscience, and all the other infinite attributes of Deity, and declares that it could not be otherwise; and although the soul can not embrace the infinite, it can, and does, declare that the infinite is perfect and immutable, that the Omnipotent is all-powerful, and that the Omniscient is all-wise. It also says that, to the Infinite, from eternity to eternity, there must be but one eternal *now*, and one eternal *here*. Truth can not be made false by any thing in the universe; justice is always true, and can not be made unjust. The love and truth which gave birth to justice, are immutable, and can not change, any more than God can change! That which is truth to-day, was truth before the foundations of the world were laid, and will be truth to all the ages of eternity! Truth is as eternal as the mind of God! It is as infinite in its existence as is the infinite God, and though you spurn it, and turn your back upon it, it is TRUTH still! Truth I can not trifle with, and, therefore, when I affirm of the Infinite, that he is omnipotent, I can not assume any thing which would contradict that attribute. So of all his other attributes. Therefore, if my logic would come in conflict with His omnipotence, omnipresence, or goodness, I know that my philosophy is false! If the truth, as I see it, does not harmonize with these perfect attributes of Jehovah, I know that I do not see the truth, but error! And if they appear to conflict, and I can not harmonize them, I know that my mind has a false perception, and that I must look further for a truth which shall harmonize them. I

have asked if it is not a fact that the mind can receive truth no faster than it can perceive it—a simple question, and one that my friend might easily answer, and then the idea of God's word containing mysterious truths would go to the winds.

When the gentleman starts the idea that Jesus of Nazareth was perfectly pure and holy, I say it was so. But when he says that God inflicted upon him the punishment of our sins, I say that involves the punishment of innocence for the guilty, and infinite wisdom and power could have avoided that, and could not have been coerced into the position of making innocence stand in the place of the guilty. If there is a fault of that kind in God's government, it shows a lack of wisdom, or power, or goodness.

Now, I say that if we can find a key that will harmonize all these things, it is a better one than that which tramples down all conceptions of right, and truth, and harmony. You can apply the case to my friend's family, for instance, and if there he should inflict penalties upon such a principle, you would despise him for it, simply because it would not harmonize with your conceptions of goodness and truth. If I talk about God's justice, I talk of justice as you and I understand it; when I talk about beauty and truth, I talk of them as we understand them; and hence, any thing which would be incongruous with our ideas of those virtues in man, would also be at variance with them as attributes of God.

I have said that my principles of philosophy would not conflict with any known truth, and I say so still. I defy him to bring a known truth which it conflicts with. I have begun with first principles and have gone forward step by step to the conclusion. I have not assumed to explain all the truths in the universe, but there is no *known* truth with which it conflicts; for I have laid down my principles upon that which we know to be true and about which we can not be mistaken. I have said that before we can have infallible truth, we must be infallible ourselves. Man can not become quite infallible in many mental and even moral processes; but if you begin with self-evident principles and proceed by demonstration, being careful that you introduce no proposition that can conflict with what is true, letting your demonstrations proceed so as to assume nothing that is not already settled, and you will find in every one of you all the elementary principles which are necessary, and by proceeding as I have indicated, you need not err in your conclusions. You can thus try individual and national character by the same standard, and your principles will apply to all character based upon a mental constitution like ours.

My friend refers again to the promised Spirit of Truth that was to lead the disciples into all truth. I have said they could only receive according to the degree of their unfolding; that inspiration was progressive, and that the apostles are even now

drinking in inspiration from the fountain of inspiration every moment of their present existence, if we may measure eternity by periods and moments. They are receiving this inspiration now, in accordance with the same law which caused them to open their mouths and speak with tongues on the day of Pentecost. Now, my friend only says they were infallible for the purposes of their mission, and thus admits the principle of progressive inspiration for which I am contending.

The passages he referred to with reference to the apostles' power to remit sin, contain but a figure of speech, expressing their power to decide the extent of man's sin and tell him what was necessary for him to do to have his sin forgiven. They were not the delegates of God, to pronounce judgments upon the world by which the world was to be bound. The subsequent history shows there was no such inspiration as that: they had their divisions and disputations afterward, and Peter had to be reproved by Paul for dissimulation. Peter thought he was doing well, but Paul thought he was acting imprudently, and told him so. I said, during the whole period of their discipleship they were Jews in their faith and practice, and continued so during their lives. They did not continue all the Jewish ritual as a Christian institution, I grant, but they did not say that Christianity had abrogated it. I say, then, that it is sheer assumption to look to authority for the purpose of evading what is true. Now why does not my friend admit that God is omnipotent and can not be frustrated; that he is immutable and can not be changed; that He

"Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,
As full, as perfect, in a hair as heart;
As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns,
As the rapt seraph that adores and burns;
To him no high, no low, no great, no small,
He fills, he bounds, connects, and equals all."

Any idea of infinity which conflicts with this perfection of the Divine mind, must be conceived in error. Having admitted this, we must see if there is no way of harmonizing the word with the truth of God.

MR. ERRETT. Will you tell us whether God has any personal consciousness?

MR. TIFFANY. I say God is conscious, and there is no consciousness but what is in him; I say God willed from eternity, for it was of his Divine nature to will; and as to his knowledge, there is not a particle of dust in the universe which was not known to him from all eternity. You must come into harmony with God, and not expect him to change to suit you. The difficulty is that you do not look at the grand result of the Universe which is to

ultimate in a perfect work ; "first the blade, then the ear," and there is yet to be "the full corn in the ear." My philosophy is based upon such principles that it proclaims the great truth, that there never was or can be a thing in the Universe, which does not help forward the great work of God.

If we look only at parts of the great system, we can not see the order and beauty of the whole, but all will appear in as great confusion as was described by Pope in the lines,

" Let Earth, unbalanced, from her orbit fly,
Planets and suns, run lawless through the sky ;
Let ruling angels from their spheres be hurled,
Being on being wrecked, and world on world ;
Heavens whole foundations to their center nod,
And nature trembles to the throne of God.
All this dread order break—for whom ? for thee ?
Vile worm !—oh madness ! pride ! impiety !"

I say, then, that any system of philosophy that does not find all God's universe in harmony, part with part, all working that Divine and perfect will of God, is no true system, and can make no pretense to being a universal philosophy.

MR. ERRETT.

I shall have to remind my friend again of the story of the lesson the young preacher was taught when he stayed over night at the tavern. There was no necessity for so much sound and fury in answering my question about God's consciousness. The gentleman may make his words impressive here, but the *noise* can not be taken down by the reporter. It would be better to weigh well his words, for this is as grave a question as we have had before us. If God is conscious, and wills and purposes, it must be with respect to something out of himself. Either the gentleman must admit this, or take refuge in Pantheism, with all its consequences.

I said there was a universal recognition of the necessity of a vicarious atonement. It is recognized as a necessity of the human heart. There is precisely the same proof of it, that there is of the universal recognition of a God. If there is any proof of the one from universal consciousness, there is for the other. Christ *did* change man's ideas as to vindictive Deities ; but at the same time he taught them that it was by his sacrifice that the remission of sins was to come, and so important did he make the doctrine of his sacrifice, that he instituted the Lord's supper for the especial purpose of commemorating it.

We have had some more of the gentleman's ideas about self-love, but he does not make much progress in showing the consistency

of his philosophy. His whole theory of loving without reference to the adaptation of the thing beloved to give us satisfaction of some kind, is without foundation, and every successive application of it, only manifest it more clearly. There are various departments of our nature, and we know that the satisfaction of some of them is more noble and more in accordance with our conception of the true end of life, than the satisfaction of others. The highest satisfaction is that which we feel when conscience approves our acts. A rational being is *lovely* to us, when his character and acts are such as harmonize with the good of all, ourselves included. Thus the scriptural declaration is that we love God "because he first loved us;" that is, we perceived his character to be a benevolent one, and therefore *lovable*. Could we love God if he were *not* pure, holy, and benevolent?

MR. TIFFANY. He would not be God.

MR. ERRETT. Exactly. He would not be one whom we *could* love; and this shows that love depends upon our mental nature, which can only love that which is in some way a source of happiness to us. It is nonsense to talk of man's throwing self into oblivion, so that he can love without the slightest reference to the character of the thing beloved—love that which is essentially injurious as well as that which is benevolent or beneficial. Man can not look into the Universe without seeing the *good will to himself* which ruled in its creation, and it is speculating about an utter impossibility, to conjecture what would be our duty, if we found God and the Universe in necessary warfare with our happiness. It is God's kindness to us that calls out our gratitude; it is his love to us that awakens our love.

We have not yet learned from the gentleman whether he considered repentance on the part of the offending son, as a consideration recommending him to his father's forgiveness.

MR. TIFFANY. I had overlooked it: I will note it down.

MR. ERRETT. Put beside it, the prayer you have so often quoted, "God be merciful to me, a sinner," and Christ's prayer, "Father, forgive them." It will interest us to know how God can forgive when he is not and can not be sinned against, by the gentleman's philosophy. If there are conditions of forgiveness, in any case, why are they such? Why can not forgiveness be granted without conditions, and would it work wrong to the universe so to forgive? And if there must be conditions, how will the gentleman, or any one else, show precisely where their limits shall be? These are questions which should not be *overlooked*, if he would thoroughly examine the doctrine of the atonement. What had the gentleman's quotations from Pope's Essay on Man to do with this? Why all this noise and so little attention to the real question at issue? and this, too, upon the last day of the discussion, as rumor informs me; for the gentleman keeps as still in regard to

his intentions in this, as in the discussion of the first question. From the sound, one would suppose that those guns which have been so long a-priming, were surely going off! I do hope that, for the short time that remains, the gentleman will exchange his furious assertions and declamations for pointed argument.

I will now read a little from JOHN CALVIN, good old John Calvin.

MR. TIFFANY. Do you endorse him?

MR. ERRETT. Not every thing he ever said, but a part of him I do. I read from the "Institutes," vol. 1, page 542. After speaking of our depravity and offensiveness in the sight of God, he says, "But because the Lord will not lose in us that which is his own, he yet discovers something that his goodness may love. For notwithstanding we are sinners through our own fault, yet we are still his creatures; notwithstanding we had brought death upon ourselves, yet he had created us for life. Thus *by a pure and gratuitous love toward us*, he is excited to receive us into favor. But if there is a perpetual and irreconcilable opposition between righteousness and iniquity, he can not receive us entirely, as long as we remain sinners. Therefore, to remove all occasion of enmity, and to reconcile us completely to himself, he abolishes all our guilt, by the expiation exhibited in the death of Christ, that we, who before were polluted and impure, may appear righteous and holy in his sight. *The love of God the Father, therefore, precedes our reconciliation in Christ*; or rather it is *because* he first loves, that he afterward reconciles us to himself."

Let me now read a passage from St. AUGUSTINE, quoted in the 543rd page of the same volume.

"The love of God is incomprehensible and immutable. For he did not *begin* to love us when we were reconciled to him by the blood of his son, but *he loved us before the creation of the world*, that we might be his children, together with his only-begotten Son, even before we had any existence. Therefore our reconciliation by the death of Christ must not be understood as if he reconciled us to God; that God might begin to love those whom he had before hated; but we are reconciled to him who already loved us, but with whom we were at enmity on account of our sins."

MR. TIFFANY. That is my doctrine.

MR. ERRETT. "And whether my assertion be true, let the apostle attest. 'God,' says he, 'commandeth his *love* toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.'"

Is that your doctrine too?

MR. TIFFANY. Yes, sir.

MR. ERRETT. And "while we were yet sinners," Paul "died for us," I suppose?

MR. TIFFANY. Yes, sir.

MR. ERRETT. I will read on. "*He loved us, therefore, even*

when we were in the exercise of enmity against him, and engaged in the practice of iniquity."

That is from the very fountain head of "true-blue Calvinism," where you would expect to find the doctrine of the atonement in the form the gentleman has charged upon us, if it is to be found any where in the whole realm of orthodoxy. You have heard both John Calvin and Augustine, and what is there to justify the conception presented yesterday, of a vindictive and angry God, who must have so much blood to glut his hungry maw? They saw the necessity of condemning and punishing sin, and yet they saw in perfect harmony with the love of God, Christ taking our place, and bearing our sins in his own body on the tree. You have their teachings from themselves now, and can judge of the truly orthodox conception of the atonement by our Lord Jesus Christ. They did not lay the foundation in the wrath and vengeance of God, but in the eternal and necessary opposition God has toward sin, and in the bearing sin has upon the universe and the whole government of God among all intelligences. It is a great moral spectacle to angels and men, and is one of those things that the angels desire to look into. The gentleman says that in holding such a doctrine, I violate my sense of justice; but it is not so. I may not see the whole universe, but I may feel all confidence that could I see the whole, and had I an eye like God's, I should see that he is infinitely just, whilst, by the plan of the atonement, he is the "justifier of them that believe in Jesus." I receive upon authority truths concerning which I can have an acquaintance in no other way. I do it when I have examined testimony and evidence sufficient to produce in my mind the conviction that it is the truth. In so doing I have exercised my mind; and when this evidence has been examined, and thus a conviction rationally reached that Jesus Christ is *the truth*, then, and only then, I sit down before him with that passiveness which my friend and his spiritual brethren require even if you go into the presence of the blackest imp that ever came from hell, to receive communications from him. Then, and only after such reasoning, I sit down at Jesus' feet, and learn the terms of pardon, the way of life, and the preparation for standing uncondemned in the presence of God, in the day of judgment. From all this I learn to conclude that God is truly just and boundlessly loving, and that it is in accordance with the laws of harmony between justice and love, that he permits his dearly beloved Son voluntarily to bear the burden of our sin upon him. Therefore men as wise, as good, as full of justice as my friend ever can be, have cherished this conviction, without feeling any discord between it and the love of justice.

I have not attacked the gentleman's morality, or his reputation. He has attacked the church, and said we taught that men might sin and give license to lust, and yet be moral men. Such attacks

come from himself. We have not attacked his character. Our only fault, in his eyes, is that we refuse to admit that he is a God, and humbly to receive his oracles without question. *That sin sits lightly upon us.* I have tried to act with civility and courtesy, and have not spoken a word which could be construed into severity until he took the stand that the teachings from our pulpits were immoral in their tendency. When it is asserted that we tell men that it is no matter if they sin, they need not be uneasy about it, that Christ will make up the deficiency; as if we demanded less repentance than he, or there were less hatred and horror of sin in our hearts than in his; when such things are said I will rebuke them, for he knows they are untrue. If there is any one thing more prominent than another, in the incidental effects of the doctrine of the atonement, it is its power to awaken a perception of the enormous crime of sin and its utter wickedness; so that while the justified soul rejoices in God's mercy, he trembles as he looks upon the cross of Christ, to think what sin has done, what a cost it has made, and at what a price they have been redeemed from it. It is rooted in every convert's heart, that sin is a fearful thing, abominable to God, and with which, if he would be saved, he must keep up an unceasing warfare. These are their deep and established convictions, and the practical results growing out of all this, the world can judge of. I am willing to have the practical results flowing out of the doctrine of salvation through the cross of Christ, fairly judged, and let it be seen if the effects are immorality and vice.

When I spoke of revivals of religion, yesterday, I spoke not of fanaticism, but of those mighty and thorough reforms which have wrought salvation for myriads in other countries and our own; such as accompanied the preaching of Luther, and Wesley, and Edwards. Under such manifestations of Divine love, the wilderness *has* been made to blossom like a rose. No other religion can show such fruits and such effects upon the heart and life. We can say with Paul, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." We preach a doctrine of the cross that crucifies the believer to the world, and the world to him, completely casting out sin. Every one knows that we preach this, and not that men can be saved though they go on in careless, sinful lives. The church has always considered it abominable doctrine to say, "Let us continue in sin that grace may abound."

The cross of Christ kindles in us purer desires and higher emotions than the heart ever knew before. Its practical effect is to kill selfishness, eradicate the love of the world, and awaken a better nature within us. It guides us to the throne of God and links us to the Father, by ties of affection that ever increase in strength, as we know more and more of the height and the depth of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.

Is this anti-Christian? If this be anti-Christian, then are we anti-Christian, and there we take our stand.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend has been speaking several times as if I censured them for glorying in the cross of Christ. I have not done it, unless they glory in the cross upon Calvary, the literal cross. If they glory in the spiritual meaning of that cross, in the crucifixion of their animal and lustful nature, I, too, glory in it, and I have preached nothing else. I do not say that they preach license for sin, and I wish my friend would take heed how he hears. I said that was the practical effect of their preaching, and so I say still. Now, did they teach that there is no salvation short of that perfect one which was wrought in Christ, and that he who died before that was wrought, must work it out in that other world in which he goes, would there not be a greater, higher, holier effect than now. Does not my friend find selfishness in the orthodox churches? And yet, when selfish men die in the church, they preach to their friends that they have gone to heaven, as they hope, through the merits of the blood of Christ. Is not that the doctrine? The practical effect of this is, that men will be happy in their sins, and men will think it is of no consequence how they live. Now, my friend says he preaches that unless you become perfect, as was Christ, in the principle of your divine and spiritual nature, and that if you should die before you become so, the atonement of Christ would not affect your condition at all. Understand, then, that nothing is of consequence further than it works the work of regeneration in your soul.

He reads from Calvin to show that the doctrine of the atonement was based upon love; but what does he base the love upon? Upon the harm done an innocent being? What did he hurt him for? Is that love? Had God not power to overcome this evil, and bring man to himself, without that? I deny that Christ ever taught that the Father had to make a sacrifice of him, in order to reconcile man to himself. If the plan involved the suffering of innocence for guilt, it was unjust, no matter who was at the foundation of it, and my friend can not show it to be in harmony with his sense of justice. Although man may cling to it, as a doctrine which flatters his selfish soul, and excites tears of joy and emotion, it does not make him better. It can not elevate his ideas of Divine justice, purity, and love.

When Calvin said that God's love is immutable, he said what Christ said; but what is his induction? Why, that innocence must suffer for guilt! Then comes in the objectionable feature, which makes God a mere selfish man. If the world was guilty,

and Christ innocent, it would be worse for him to suffer than for all the world to suffer: it is unjust and monstrous! If my friend can derive food for his soul from such a doctrine, let him tell us where he finds it; let him take the principle into his family, carry it into government, and see if it harmonizes with his sense of justice, love, and wisdom. Love seeketh that which is just and right; but imagine a union of love, wisdom, and justice, which will put penalties upon the head of one who is innocent, and you have a strange type of a Divine character. If my friend can get glory out of it, it is only another proof that he glories in a part of his nature that does not know the Divine.

Christ and Belial have no affinity for each other. If hate, in my friend's vocabulary, means only lack of harmony, I have no objection to it; but if it is that kind of hate which made old Shylock say, "Does a man hate what he would not kill?" I say it can have no place in a Divine character. When Christ taught to pray for forgiveness, he meant to bring the minds of his disciples into the proper frame, so that they might harmonize with the Divine love. As to the prayer upon the cross, I will ask my friend if Christ's will and God's were alike, when he prayed forgiveness for his murderers.

MR. ERRETT. They were.

MR. TIFFANY. Did God forgive them!

MR. ERRETT. No, sir.

MR. TIFFANY. Can you show the consistency of that?

MR. ERRETT. I will, when I get up to speak.

MR. TIFFANY. If men ever indulge in malice and hate, they must change, and not God. If they become loving, they will find a peace and harmony with the divine nature, that you may call forgiveness, if you will, but it is a different thing from that which men usually mean by the term. There *was*, in Christ's death, and in his life, great power to raise men above their low and sensual natures, by presenting to their eye the attractive form of goodness and perfection; but it was not needed, to make God forgive them. God always forgave them, from all eternity. The word is a figure of speech: the difficulty is that you adhere to so literal an interpretation, that you contradict every attribute of omnipotence and omniscience.

My friend said that God can not will, except with regard to a being outside of himself, and that I must admit that, or be a Pantheist. Well, if I must be a Pantheist, you must be a Limitarian, and if you will drop names, and attend to the *things*, you will find nothing in your position to boast of. I have convicted the gentleman of denying all real infinity to God. But God *is* everywhere, and all that keeps you from perceiving him, and loving him, is the self-love in you. My friend does not seem able to perceive any middle position between being a Pantheist and a Pagan.

I stand here having my life and being in God. My life and power come from the power and wisdom of God. My character, if it differs from his, differs only in the sphere of my love, which prevents me from loving God. I said Christianity ignores a vicarious sacrifice: it would not differ from any other religion if it did not. If it accepted the idea of pleasing God by any outward sacrifice and ablutions, it would be the same in spirit as the old pagan religions. Christ brought man back from outward forms, to himself, and turned his attention to his own soul, teaching that the only offering which could be acceptable to God is that which is offered up upon the altar of the heart. This was shown in the extract from the "Epic of the Starry Heavens," which I read the other day, and which, as the gentleman thought, needed so much interpretation.

I think I can make my friend understand something of the key by which I would interpret the Bible. Let us take the command to forgive your enemies *from your hearts, &c.* "From your hearts" means from the exercise of your purest and holiest love. You must, then, exercise such pure and holy love toward your enemy as God exercises toward all his creatures, and then you will be in harmony with (forgiven of) God. So, when Christ taught his disciples to pray, he did not tell them to pray after this *form*, but "after this *manner* pray ye." It was the *principle* to which he called their attention, and that was, that a forgiving, harmonious, and loving spirit was necessary on their part, in order to be forgiven, i. e., in harmony with God. He told them expressly not to think they were informing God, for He know what they had need of before they asked him; and they must not think of moving or influencing God, for he was already more willing to give than they were to receive. This was the *meaning* of his instruction, and he only used the language as a figurative means of conveying an idea of the subjective state of mind which it was necessary for them to attain: that they must forgive their deadliest foe—yea, even *from the heart!* He did not establish public worship: he said, Go into your closet, and pray to your Father, in secret. He said that when you stand up to pray in meeting-houses, and at the corners of the streets, to be heard of men, you have your reward in men's praise, but you are not accepted of your Father. He taught unremitting aspiration of soul; prayer without ceasing, in the true sense of the words; a constant feeling that there is an Almighty God over us, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift. With that feeling we shall make no idol to worship—either in a temple of stone, or far off, in some remote corner of the universe; but we shall commune with God in our own souls, and purify ourselves from every lust of the flesh, and go forth with hearts elevated by communion with His Divine Spirit.

We read that "the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin." Now, no one has been *literally* washed in Christ's blood, and the meaning of the passage must, of course, be a spiritual one. The sacrifice of blood meant that as the blood was the life of an animal, the thing typified by it was, that your *life* was to be devoted to God, offered as a sacrifice. The blood of Christ represented his life, which, by being made *your* life, will wash and cleanse your soul from every sin. In that life, that spiritual blood, we shall appear before God, washed white in the life of innocence—the blood of the Lamb. When, then, the bread and wine are eaten in the spiritual sense, you do not partake of the literal body and blood, but of the spiritual life. You are thereby begotten of God, putting off the old man Adam, with his deeds, and putting on the new man, Christ Jesus.

Now, make a personal application of this. Christ taught that you need not go to Jerusalem, or to Mount Gerizim, to sacrifice, and that God, being a spirit, must be worshiped in spirit and in truth. The work was, therefore, to be wrought in your own heart, and in a spiritual manner. For that work, you need to be clothed with power from on high, to give you strength to work it. Christ taught that in his animal lusts, the natural man is at enmity with the love of God, and that before you can serve God acceptably, you must get up higher, putting away the world, the flesh, and the devil. Christ and Belial can not be in you at the same time. The "key of the kingdom" we need is the key of knowledge, by which to unlock the mysteries of knowledge, and the key of love, by which to unlock the fountain of love in our mysterious beings. The Cross is significant of destruction: of the destruction of the first man Adam, which is of the earth, earthy: the establishment of Christ's kingdom means the establishment of the new man within: the altar is the altar of our affections, and the sacrifice is that in us which is opposed to God, to divine truth and love. When you take this key, the whole of Jesus' life and teachings are unlocked, and there is no mystery or antagonism, but all flows on smoothly.

Now, let not my friend tell me that I reject the cross of Christ, for I regard it as that by which I must slay all my appetites and passions; by that blood alone do I expect that my sins can be washed away, and all this is in perfect harmony with infinite goodness, when viewed from my position. It neither jars upon infinite love or wisdom, and consequently is in perfect harmony with infinite justice. It appeals to our understanding; it throws off all discord; it makes the way so plain, that "a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein." Then why bring up the old doctrine of heathenism, that a sacrifice of the body and life of Christ must be made for our sins? Why not make man responsible for his own ignorance, lusts, and sins, and teach that these are

all owing to his animal nature? Why not tell him that if he would know the truth of God, he must first harmonize himself with the manifestations of God in this outer sphere? Why not teach him that he can not love God and hate his brother, or despise his neighbor, or bear any malice, or feel any envy or strife?

Jesus of Nazareth was not God, but a manifestation of God to the world, and there is truth, and justice, and purity, and love, all manifested in that Divine character. You need not worship the individual, but you can worship the purity, and love, and divine character. Throw away all the forms and ceremonies which lead the mind back to those days of ignorance, when the outward forms and ceremonies were used to address the outward eye and ear, because the spiritual eye and ear were not developed!

AFTERNOON SESSION.

MR. ERRETT.

I wish to read a little of the philosophy of the spirits themselves, with regard to sin, and the government of God. We will inquire from the spirits of the *fifth* and *sixth* spheres, what they teach on this matter.

In "Light from the Spirit World," page 241, we read:

"Spirits assent to no doctrine which involves inconsistency in the divine rule of God. Spirits know that God forgives sin, but they do not know that he forgives sin without the repentance of the sinner. They do not know that God forgives a wrong, and yet suffers the wrong to be. They do not know how he can forgive or take away, and yet not remove. They do not know that he ever has removed any wrong, while the mind loved the wrong, and resisted its removal. He forgives iniquity, transgression, and sin: *but he forgives as is consistent with his government.* He forgives, as the good of mind requires; but the good of mind does not justify the removal of divine *disapprobation*, while the wrong exists." On the next page, we learn that, *without repentance*, no reform is "of the character to *justify the forgiveness of the sinner.* When the sinner is forgiven, the wrong of sin will not remain." And on still the next page we read: "no mind can be happy, only as it is forgiven of God."

Now, the very moment it is urged that there is injustice with God if he does not forgive the repentant sinner, it is admitted that there are circumstances under which it is right for God to withhold forgiveness. The denial of forgiveness is only charged as a cruelty and injustice in view of the repentance of the sinner. But if it is once admitted that it is right to withhold the pardon until

the sinner repents, the principle of satisfaction is admitted, and the only question is whether the satisfaction is sufficient; and when you come to that, the Scriptures do not teach, and Christ does not teach, that repentance is sufficient in the case.

My friend says, the practical tendency of the doctrine is to give license to sin; but I content myself with putting my assertion against his, and saying, practically it has no such tendency. The fact that there are ignorant persons and ignorant preachers who would preach a sinner into heaven, and who cater to the wishes and prejudices of sinful people, may be admitted; but that such is the settled conviction and doctrine of any church known as orthodox, we emphatically deny. When the dead are commended to the mercies of God, and the hope is expressed that they may be forgiven, it is always connected with a word of warning to the living that they shall be like servants ready for the return of the Lord from the wedding. When, however, my friend teaches that God is not affected by our sin, and has no care whether we sin or do righteousness; that all things are alike to him, and that all sin is merely a question between man and his neighbor; tell me, what is the tendency of that? When God is practically ruled out of the universe, so as to destroy all responsibility to him, what is the practical tendency of that? So far as the tendencies of the doctrines are concerned, I am willing they should go before the world, side by side. For my own part, I would as soon teach my children that they could take a viper to their bosom and not be harmed, as that they could take my friend's doctrines into their hearts and not experience pernicious practical results.

Suppose that a child has called his father by every conceivable bad name, violated every law of the family, and been the cause of disorder, strife, and wretchedness in the family; the father looking at all this, and sustaining the relation of ruler and governor, with rightful authority in his hand to see that the government is obeyed, says, when the son comes before him, I care nothing for it; I am as well pleased when you do wrong as when you do right; if you can get along with it among yourselves, it is all one to me; I think for the sake of each other you had better do differently, but I want you to understand that so far as I am concerned, it is of no consequence whatever to me. This is a fair illustration of my friend's argument if I can understand his theory. I am well aware that injustice is often done in illustrations, but I have tried to avoid that, and I think you have now a fair illustration of what he considers God's course of action toward the world.

For the purpose of involving me, he wished me to say that no man can enter the kingdom of heaven till he is perfect. If to enter the kingdom of heaven *means* to be perfect, the sentence he gives is a paralogism. But I say I am not ashamed to teach whatever Christ taught. I tell the people that if they would enter

the kingdom of heaven they must deny themselves, take up the cross, and follow Christ. I repeat to them His own words. So I tell them when they come confessing Christ, that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and I try to derive the Saviour's meaning from the language and convey it to the people's minds. That is my course, and if that be anti-Christian, I am anti-Christian; and if to differ from my friend as to what Christ meant be anti-Christian, I am anti-Christian. But if I have, before heaven and earth, the same right as himself to interpret the teachings of Jesus, honestly and candidly, and to explain Scripture by Scripture; and if I do this, then I protest against such a term as anti-Christ being used with reference to me or those who agree with me in their views of what Jesus taught.

The gentleman said the innocent could not suffer for the guilty. I must reply, they *do* suffer, every where in the whole universe. They are involved in sufferings growing out of no wrong of their own, no act of theirs, but out of the arrangement of the laws of God himself. We see this and know it; it pertains to the body, the mind, and the heart, and my friend himself in his labors to regenerate society, suffers the toil and privation which would not be necessary were it not for the sin of others. Admitting his theory to be in other respects true, this labor and toilsome course would all be avoided, were every other heart engaged in the same work. He is doing it not merely for himself, but for others. So we see physical suffering, and the inheritance of painful disease in generation after generation. I know we see that all this may, by the infinite mind, be turned to good: we claim that it is so, and it is our glorious hope and confidence; but the *fact* remains,—the good and the innocent do suffer for the evil. Infidels have taken hold of this, as well as of the doctrine of the vicarious atonement, and have proved, as they thought, by reasoning as incontrovertible as my friend thinks his, that there is no ruling Providence whatever. The doctrine of the cross or any other doctrine, may by false dealing be made repulsive; but the truth still remains that it is "power of God, and the wisdom of God."

He found fault with Calvin for teaching that God can hate the deed and love the doer. I appeal to every parent, whether you do not know, by actual experience, how true this is: that you may hate the evil deed of your child, and yet feel your heart full of love for the guilty one. I am not ashamed to say, that foolish as *this* doctrine, also, seems to my friend, I believe it to be true. God is eternally arrayed against all sin, and hates it with a perfect hatred, yet his infinite heart of love is yearning over the sinner. If the gentleman takes the position that God regards the sin and the sinner alike, you can form your own conclusions.

A word now with regard to Christ's exclamation, "Father, forgive them!" My friend tried to involve me in a difficulty upon

this passage. Let us look at it for a moment. The relation which God sustained to those for whom Christ prayed, was a governmental and sovereign one; and you can understand, how, whilst a child or brother may plead for an erring one, the father, the governor may feel that it is necessary to deny the forgiveness, till the conditions of forgiveness are complied with. The Father did forgive, when Christ's murderers repented and believed in Christ, as many of them did on the day of Pentecost. There was no wish on the part of the Father to take special vengeance. The Father and Son were one in seeking the salvation of man, and the love of the Father permitted the desire that they might escape punishment, even as that desire found utterance in Christ's words. But judgment and justice demanded that they should not be forgiven till the conditions were fulfilled. My friend, if I understand him, would make Christ utter this prayer either as a means of affecting himself, or for theatrical effect upon those who heard him; but I affirm a most decided opposition to any such sentiment. There is nothing indicating a figure of speech in the words, and any such turn to them would be merely arbitrary. The only reason for making it such a figure, is that the exigencies of my friend's philosophy demand it. By this view, Christ was in full knowledge that God could not forgive and that He would not, and was speaking only for theatrical effect! Such indeed is all my friend's theory of prayer amounts to in any case. Take the publican's prayer, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." He prays to a God who can not hear and will not answer! The whole effect is to be upon the man himself! Try it! Cast out from your heart all thought of God's sympathy or interest in your case: throw it all aside, and try to imagine yourself working your own spirit up mechanically by means of prayer to a God who cares nothing about it, hears it not; in short, imagine yourself praying to no God at all! You might as well be a heathen and done with it, for a wooden block would be quite as good an object of worship as such a God! Moreover, as I understand him, there was a forgiveness of Christ's murderers before they repented, away back in the decrees of eternity, or in other words, there was no forgiveness, because *there never was any condemnation!* Remember, that the question now is concerning what *Christ* taught; not what philosophy teaches; but what is anti-Christian. So in the prayer for forgiveness as we forgive, I argue that Christ's meaning is not consistent with the gentleman's theory, because the necessary implication is that we may expect from God the same *kind* of forgiveness as we exercise toward our offending neighbor. Any other interpretation makes a mere farce of the prayer.

After being several times called out upon it, my friend replied, but not with a very good grace, that God is conscious. How much you know about it I can not tell, but I confess I do

not see much that looks like personal consciousness in God, when he says that all conscious beings are conscious in God. The point I made was, that if God has a consciousness *of his own*, there must be something out of himself in the universe. If you have a will, and God has a will, there are *two* wills, and if He only exists and wills in *our* consciousness, then *regarded as God*, he has no consciousness of his own. I may be very obtuse, but with all the gentleman's explanations, loud as they were uttered, I can not tell any more than before whether he believes that God has a consciousness, will, and existence, distinguishable from his creatures. If there be separate wills, then when you do your will and God his, there may be a crossing of wills, and if there is any government, you must be accountable *to God* for violating his will and offending against him. I have asked the gentleman to be explicit upon these questions, but he has not been so. I think he has no right to complain that I do not meet his points. I allowed him to go on for eight days with his philosophical propositions intended to hem me in, and with all his concealment of his purposed application of them, and his attempts to entrap me, I took up enough of those propositions to show that his chain of logic was not sound, and that any future reasoning of his which assumed it to be sound, would rest upon a rotten foundation. In breaking several important links I destroyed its value as a chain, and that has proved abundantly sufficient for my purpose in this debate.

MR. TIFFANY.

My friend seems to form a very limited idea of that which he calls infinity. Affirming of God infinite power and yet abstracting all the power of individual beings from him, is a method of proceeding which I can not understand. It seems to me that I have no life of my own: I do not live by my own power; for separate me from the Divine and I die. Withdraw God, as he is manifest in my animal and vital functions, and where am I? I live in God, I move in God: I am a finite form of will, but nevertheless, in every department of my being, I am in God. My friend does not understand the difference between states of mind, love, knowledge, and understanding, and my individual being, power, and will. It seems to me that my friend has not understood me, yet I will notice the objections he has taken to my positions.

He says, if he understood my philosophy, I would say to my child, God has not thought of you, nor cared for you: he is indifferent to your welfare and happiness. He would put this face upon my philosophy, because I say you are not the subject of a

special will on his part. Now my idea of God's will is so replete with infinity, that even the hairs of our head are all numbered, and yet in no finite and objective sense. The love of the Father is so infinite, that it requires no special will of God, no volition in time and space, to pour it out upon us. His system was not so imperfect as to require special volition. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and all that is left for us is to harmonize our understanding and will with the perfect will and wisdom of our Father. I understand that the table has been spread from the time the first man walked the earth, till now, that whosoever would, might come to the Father, and partake of the repast provided for all. I understand that, ever since the morning stars sang together, the Divine voice has gone forth: Whosoever will, let him come, and take of the water of life freely.

In regard to repentance, I am satisfied my friend does not get my idea. I agree with him, that repentance is necessary to bring us into harmony with God and with the Divine government, but it is not because God hates us, or has any will against us, but because, being in this exceedingly low plane, and being enwrapt, as we are, by darkness and ignorance, in this outer plane of the manifestations of God's intelligence, we can only receive the blessings adapted to those who are in this low plane. I can enjoy the things of earth while I stay, but when death comes, moth and rust corrupt them, and I go into darkness, because I have hid my talent. God is ready to pour out the richest of heaven's blessings, but we have so lived, and so closed our eyes and ears, by absorbing ourselves in low and obscure things, that we have not come up into the plane where we can feel purity, enjoy its fruits, and understand all the harmony, and purity, and justice of God's government. If I have shut my eyes, and did not see the harmony of nature, it was not because God was not speaking through the tree, the flower and the crystal, the dewdrop and the sunshine; it was not because he has not spoken, but because I close my senses, and do not attend to the divine harmony that are voicing forth the love, and wisdom, and goodness of my heavenly Father. My Father is all true goodness, wisdom, and love, and if I have not feasted upon his bounty, it is because I would not come to the feast. When asked, we have replied, I have married a wife, I have bought a yoke of oxen, I have bought a piece of land, and, therefore, I can not come. If I have clung to earthly things, I can not eat of the supper. God does not change; he always loved, was always ready to bless.

Christ said, if you would be like God, love like him; love friend and foe alike, as he does. The object of repentance is to purify my breast; for if I am impure I can not see God: it is the pure in heart that see him. It is not because God is not every where present, but because we do not live in that department of

our nature which can perceive him; just as a blind man can not see the glories of light, although they are all around him.

Now, the beauty, and purity, and simplicity of Christianity is this, that it comes right home to ourselves, and says to us, the fault is in you; God is all love; you need not go to offering sacrifice with a view to affect him. So says Christ; but these forms all had their birth in an idea that God was not quite right; that he got angry, and that something must be done by us to appease his anger. Search the annals of heathenism, and you will find that all their forms and ceremonies express the idea that God must be appeased. The dispensation which had sole reference to man's action in relation to his fellow-man, could not make the comer thereunto perfect. The first was to restrain man in respect to his neighbor: the second, in respect to himself. The first only cleansed the outside of the cup and the platter; the second cleansed them within, also. "The kingdom of heaven cometh not by observation:" the sayings of Christ had reference, not to what was to be done out of us, but within us. There is that which is earthy in you and me. There is the part of our nature which needs illumination, so that we may distinguish between truth and error, purity and impurity.

I ask you to walk in the way Christ pointed out. My friend and I debate about it, and you debate. What is it in you that debates? You will find, that as there is a natural, a spiritual, and a divine sphere in the universe, so there is in man; as there is an outward kingdom in the universe, so there is in man, and as there is a spiritual or inner kingdom in the universe, so there is in man. There were those who saw the Son of Man come with power, even in the days of the apostles. They saw the stars fall from heaven, but not the literal stars, for these things only typified the work that was to take place in men's own hearts. When men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, because no one has a disposition to infringe upon the rights of another, then shall be established that inward kingdom, which Christ came on earth to establish. Man's heart will be full of love to his neighbor, and then, of course, he will not need outward government. Man, then, represents the material and grosser nature of the universe in his carnal heart; he represents the spiritual universe in his inner nature; and there is also a divine, or inmost nature, in which Christ's government is finally to be established. In the middle nature are the clouds of the mind, and there it is that we need illumination. When Christ shall come in the clouds of heaven, and all his holy angels with him, when the true standard shall be set up, and the books shall be opened, so that we may see, and analyze, and compare, by a true standard, then shall our minds be illuminated, and we shall know the truth. The book of life, sometimes called the book of

remembrance, shall be opened, and our lives being tried by Christ's perfect standard, we shall begin to confess that here was impurity and there falsehood, and the record of that book will be the sure witness against us, for its entries we can never deface. All will be committed by the Father to the Son, and by the revelation made by the illumination of that day, all will be judged. We may now forget our sins, but they are not lost: there is recorded deep in our conscious being, a record which will never be effaced. Our deeds and thoughts will then be recalled, and we can distinguish between the true and false, the pure and the impure. Then there shall be a final separation, when that which is true shall be gathered into the garner of the Lord, and the bad and false will be cast out for destruction, banished from you and me, to be burned up. Nevertheless we ourselves shall at last be saved, "so as by fire."

If we lay up our treasure in the perishable things of this earth, when that day cometh which will try a man's works, of what sort they are, who shall be able to abide the day of His coming? Who shall be able to stand, when tried by that standard? He shall be like a refiner's fire and fuller's soap, and shall sit as a refiner, and the sins of man shall be purged away by that process, so that all dross shall be burned up, and all that is pure, and holy, and immortal, be saved.

I find, therefore, no difficulty in harmonizing every word of truth that Jesus and the apostles uttered upon this subject, for it has a direct bearing upon our mind, and tells us that for every word and deed we shall be called to an account, and can not escape.

I meant to have referred for one moment to what my friend said of the serpent being lifted up in the wilderness. The serpent, you will remember, was not lifted up to be killed; it was no sacrifice; but it was to be *seen*. So Christ was lifted up, not as a sacrifice, but to be looked to as a teacher and a light to guide us in our way. He would then draw all men unto him, and they could not fail to be attracted. Until John came, the kingdom of heaven suffered violence; but now it is preached abroad, and all men flock into it.

My friend quoted from a medium's book to prove the theory of forgiveness held by spirits in the other world. I see that my friend and his book, "Light from the spirit world," seem to belong to the same persuasion in some respects. It would seem by it, that something is necessary to be done beside being like God.

Do not the innocent suffer as well as the guilty in this world? he asks. If they do, they do not suffer to excuse the guilty; they suffer by the very law by which they have life. It does not excuse the guilty parent that his child suffers. By this same parallel, if Jesus suffered for our sins, it would only increase our

pain; for a parent's remorse for his sin is doubled when he sees its effects upon the child whom he loves. I receive evil by the same law by which I receive my existence. The law by which my parents imparted existence to me, is the only one by which I could obtain it; and if they gave me a diseased constitution, it was done by the very law by which I received my existence. The suffering of innocence does not give the healing or recuperative principle.

I will notice one other point my friend referred to, that I may be perfectly understood. He said I am obliged to labor as I should not have to do, if you were all in the moral sphere, so as not to need my preaching. It so happens that such labor is not a misfortune, but a blessing, for it redounds in good to myself.

His remarks upon the prayer, to be forgiven as we forgive others, I have already answered, by saying that the only necessity is that we should be like God, and the thing to be conveyed to the mind of the disciple by that petition was, that we must come into a condition of harmony and reconciliation with all men, so as to be in such a state that it would be possible for us to receive the influx of the Divine blessings, and be in such harmony with Him that by contrast with our former condition of opposition, it could be figuratively expressed by the term "forgiveness."

[The Moderator here announced that Mr. Errett would occupy the time of two ordinary arguments in his next speech, which would be followed by a closing argument from Mr. Tiffany, ending the Debate.]

MR. ERRETT.

I think, Mr. Moderator, that instead of our views of God being false and heathenish, our friend has been getting very false notions of our views. He seems to think that we have been believing in a God who could be wheedled and coaxed into any thing that we choose to beg of him. He has been spending a great deal of time in showing that God was always ready to give, if we would come into the proper position to receive. Now, I know that there have been views held which are somewhat obnoxious to his criticism, but he does great injustice if he supposes that any such thing is fairly chargeable upon orthodox churches. I know that there are some expressions in orthodox creeds, such as that God is reconciled to the world, which I consider unfortunate expressions, *in form*. But there is no understanding of the expression by the church, such as would make his charge upon the church a fair one. There is no candid reasoning which will turn the orthodox belief into any such form. I do not speak for other denominations from any sense of duty, for the relation they have sustained toward us

has not been such a one that we would be under any obligation to defend their belief; but I speak to satisfy my own sense of justice and to repel a slanderous charge from those even, who have been too ready to believe every slander of us. I say, therefore, that taking the Episcopal and the Methodist churches, which have in their creeds the objectionable expression which I have referred to, and every candid person must admit that they preach as clearly as any one can, that man's whole hope of salvation is based upon the *love* of God and the voluntary death of Christ our Saviour. They always teach that God is ever ready to receive, and that the sinner is the one whom it is necessary to bring and reconcile. They do not believe, and they never have believed that God is more ready to give at one time than at another. I know that ignorant minds may make objectionable statements of such doctrines, but let ignorant men get a smattering of my friend's philosophy, which he has for so many days tried to make us understand, and with such poor success; let them take such crude conceptions of his views as they would surely obtain, and I am very sure he would complain loudly and *justly* if the world should judge his philosophy by such a statement of it. I could go through all the theological views given in the works of eminent theologians, and I could not find there any thing like the view of God's government given in the comparison made by my friend in his illustration of God's conduct by the supposed case of a father and his two sons. Had he given it as a hasty thing, in a moment of excitement, I could overlook it; but he has repeated and printed it, and yet he has utterly failed to reply to my challenge to produce a single respectable theologian in the orthodox churches, whose words could by any possibility be tortured into such a repulsive doctrine.

We believe in the infinity and immutability of God, and yet we believe in the teachings of the Gospel concerning his love of holiness and hatred of sin. We do not see any thing inconsistent in believing both, and can not admit the gentleman's assumption that he has the ability or the right to measure the Infinite and assert dogmatically what it does or does not imply. We love the gospel because it meets our wants. We are happy in it: it comes home to us in all the fullness of heaven's grace and love, and gives light, peace, pardon, holy relationship with God, and everlasting life. It is dearer to us than life, and we will contend for it till death! My friend says he is happy in his labors; and does he not think Jesus was happy in his labor of working out happiness and salvation for the human race? and will he not always be happy "in bringing many sons unto glory?" As one after another goes home to bliss and to angelic existence, sounding the praise of that Redeemer, think you there is no happiness for Him who bore our sins upon the cross, to make that bliss and that salvation possible? Does not Paul say that He "for the *joy* that was set

before him, endured the cross, despising the same, and is now set down at the right hand of God?" Though there was suffering and humiliation in His life, and shame and agony in His death, do you think it was not mingled with joy and gladness in the heart, the great Divine heart of him who bore it all for us, sinners as we are? It is indeed one of the thoughts mightiest to strike us to the dust and humble us before God, that our sins cost all that suffering to the Son of the Most High; the lesson that comes from that cross is one of the strongest appeals to our conscience; yet viewing the whole matter from the glorious position that the Saviour occupies, we can see how he might say, "*Lo I come; I delight to do thy will, O my God!*"

I have not time to notice, and must pass over many other matters in my friend's last speech. They are interesting, as giving his views of the interpretation of Scripture. It will be profitable, as a matter of philosophical curiosity to you, to see how he gives the tinge of his own mind to the passages he quotes, and how ingeniously he tries to bring them into harmony: it will call up your remembrance of the commentators of ancient times, who used to spiritualize the whole word of God; but further than this, I do not believe you will find either profit or satisfaction in it.

As this is my concluding speech, I shall summarily review the ground we have traveled over, and see what the conclusion of the whole matter should be. We have been held up as anti-Christian. You have heard my friend's charge against us. I was upon the defensive, and have had little to do in the way of affirming. It was my business to show, if I honestly could, that my friend's arguments were not sound, and it is with that state of the case in mind, that you must judge of the progress we have made in the debate.

But now, in justice to myself and my brethren who are known as Disciples, I must say that we look upon Jesus Christ, Jesus of Nazareth, as our only Saviour and our only hope. We regard him as the son of the living God, the son of Mary and the son of God, human and divine, God and man, uniting, most mysteriously, these two natures, and representing, alike, the divine and the human. We regard him as Immanuel, God with us, the Word by whom all things were made. We believe that he was revealed in the fullness of time, after the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations had passed, and came into the world "to seek and to save that which was lost." We believe that the spirit was given unto him, not by measure, and that with all the fullness and perfection of the wisdom of the Godhead in him and upon him, he was emphatically "the way, and the truth, and the life." With divine fitness for his work, he entered upon his mission, and lived, and taught, and died: he rose again from the dead, and entered the heavens, where he ever liveth, to make intercession for all who

trust in him. He was the Sun of Righteousness, after whose rising no stars can ever shine: in whose rays the Christian rejoices, and will not seek for the taper-light of any philosophy to lead him into divine wisdom. We believe that he was the embodiment of all goodness, truth, purity, and virtue, so that we may safely walk in his footsteps with implicit confidence, and trust that all will be right. He did the will of God, as well as taught it.

We believe that he died for our sins: that in that strange agony in the garden, when his soul shrank, for a moment, from the fate before him, it was not the mere terrors of martyrdom that made him shrink, but that he tasted the terrors of a death all unknown to those who put their trust in him, and from which they will be forever saved, by the grace of God. We believe he died, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God:" that He "his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." We believe that, in view of that death, God can be "just, and yet the justifier of them that believe in Jesus." When we put our trust in him, we believe that our confidence of salvation rests upon *no mere creed—upon no mere symbol or ceremonial observance*, but it is placed in *Jesus Christ himself*, the only Saviour of sinners, the only name given under heaven whereby we must be saved.

We believe, likewise, that Jesus did, according to his promise, send his spirit upon the apostles; that the Holy Ghost came upon them at Jerusalem; that they were filled by the Spirit with *wisdom* as well as with power; so that they were authorized to proclaim salvation, to remit sins, to open and to shut, to bind and to loose, under a solemn pledge from their Lord and Saviour, that whatever they bound on earth should be bound in heaven. We believe that was the beginning of the kingdom of heaven, spoken of by John, and it was what was referred to, when, in opposition to the Jewish ideas of the temporal pomp and grandeur with which the Messiah should come, it was said, "the kingdom of God is within you." We believe, at the same time, that that kingdom is established with reference to our whole nature, and that it has rites and ordinances adapted to our condition, and fitted to aid our mind upward in its grasp after spiritual things. A church was planted by Divine direction: a society in which those who were called away from their sins might find fellowship among those like-minded, and be surrounded with influences which should help them in their way toward heaven. We believe that those who are truly converted renounce their sins and selfishness, and crucify their lusts; and when baptized into Jesus Christ with faith and obedience, they come into the kingdom of God, born of the water and the spirit. They are then prepared for communion with the Spirit of God, and if they keep themselves pure, that spirit lives in them, and dwells with them. In this communion with

God, they enjoy in their hearts an earnest and foretaste of the "inheritance of the saints in light," and begin to realize, even here, the first fruits of heavenly bliss. They have great clusters of the grapes from the land of Canaan, that they may know how blessed a land it is. They drink of the water of salvation, and are fed with heavenly manna; and as they journey on, guided by the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, they are more and more educated and fitted for the glory and honor of the heavens. We believe that they have their Father's eye of love watching over them in their pilgrimage; that they have a throne of grace accessible to their petitions; that they can cast all their cares upon him who careth for them; and can, in the name of Jesus, come boldly to the Father, and ask and obtain all the strength they need. They have a high priest, "who is able to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him," and who will give them the victory over all their foes; and although they have trials and sorrows, they sing many songs of joy as they go along their pilgrimage. Those songs often burst from their full hearts, as they think upon their Redeemer's love, and you may hear them singing,

" 'Tis heaven below,
My Redeemer to know,
And the angels could do nothing more
Than to fall at his feet,
And the story repeat,
And the lover of sinners adore."

The Christian has all the blessed assurance of the fellowship and love of Christ in his heart, and knows that just as he loves Jesus, and walks with him, he will be "changed into the same image, from glory to glory." He partakes of Jesus' spirit, and exhibits the divine life and character, in an imperfect sense, it is true, but yet in a true sense. He has to contend with passions that are striving to hurl him to the dust; his life is a warfare; the flesh and the spirit are lusting against each other; he has battles along the way, and sometimes, in a thunder-gust of temptation, he may be swept away, and the enemy may point his finger and laugh in derision, saying, "There, there! see your church-member! your holy, pious man! wonderfully better than the world, is he not?" and the proud Pharisee, looking down upon him in his humiliation, may swell and lift himself up, saying, "I thank thee, O God, that I am not as other men;" yet that struggling heart shall rise again! he shall fight on, and strive on, till he does gain the victory, and the angelic host of heaven shall sing with him a song of triumph, that, though often buffeted, he has come out at last, "more than conqueror, through him that loved us!"

We believe it is the solemn duty of all Christians to make it

the humble, yet earnest purpose of their lives, to do the will of God. We publish no license to transgressors: we tell no man that he can trifle with truth, or with the God of truth; but we say that to do so is to fight against God, and destroy his own soul. We tell him it should be his high and holy purpose to seek the good of his race with pure benevolence, and to cultivate more and more the love of God; that he should rejoice in God's boundless love, adore His infinite perfections, and make his life a life of prayer, ceaseless prayer, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and longing after purity and holiness. We believe that those who do these things shall never be offended, and that "neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

We believe, moreover, that the only hope of the world is in this religion: all the hopes of humanity center in it. Christianity has had a hard time in this world of selfishness and sin; it has had to run the gauntlet, with infidels of every sect and creed ready to pierce it through at every step; it has been tried at every bar of prejudice; it has been betrayed in the house of its friends; it has been chained as far as man could chain it; in its holy name black deeds have been done which have given the enemy cause to rejoice; but in spite of all, *it lives!* and it lives as the only hope of the race! It bears upon it the marks of its battle for existence, and we mourn to say, it is disfigured by much sectarianism, and bears the reproach of the faults and follies of many of its professors; but it is still the holy religion of Jesus Christ.

With respect to ourselves as Disciples, and our peculiarities of belief, I have little to say. We believe that the splitting of the church into sects is wrong: we ought all to forget our animosities; we ought to be one in Christ. We love the same Saviour, we revere the same truths, and we ought to stop all strife. Then, presenting a solid front against the enemy, we could work to turn the world to God, with a power and success almost inconceivable. We admit that we ourselves have often erred, as well as our brethren. Unkind things have been said, and imprudent things done. We know this, we feel it, we mourn over it, we confess it. We stand here in the name of Jesus, and in the love of Jesus, pleading with all to be one in Him, and to seek unitedly, in His name, to carry his gospel unto the ends of the world, and tell all the nations to turn unto the Lord. Here, where our divisions and our weakness has been urged as proof that we are all anti-Christian, we plead with all to rally round the cross of Christ in the support of truth. We have been by the bedside of the dying Christian, and seen these promises and truths tried there in that dark scene. We know how many words of trust and confidence

in the cross of Christ, how many visions of the glorified Saviour have come from the very verge of the grave. We know how often the dying saint has urged his own peace and joy, as an argument to his sinful friends, to induce them to turn from sin and walk with Jesus, that He may be to them also a sure support when they shall walk through the valley of the shadow of death. There is joy among the angels when they look upon the triumphs of the Saviour here, and we believe that they sympathize with us in all our attempts to reach heavenward. If it be anti-Christian to cherish these truths, to love this Saviour, to trust in him, to accept his salvation, and to labor to bring the world to the same belief and trust, then we are anti-Christ, and before God and the world, we will glory in it!

We have to mourn our follies and short comings, and we are willing to receive with kindness and meekness, all the reproaches my friend or any others can cast upon us: we will strive to improve by the truth there is in them; but we will not suffer him, or any one, to take from us our hope and our faith, which has been the light of the world so long, and which is now not only the strength of our hearts in this life, but the ground of our hope that it will be well with us in that which is to come. We believe that there are angels, countless angels, who are the ministers of the heirs of salvation, flying through the world to carry His high behests to every people and clime. We know that our time of death must come: that the day will come when we shall see that time is past, and eternity commencing; when the music of the birds shall die away, the light of the sun be no more seen forever, and the tones of the voices of our friends die away in gentle cadences upon our ear. That is a most solemn hour for man, but we know it will come, and we believe that the church is here to tell men that it is coming; to tell men to escape from the coming wrath which it will bring if it finds them in their sins; to tell men to turn from all unrighteousness; to say to them, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."

Let me say now, that while we are aware of all the imperfections that belong to Protestant Christendom in its present aspects, we do at the same time rejoice in the history of the progress of the religion of Jesus Christ: we rejoice to see it in its onward march among the most free and enlightened portions of the race: we glory in the fact that the happiest, the greatest, the wisest of our race, are those whose characters have been developed under the genial influences of the gospel of Christ our Lord; We have hope from the teachings of the past, for we see that our faith has lived and triumphed in spite of all opposition, so that its course has been a marvel to the philosophical reader of history, who

knows how to trace effect to cause. The past has not done justice to Christianity, only in preparing it for triumphs in the future. The past has been the season of trial, but it has not been spent in vain; for though bowed and rocked by the storm, so that it seemed about to be prostrated to the ground, the church has only struck down its roots and took stronger hold upon the earth. It will not always be a time of controversy. There will be ages when these principles will be all settled and these truths be rendered eternally firm; and then this blessed religion of Jesus will go forth and bear to every habitation the blessings of God. There is a time of millennial glory coming: it has been the hope of every age, and is our hope yet. If days have been dark, the spirit of prophesy foretold it, and we let not go our hope for this. We need to understand our duties to our own age and to the world, and in the spirit of enlightened Christianity to do what we can for the generation in which we live. When we do this, we know that we shall be working for the removal of darkness and the ushering in of that glorious millennial dawn. If this be anti-Christian, then are we anti-Christian!

Christianity has been attacked and battered a thousand times, and survived all attacks; but infidel systems of morals and philosophy (to say nothing of religion), which would have usurped her place in the hearts of the church, have gone down to graves of infamy and are known only in the pages of history. These systems died, and upon their dissolution others sprung up in their turn, and thousands upon thousands of hearts have thus been crushed to the dust, under the dread tyranny of false philosophy and false religious doctrine and practice, developed in so many forms in the skeptical systems of the world. These systems work mischief for a time, but they soon die, and the church moves on. Nothing can make them live. The honesty of such a man as Robert Owen can not save them; the intellectual ability of a Hume or a Voltaire can not save them. Men may think they will tumble the church upon its back in a short time, as my friend here does, but one by one such systems perish and go down to the grave with the minds that gave them birth, leaving only wrecks behind; but the church of God has stood, and will ever stand, like a mighty rock, and reposing upon its lofty summit is the calm, sweet sunshine of God's approbation and love. The lightnings may flash and the thunders roar, and the waves beat against its base, but it will stand, because it is the Rock of Ages, and Jesus has said the gates of death shall never prevail against it.

I fear not the charge of being anti-Christian, any sensible community being our judges. That my friend has proved us anti-Tiffany, I think there is no doubt. His stand-point and mine are very different; but we come not here to be judged by his philosophy. I have, however, paid all due respect to his system, and

devoted some time to what I consider his errors. How far I have succeeded in exposing them, is not for me to say: I can only say that I am satisfied with the result and with the course I have taken. As to the second question, I warned him at the outset that his philosophy had nothing to do with it: the only appeal was to be to the teachings of Christ as found in the New Testament. We might reason upon the absolute according to his system, till every mind was bewildered; but I would not suffer myself to be turned away to such a field of discussion. Our business was to give you the words of Jesus, with such light as we could afford in their interpretation, and you were to judge whether we were proven anti-Christian, by that criterion. In this second debate I have not made any special attempt, therefore, to meet his philosophy, although I have done so wherever I thought it had any bearing upon the question.

There is not a single word in all the teachings of Jesus, and of the apostles sent out under the baptism of his spirit, that we do not most firmly and fully believe. There is not a law which Christ gave, that we do not desire in all faithfulness to proclaim and urge upon the consciences of men. There is not a single promise that Christ has given, of aid, of deliverance, or of hope, that we do not rejoice in with all our hearts, and present to all the world with exultation and gladness.

If there is any thing we mourn over, it is that we have not come up to our own ideal of what a follower of Christ should be; but with the knowledge of all our imperfections, we tell you again that the hope of the world and of humanity is in that gospel. If there is no hope there, you may dig a grave for all the expectations of the race, and bury them, face downward, a thousand fathoms deep, never to rise again, and let them sleep there an eternal sleep, without a dream! In the religion of Christ as preserved upon the pages of the New Testament scriptures, the only hope is found.

We have now been here some ten days in our discussion, and I must return my thanks to you, Mr. Moderator, and to the community, for the interest which has been manifested, and the persevering attention which has been paid to the arguments we have presented. As to my friend Tiffany, I can say (though perhaps it is not called for), that I have endeavored to carry on the discussion in the spirit of courtesy. Upon his views and positions I have commented with freedom, as I thought truth demanded; and whilst I must say that with all my heart I despise Spiritualism, as one of the most detestable delusions which ever has gained ascendancy in the hearts of men, I have no such feelings toward my friend Tiffany personally. He has a right to his own thoughts and feelings, and I am willing to give him full possession of his rights in that respect, whilst I stand up and meet him boldly in defense of

what I myself believe. He has great advantage of me in practice in debate, and has acquired no mean skill in the use of his logical weapons: I have had little practice in such kind of discussion, but believing his arguments to be sophistical and his doctrines dangerous, I have combatted them as I could, and defended what I believed to be the truth. In defense of *that*, I would stand up against the attacks not only of men, but of spirits, whether they call themselves angels or devils.

Some men fear discussion, but I must say that I think there is no danger in an investigation of truth in a *fair* discussion. In this spirit we have tried to carry on this debate and I am satisfied that no harm can come of it. I close my remarks by repeating my assurance to my friend of my kindness of feeling and cordiality toward him, and with a sincere hope that his investigations may lead him out of what I can not but consider pernicious error.

MR. TIFFANY.

I believe my friend commits one error, but I presume he does not do it intentionally. He says he despises Spiritualism, but I am sure he must agree with me that no form of belief is to be despised. God, in his universe, has made provision for all, and the truth is manifested as much in one department of his universe as in another. If these phenomena are what they purport to be, it behoves my friend to be wise and try to understand them. If spirits can communicate with man, good ones will communicate for good purposes, and evil ones for evil purposes. If it be true that our departed friends can and do hold intercourse with us for good, it is good for us to know it. There are those who so love their departed friends that they can love to commune with them, and would regard it as a great blessing to be able to converse with them almost as freely as when in life.

In the discussion of this last question I have gone through with a part of the points I intended to make, and shall, of course, confine myself in my remarks to those which my friend has had an opportunity of replying to, and shall not take up any new arguments.

In looking over the history of the world, we find that, some eighteen hundred and twenty-five years ago, a new dispensation was introduced, which had been heralded beforehand by angels singing "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good will among men. The individual who introduced the dispensation was well worthy the proclamation. In all he did, he was the manifestation of Divine justice, goodness, wisdom and love. I agree with my friend that the spirit was poured out upon him without measure, so that he received from the Deity all things, and

imparted according to what he received, giving to all men liberally as they were able to take his lessons of wisdom, and his precepts of love.

He died: a church was formed, not by him, not in pursuance of any directions given by him; yet it was established. A form was adopted by which it was outwardly known to the world; but it was not fixed by him, nor adopted by his direction; still it was adopted. From that day to this, in one form or another, there have been organizations claiming to be the representatives of the teachings, the life, the character, and the power of that individual. That church existed all these two thousand years that time has rolled on. War was to cease: war rages now as ever. Slavery was to cease: slavery exists in the very nation where that church is most powerful, and master and slave sit down together at the same table, and profess to partake of the very ordinance instituted by that Saviour! The bonds of the oppressed have not been broken: he has not been set free. There is not a government on earth which does not violate every principle of Christianity in its fundamental constitution. Yet the church lives along, mixing with the world in all these things, and still professing to believe that Christianity will put an end to all sin and evil when the world is converted to its faith and practice! The promised regeneration of the race does not follow, and the question very naturally arises, Is there not something which is anti-Christ in all this?

Another astonishing thing strikes the mind. The church numbers its professing Christians by millions, yet as we go in and out among men, we can not tell who these Christians are, unless we see them engaged in some form of worship. We may talk with them upon philosophy or politics, and never suspect that they profess to have received the benefits of Christ's salvation. We must have some outward manifestation, other than character, in order to find them out. I suspect that it is so in Warren as well as elsewhere, good as you are here. There is something anti-Christian in all this: it does not exhibit the spirit and the fruits of a true discipleship of Christ. Therefore we are left to inquire, what does all this mean? If the world is to be redeemed by Church organizations, certainly the world has had time enough to be redeemed by them. Christ laid the ax at the root of all these evils which I have enumerated, but these churches suffer them. We can not call them Christian churches, therefore, because they have not arrived at a point where they can be entitled to the name. To call them Christians is to defame Christ in character and doctrine. If we stop to inquire how they are distinguished from others, who do not claim the name of Christian, we find that they have generally fashioned a sort of creed, and have certain forms and ceremonies. As to morality, they try to keep up to the standard of the world, so as to hold a respectable position. These things be-

ing done, they call themselves Christians, and say they are the representatives of Christ.

In looking upon all this, I feel in my soul that this is not Christianity: this is laying a foundation other than that which Christ laid, and it must, therefore, be anti-Christ. In examining further into their faith, for the sake of information, we find that they have a sort of faith looking to externals; but we find that Jesus of Nazareth called man's attention exclusively to the internal; that he commanded to make the *inside* clean, and said that he was not to exercise a kingdom of force *over* man, but a kingdom of love *in* man. To follow his teachings in these respects would make a country or community Christian, and any thing short of it would make them anti-Christ. We find these professing Christians teaching all that makes up the *form* of Christianity, but they overlook the weightier things of the law, attending more to the washing of cups and of platters, and laying the stress upon these things, which should only be laid upon the things of the heart. We notice, also, that they do not give such instruction as Jesus gave, so that if an individual should go into one of their meetings, he would find a very different order of things from what Christ taught. He would find them beginning their worship by oral praying, standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets. I have no objection to this, except on account of its influence; but it is manifestly not in accordance with Christ's teaching, for he told them when they prayed to enter into their secret closet, and shut the door. In that case there could be none of those temptations, which, I suppose my friend will admit, brings much mere declamation into public praying.

MR. ERBETT. I know not from experience, and judge no man's heart.

MR. TIFFANY. Well, so the fact is. Men suppose that they worship in this way, when there is, oftentimes, no particle of worship in it, and they lean upon a broken reed. In our cities, if you look in upon the service, you will see the minister in his surplice, the golden candlesticks before him, the magnificent gilt-embossed Bible, the people with the incense of the perfume shops upon them, holding their heads high, singing, and going through with their forms; and then they go home thinking they have worshipped God *in first rate style!* In all this I see none of the significance of Christ's religion. I see, also, why Christ had not invested his religion in an outward form, for such a religious formality had, in all previous ages, brought forth its natural fruit, in making God a mere external being, who could be moved by their prayers and entreaties. Christ taught no such religion: his worship was the worship of the soul.

"The desert and the mountain air
Witnessed the fervor of his prayer."

He always told his disciples to "wait here," while he went to pray "yonder." In prayer, the world with all its influences should be shut out, and the soul left alone to commune with its God.

When, then, I found that sectarianism had expended itself in these forms, was teaching baptisms, not merely the washing of cups and platters, but even *bodies*, with water, I saw that it was leading the mind away from Christ by such practices, and therefore I said, in perfect good faith, they are anti-Christ in faith and practice. When I found them teaching the doctrine that no man could attain the perfection of Jesus, or be absolutely dead unto sin and alive to God, I considered that that was anti-Christ. Christ's promise of salvation was made to none but those who came up to the standard which he attained. Whosoever had true faith and love, the works that Christ performed, he did also. The same faith and power which was poured out upon Christ was to be poured out upon his true follower. Christ was a man—so are we. He was finite—so are we. He was subject to the temptations of the body—so are we. But he extinguished all that was lustful and false, so that in him was seen the true devotion of the soul to the pure, the good, the beautiful, and the true. The true sacrifice of every consideration of personal distinction and fame, personal comfort or this world's goods. He reached that elevation of soul that the Divine Father could, of his own infinite and divine spirit, pour life and power into his soul, so that he could manifest it to the world. There Christ stood; and he taught that all the world could come to the same point, and that all could receive the same inspiration that he received. Orthodoxy does not teach that doctrine; but Christ taught it; therefore Orthodoxy is anti-Christ.

Now, although it is taught by the churches that Christ died for us, to save us by paying the penalty of our sins, I found that Christ never taught such a word, but his whole life and teaching was contrary to it. I found, indeed, that the apostles, who had been brought up in the Jewish religion, and only slowly comprehended and adopted the teachings of Christ, did use words that might seem to teach such a doctrine, but I found that they used them in a highly figurative sense, and that they never intended to teach any such doctrine. Hence, I found that the doctrine of a vicarious atonement was anti-Christ, because it led man to lay his hope of salvation on other foundation than that which Christ laid. I found that Christ must be formed *within* us "the hope of glory," and just so far as his life was made our life, and he was thus formed *in* us, so far we should have the benefits of his salvation.

The doctrine that the world was to be burned up, and an external kingdom of heaven set up in a new earth, and that there was to be an external judgment, with all men assembled into one

place, I found contrary to the teachings of Christ, and they seemed to me to be anti-Christian faith. I only refer to these things incidentally, because they have not been discussed.

The question between paganism and Christianity, between all other religions and the pure religion of Christ, turns upon the decision whether the religion is to be an external one, a religion of forms and ceremonies, or whether all these were done away by Christ, and a pure internal and divine religion taught. As the divine original has come, been incarnated, and become an example, so that it is no longer necessary to have types and shadows like those of the Mosaic ritual, there is no longer a necessity for forms and ceremonies. The effect of teaching an observance of forms can be seen in my friend here, who, no matter under what circumstances an individual may come and profess a desire to be a Christian, will first of all require that he should go away and be immersed in water; and although the mind feels no new truth impressed thereby, yet somehow or other that old form must always be gone through with. I do not find fault with the particular form of baptism; for if I baptized at all, I should certainly put them in all over, for I believe that was the only real baptism; but I believe that Christ did not command it, and that the soul is no way benefited by it. The form, without any benefit, is mere idle mockery; a species of idolatry, and I could not be guilty of it. Now, I am willing to leave this matter to every individual. Christ said, Go, teach all men, baptising them in my name. I say that referred to Christ's baptism, the baptism of the Holy Ghost. As to water baptism, we certainly know that from his resurrection to his ascension he did not practice it, or give it any countenance whatever.

Another idea that I thought anti-Christian was, that they thought they could get the true meaning of the Scripture from the literal words of the Bible, without the aid of the spirit; whereas the Bible itself teaches that the natural mind can not discern the things of the spirit, because they must be spiritually discerned, and therefore without the inspiration of the spirit we can not understand the word of God.

I agree with you all that no system of philosophy can be permanent in the world unless it makes provision for religion, for man is a religious being. The influence of his religious nature will bring him home to God at last, and without religion, therefore, philosophy is worthless, so far as affecting character is concerned. Such a philosophy can not give to man that bread of life, which, if he eat, he shall never hunger.

I will return my thanks to the audience for their kindness and attention. If I have abused your patience I beg your pardon. In regard to my brother I have the kindest feelings, and wish to shake hands with him, and bid him good bye in your presence.