

**WHICH:**  
**SPIRITUALISM OR CHRISTIANITY?**

**FRIENDLY CORRESPONDENCE**

**BETWEEN**

**MOSES HULL, SPIRITUALIST,**  
**AND**  
**W. F. PARKER, CHRISTIAN.**

---

*"Fair Truth, for thee alone we seek,  
Friend to the wise, supporter to the weak;  
From thee we learn whate'er is wise and just;  
Creeds to reject, professions to distrust;  
Forms to despise, pretensions to deride;  
And following thee to follow naught beside."*

---

**D. M. BENNETT:**  
**LIBERAL AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING HOUSE**  
**141 EIGHTH STREET, NEW YORK.**

Phil 7059.12.15



*Friends of the Library*

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1873,

By MOSES HULL,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

# SPIRITUALISM OR CHRISTIANITY?

---

## MOSES HULL'S FIRST LETTER.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., May 19, 1872.

W. F. PARKER.

MY DEAR BROTHER: Excuse the liberty I take in addressing you, and more especially my rudeness in calling you my brother. The fact is, "we be brethren." "God hath made of one blood all nations." You and I can not help it. I would not if I could, nor do I believe that *you* individually would. The truth is, you are better than your religion. I think you find it hard work to be a sectarian. Every discussion and every interview I have with you fastens the conviction upon me, that you are, like myself, more of a cosmopolitan or optimist than anything else. I do not believe that sects-churches are good for men who have grown to your stature.

II. It may be good for men and women, even after they are grown, to unite on certain principles which may or may not be written. It may be well for them to confederate together for the promulgation of these principles; but to believe that God will go out of his

way to put some people into hell because they do not believe certain propositions, and take others to heaven because of a faith in certain dogmas, is an absurdity that, I beg leave to suggest, is out of harmony with your general character.

III. Your views with regard to churches and church matters, I conceive, grow out of another error; that is, that inspiration belongs only to one age or race. If you could only get thoroughly into sympathy with the idea that God is unchangeable, and that all men are brethren, that every age produces the phenomena of previous ages, and that men will differ as to the cause of their production, I think you could then see that Spiritualism is but a reproduction of the phenomenal part of all former religions, and that, instead of being at war with other religions, it comes as an *explanation* of the past. While its phenomena are similar to those that always have existed, to a greater or less extent, in every part of the world, it has, by proving itself and all other religions fallible, thrown its adherents entirely out of the idea of any teaching except absolute demonstration being authoritative. Spiritualism puts Confucius, Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed, Swedenborg, and Andrew Jackson Davis on the same basis; and instead of setting any one of them up as an absolute standard of authority either in preaching or practice, it takes them simply as *helps*, and strives to improve on their sayings and doings.

IV. Christianity has never pretended to any more than strive to work up to a pattern it supposes this world to have had many hundred years since; it is simply an *imitation*, and much that is *played* in the name of Christianity is only a burlesque imitation at



that. Spiritualism, while gathering aid from the suggestions and actions of all heroes, gods, and historic characters, puts "excelsior" at its mast-head, and does not propose to be content with simply an imitation of the life of Jesus or any other person. Discovering from the history of the past moral and physical world, that past ages have only been repeated efforts of nature to perfect and adjust her grand machine for making men and women, we spiritualists propose that we will not be content with any samples of manhood this world has yet produced. The world is young, and this age must produce a better religion and better men than the past has known. Weighed in the balances of the present, every political, social, and religious system of the past is found wanting. Let us have something better, larger, more potent.

V. Indulge me now in the humble suggestion that your otherwise great soul is being cramped by its confinement to the narrow systems of theology, which more or less bind you, a nineteenth century man, to the modes of thought of many hundred years in the past. I sometimes think that your keen perceptions, without words from me, will soon reveal to you the fatal mistake you make in your effort to put nineteenth century wine into bottles from one thousand to six thousand years old.

VI. In conclusion, I have written this letter, not with the idea of conveying to you any new thought, but for the purpose of calling out a response from you. You are my brother: I love you as such; our debates have only endeared us as brothers; we are also bound by a tie that "the outside world" can know nothing of; so I feel like going to work in ear-

nest to see if the gulf between us can not be bridged, or at least narrowed, to the end that we may get spiritually near enough to each other so that each can see and know the other as he is. Should this call out a response from you, it may be followed by other letters, which, if they do not result in our seeing "eye to eye," will at least enable each to know more perfectly the ground occupied by the other. Should you answer this by silence, I would not take it as an offense, but would rather conclude that either a desire to avoid controversy or multitudinous cares had caused you to choose that which in many instances is the better part of valor.

I am, my dear sir,

Your well-wishing brother,

MOSES HULL.

## W. F. PARKER'S FIRST RESPONSE.

CEDAR HILL, near LA GRANGE, KY., }  
May 23, 1872. }

MOSES HULL, Esq.

MY DEAR BROTHER: Your very kind epistle, bearing date 19th inst., is at hand, and its contents have been duly considered.

You need not ask me to "excuse" you for writing to me so kind a letter, or for calling me "brother." I am your brother, and I am the brother of every man for whom *Jesus of Nazareth died*; and the longer I live, the more I desire to feel that spirit of universal brotherhood which made Jesus so unlike any man

that ever lived before his time, and which has been but faintly repeated in the life of any person who has followed him. The *common brotherhood* of man is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity; and, therefore, a narrow-minded, selfish misanthrope can not be a Christian. Allow me to thank you for the fraternal sentiments of your letter, and to assure you that they are fully reciprocated. I flatter myself that I have learned one of Christ's lessons, which is, to distinguish a man from the faith he has embraced. And, whilst I would assure you that I have no sympathy for modern Spiritualism as a "doctrine," "philosophy," or "religion," still I love you as a man, and desire your deliverance from the unfortunate bondage into which I think you have fallen.

I shall with pleasure read your letters, and candidly weigh your facts and arguments, and respond to them in the true spirit of the religion I profess; and I shall also seek to convince you that Christianity, though eighteen hundred and seventy-two years old, is still far better for you and me than anything modern Spiritualism has to offer.

You say, "I do not believe that sects-churches are good for men who have grown to your (my) stature." Your *belief* here is sound. "Sects," "churches" in the common acceptance of those terms, are too small for full-grown men. But the "church of God" is so very spacious, that I assure you I am far from being of such a "stature" as to find it unpleasant, unprofitable, or *undesirable*. I think, too, your "stature" could find ample space for all its possible wants in that ancient institution.

II. In your second item I think you show clearly

that your dislike for the teachings of Christianity arises from not understanding them. "To believe," you say, "that God will go out of his way to put some people into hell because they do not believe certain propositions, and take others to heaven because of a faith in certain dogmas, is an absurdity . . . out of harmony with your (my) general character."

True.

But, 1. I do not, and never did, "believe" the "absurdity" to which you allude.

2. I know no Bible document that sets forth the absurdity which looks so horrible. It certainly formed no part of the teachings of Jesus, and surely it can not be charged upon an apostle. Hence you are illogical in rejecting Christianity because you suppose some so-called Christians have been unfortunate in their expositions of Christian teachings.

III. You charge upon me another error which you seek kindly to correct. . . . I have never affirmed, either in writing or orally, that "inspiration" is confined "to one age or race." Such a statement would not be historically true. I do not know what you mean by "inspiration." But when you would have me believe that "*Confucius*, Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Paul, *Mohammed*, SWEDENBORG, and ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS" were equally *inspired* persons, and occupied the same "basis," I beg leave to say, I can not do so *without evidence*. As this is a favorite dogma of the spiritualistic creed, I trust you will be ample here in the bestowment of reasons why these men are alike worthy our hearing, belief, and obedience. Until the proof is forth-coming, I shall consider your statement as something written "for appearance' sake," only.

I would like to see your evidence for saying, —

1. "That every age produces the phenomena of previous ages." Whilst this is true as to some phenomena, it is not true as to all phenomena.

2. "That Spiritualism is but a *reproduction* of the phenomenal part of all former religions."

3. That Spiritualism "comes as an explanation of the past" (religions).

These assertions demand proof. Of course you are prepared to give it, or you would not ask me to believe them. Let us have your proof—your proof, my brother.

I *am* in full "sympathy with the idea that God is unchangeable," and "that all men are brethren." I could not be a Christian and deny these two truths. They lie at the bottom of Christ's teachings; and he gave them to the world, first of all teachers, in the positive enunciation which makes them fruitful of good. At least we are not indebted to Spiritualism for them. And, although I as heartily accept them as you do, as fundamental items, still they do not suffer me to see at present any good thing in modern Spiritualism."

That Spiritualism has proved "itself fallible," as you say, I know; but how, in consequence of this fact, it has proved "all other religions fallible," I can not see. . . . That Spiritualism "has thrown *its adherents* entirely out of the idea of any teaching, except absolute demonstration, being authoritative," I have no doubt; and I hold this to be one of the unpardonable crimes of Spiritualism against its own *adherents*. It will never succeed in throwing any one but one of "its adherents" out of that "idea."

Spiritualism takes "Confucius, Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed, Swedenborg, and Andrew Jackson Davis, . . . simply as *helps*, and strives to improve on their sayings and doings." Hence you would have me become a Spiritualist. Christians, too, can and do use all these as "*helps*." They use Confucius to show the impossibility of receiving from the unaided human mind a religion adapted to human wants; they use Mohammed to show the difference between a religion of force and a religion of love; Swedenborg to illustrate the extravagances of human speculation; and Andrew Jackson Davis to illustrate the madness of speculative atheism. These all help the Christian to understand human nature, and help him to the conviction, that men unaided from Heaven — even men, as you may insist, that are the media of disembodied spirits — can not give to the world anything worthy the name "religion."

Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul, are also, to all men, specially to Christians, "*helps*," safe, sure, unerring, to a religion full of power and glory — a religion fitted to meet and fully satisfy the entire body of the soul's requirements. Of course you do not believe this statement. I think you do not believe it, because you do not understand what "Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul" have given to the world for a religion. I hope to make this fact good before our correspondence closes.

Please specify some of the improvements made by Spiritualists "on their teachings."

IV. You say "Christianity" "is simply an imitation." This I shall offset with the statement that "Christianity" is an imitation of nothing. . . .

As to the development of humanity, Spiritualism has no advantage over Christianity. If it has, I ask you to show it.

V. I am a nineteenth century man ; but I have not yet *experienced* the unfitness of first century religion.

I put the first century wine in first century bottles, and the nineteenth century wine into bottles of the same period.

What is the "wine" of the nineteenth century? Show us wherein it is better than the "wine" of the first century.

In conclusion, let me ask, Is the Spiritualism which you advocate, and wish me to embrace, "orderly" or "disorderly"? Is it a philosophy, a religion, or both, or neither? What is it? What does it teach for truth? Is its truth of any authority? What has it done toward making its "adherents" better men and women, for the last twenty-five years?

Let me hear from you speedily.

Affectionately yours, &c.

W. F. PARKER.

## MOSES HULL'S SECOND LETTER.

NEW LONDON, CONN., June 13, 1872.

BROTHER PARKER: Knowing your soul, I expected a response to my letter; but your promptness this time even beats yourself a little. I will try to equal you in promptness and in the spirit of my letter, though I fall behind in every other particular. By the way, the reading of your letter only serves to strengthen the ever-growing bond of friendship I entertain for you; and now, shall I take the advantage of this brotherly feeling, and ask you to agree that this exchange of letters shall continue to the number of somewhere from twelve to twenty, and that we afterward publish them in some convenient form, for the benefit of the public? By this I feel that the public would be the gainer. Not only would it get a little insight into the *pros* and *cons* of the issues between us, but we could manifest a spirit that would teach the world that people need not be either enemies or bigots because of a difference of religious opinion.

II. In the first paragraph of your letter I could not but notice a little of the shrivelling effect of your religion. You are "a brother of every man for whom Jesus of Nazareth died." Now, I do not believe Jesus of Nazareth died for me. Are you therefore not my brother? Suppose Jesus had not died at all; would you not have any brothers? Is it the death of Jesus



that makes you the brother of the human family? or are you a brother to all because all are the offspring of God? (See Acts xvii. 28.) Come, my brother, let us permit our fraternal feelings to take in more than those who accept a dogma. Jesus did not claim that spirit of universal brotherhood of which you boast; on the contrary, he would not allow any to be his brethren unless they complied with certain conditions. Please turn to Matt. xii., and read carefully from verse 46 to the end of the chapter. That will teach you that it is your *manhood*, and not your *Christianity*, that leads you to a belief in the universal brotherhood of man.

I thank you for your expressed desire for my deliverance from "unfortunate bondage," and shall second every movement you make to show me the better way. Be sure your arguments will be candidly read, and weighed as impartially as my ability will allow.

So you think you find ample room "in the church of God" for growth. Well, that is probable. I do not know where that church is; it is just possible that I am a member of it. I hope you will not confine it to some narrow sect. If so, please tell me what one; that will at least help me to know what churches are *not* "God's churches." Wouldn't it be queer if it should turn out that all are God's people, and that he never took much stock in any of the churches?

It is possible that I do not "understand the teachings of Christianity." I have no knowledge on the subject, only what I get from its books and teachers. The propositions about putting people into hell, however, do belong to the Bible and Christianity; for proof, see Ps. ix. 17; Matt. v. 29, 30, x. 28; Rev. xix. 20, xx. 10.

III. I think you misread the third paragraph of my letter. I did not intend to state that Confucius, Moses, A. J. Davis, *et al.* were equally inspired. I did intend to convey the idea that each was inspired to his fullest capacity. I would not undertake to state which of these great men had the most direct or thorough inspiration, nor yet which was surrounded by the more honorable or intellectual class of influences. I could not ask you to take any of these men as being "worthy our hearing, belief, and obedience," any further than what they said commended itself to your judgment. Brother, you have an inspiration as true as that of any other man; it is not infallible, but it is all you have; follow it. I hardly know what you mean by asking evidence "that these men were alike worthy our hearing," &c. Do you wish me to show the infallibility of Confucius, Swedenborg, or Andrew Jackson Davis? or the fallibility of Moses, Isaiah, and Jesus? As to the former, I confess their liability to err; and as to the latter, I can present you many pages of positive proof that they were only erring men. If Moses was guided by an unerring inspiration when he said, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," then the influence that prompted Jesus erred when it said, "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil."

IV. You ask proof of three important assertions in my former letter. I will briefly answer your questions, *seriatim*.

1. "That every age produces the phenomena of previous ages." In general you acknowledge this to be true; yet you say, "It is not true of all phenomena." Quite likely! Do you not see that the *onus probandi*

is in your hand. You ought to have shown me the exception. I did not mean to have you understand that every particular phenomenon was repeated in every age. But I do mean to say phenomena of the same class are continually repeating themselves. You remember what Solomon said on this subject: "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be, and that which is done is that which shall be done, and there is nothing new under the sun." Eccl. i. 9.

2. "That Spiritualism is but a reproduction of the phenomenal part of all former religions." I can not now take up all former religions, and show the proof of this proposition. I will give you a few instances in Judaism and Christianity, and examine any exceptions you may bring from the history of the past.

The wonderful deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage, and their establishment as a nation, was the result of the angel appearing and talking to Moses. It was mediumship that enabled Joshua to do his great work. Elihu describes very minutely one of his clairvoyant visions. The phenomenon of the appearance of Samuel is paralleled by similar phenomena to-day. Every event connected with the various appearances of Jesus finds its parallel in the Spiritualism of to-day. The disciples, speaking as the spirit gave them utterance, on the day of Pentecost, finds its equal in modern trance speaking. For proof of this, see Ex. iii. 2; Acts vii. 30; Deut. xxxiv. 9; Job iv. 12-17; 1 Sam. xxviii. 14-20; Acts ii. 1-4.

3. "That Spiritualism comes as an explanation of the past theologies." One great proof of that lies in the fact that out of deference to it almost every minister (and I think you are not an exception) has re-

adjusted his discourses. The "thus saith the Lord," in the Bible, becomes thus saith a spirit; thus the supreme Ruler of the universe is not held responsible for all the nonsense following that form of expression in the Bible. While the ignorance of the people of past ages would incline them to a belief in the godhead of every spirit that communicated, the fallibility of communications given through prophets of old has taught spiritualists not to receive as authority the *dictum* of any spirit.

V. You "can not see how Spiritualism has proved all other religions fallible." Well, I may have been too fast in that. I think I was. Every religion has presented in itself all-sufficient proof of its fallibility. Spiritualism was not needed for that work. Yet if anything had been needed on that point, Spiritualism has proved that unless a stream can arise above its fountain, all religions are fallible. The spirit world itself, the source of religions, is fallible.

Then you do think there is authoritative teaching somewhere. Please tell me in your next where it is, and who is the teacher. On this point I think I have light for you.

I am a little astonished that Christians should so prostitute the proper use of Confucius, Mohammed, Swedenborg, and A. J. Davis. Yet all goes to show how perverted one's vision can become. I notice we can not exalt one person above what he should be without sinking others correspondingly low. Let me suggest that your admiration of the good Nazarene prevents your doing justice by the other persons you mention. Confucius' mind was not unaided. Mohammed's religion was no more one of force than were

Judaism and Christianity; and surely Swedenborg nor any one else could "illustrate the extravagances of human speculation" more than did Jesus. If you want proof, I will mention a few points in my next letter. So far as A. J. Davis' atheism is concerned, you could not possibly have shot farther from the mark. Have you read his "Arabula"? It is the grandest argument against atheism that it has been my fortune to read.

I join with you in the "hope" that your "facts" concerning Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul will be made plain before our correspondence closes. On this subject, brother, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." In this department of our correspondence I will bring out some of the specifications you call for.

VI. You think Christianity is not an imitation; then it fails in its design. Jesus' words are, "Follow me." Paul says, "As I follow Christ, so follow me." Matt. viii. 22; 1 Cor. xi. 1.

VII. My brother, this letter is lengthening almost beyond what courtesy could demand of you to read; yet I must notice one request of yours, and I hope you will occupy all the space you wish in reply. You ask me to show the advantage of Spiritualism over Christianity in the development of humanity. Please examine the following twenty propositions. I will give you more before this correspondence ceases.\*

Spiritualism is better calculated to elevate man than Judaism or Christianity, —

\* The substance of these propositions is taken from the author's manuscripts of a book since published by William White & Co., and for sale at their store, 14 Hanover Street, Boston. The title of the book is "The Contrast: Evangelicalism and Spiritualism Compared." Price \$1.50; postage 16 cents.

1. Because it recognizes the soul as being the highest authority. Its language is, Man has an inspiration which, if followed, will guide him as unerringly as the instincts of a bird will guide it on its wing.

2. Because it teaches that all spirit is the same, whether in God or man, and that the *lowest*, by virtue of their relationship with Deity, can, by proper effort, develop and bring into activity the God within.

3. Because, in denying the possibility of the pardon of sin in any sense of the word that would permit the culprits to escape the penalty, it teaches them to refrain from sin as the only means of happiness here and hereafter.

4. Because the evidences of its phenomena are more in harmony with reason, and better certified than those of the Bible. Its phenomena, being proved by living witnesses, are established by as much better evidence than those of the Bible as "a living dog is better than a dead lion."

5. Because it is the only religion that teaches the absolute equality of men. Even Jesus calls the Gentiles "dogs," and urges that "it is not meet to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs;" and when he commissioned his disciples to preach, his first commission was, "Into any city of the Gentiles enter ye not;" the second was, to "begin at Jerusalem."

6. Because it teaches that perfection never having been attained by any one in this life, there is room to live a better life than ever was lived, and urges upon each one to take as an example the good of all historic characters, and in themselves develop some good never yet illustrated in humanity.

7. Because it is the only religion that teaches that

the standard by which every one is to be judged can not be swerved by any *extraneous* power, such as prayer, sacrifices, or the blood of the atonement.

8. Because, instead of looking to a future day of judgment, when an arbitrary tyrant shall reward or punish men for the belief or disbelief of a dogma, it teaches that every man shall here and hereafter receive the *consequence* of every act.

9. Because it teaches that every man must be true to his condition. It would, therefore, treat the kleptomaniac or murderer as diseased, and find a refuge and proper medical treatment for him, thus elevating him beyond the possibility of committing crime.

10. Because it makes the practice of the virtues the only path to happiness here and hereafter. It allows no supererogative work to step between man and his duty.

11. Because it places all men on the same basis, teaching that all are children of the same family, and believing that the ultimate destiny of all is to happiness, it, instead of saying, "Let him that is filthy be filthy still," works for the elevation of those whom others recognize as incorrigible.

12. Because it teaches the principle of fellowship of the entire human family, while Christianity only teaches the fellowship of a certain class, urging that some are of their father, the devil, while others, on certain conditions, may become the children of our Father in heaven.

13. Because it is the only religion that teaches man that the only method of elevating himself is by the elevation of others, thus giving him a stimulus to work for others in order to help himself.

14. Because its revelations and documents are always written in the language of those for whom it is written, thus saving its adherents the valuable time and money thrown away by others in the study of languages that no erudition can enable one to perfectly understand, thus giving its adherents more time for the pursuit of ethical and scientific studies.

15. Because it teaches, as did ancient heathenism, as Paul was compelled to acknowledge, that man is the offspring of God, a part and parcel of nature, and thus invites its adherents to the study of nature in order that they may understand themselves: thus time thrown away in the study of a book which teaches that God and nature are at war with each other, is by the Spiritualists spent in looking through science to nature's God.

16. Because it advocates the principle of self-abnegation here in order to perfect happiness here and hereafter, thus enabling its adherents to endure the scoffs and sneers of an infidel Christianity.

17. Because it lifts its adherents out of a cold church materialism, and gives them a knowledge of endless life.

18. Because it calls the mind away from the weak, revengeful, passionate, illiterate human spirit that the Bible calls God, and bids its adherents behold God in all nature.

19. Because it does not compel its adherents, by forms, ceremonies, and memorials, to remember that a Christ was once on earth, but bids them now find him afflicted, sick, and imprisoned, and minister unto his wants.

20. Because it to-day carries with it living tests



that no other religion has, that the ministers of other religions dare not even see, lest they should be converted and healed.

VIII. You ask whether the Spiritualism I wish you to embrace is orderly or disorderly. I answer, *yes*. My Spiritualism is both a philosophy and religion. Some of it is written in books, some of it is not. It teaches "for truth" that man, as a spiritual being, is allied to the world of spirits; that spirit comes *en rapport* with spirit, whether in or out of the body. Thus it puts the *fact* of spirit communion as demonstrative, and therefore "authoritative." "What has it done to make its adherents better?" I answer, in the language of Paul, "Much every way."

Hoping to hear from you soon, and that our correspondence may soon develop into a pointed and concise presentation of the issues between us.

Permit me to subscribe myself

Your brother,

MOSES HULL.

## W. F. PARKER'S SECOND LETTER.

CEDAR HILL, near LA GRANGE, KY., }  
June 11, 1872. }

MOSES HULL, Esq.

DEAR BROTHER: Your very long letter is at hand. I have plodded through it with considerable interest, as I always feel pleased with your *ideas*, although I consider them totally out of the pale of truth. I need not occupy space in returning to you assurances that

your fraternal feeling toward me finds always its reflection in me.

Your letter contains so many *things said*, that if I were to pay even a passing attention to them, my letter would swell into colossal proportions, greater than those of your last epistle. I shall, therefore, leave a multitude of things unnoticed, and let them "go to the jury" for what they are worth. Still, I will endeavor to dig out the important matters, and consider them as fully as possible without being tedious.

You are at liberty to put into print anything I may write; and you may continue to write me whatever number of letters you shall please, and if I can find time from my other duties I will promptly respond.

I. Your supposition that I consider myself a brother only of a *class* of persons for whom Jesus of Nazareth died, is quite erroneous. Jesus did not die for a "class," but "*for the world*" — for humanity. Hence I would say, that I love all men, and esteem them brethren, for the following reasons: —

1. Because God "*hath made of one blood all nations of men.*" Acts xvii. 26.

2. Because all men are the objects alike of the divine love and providence.

3. Because the individual growth into better things depends on the aggregate growth, and *vice versa*, God having made all men thus mutually dependent.

4. Because the Christ laid down his life *for all men*, thus linking all men to the same individual center, and thus expressing the true idea of universal brotherhood.

Besides these reasons, which I think are more and better than you can give *for your* love of all men, the

Bible, Christianity, gives many others why I should be a *brother to every human being on earth*.

I have examined the passage to which you refer in Matt. xii. 46-50. You quote it to prove that Jesus did not have the spirit of *universal brotherhood* in his heart. Now, to my mind, the spirit of universal brotherhood breathes in every word of it. You say every man is inspired—every man does the will of God. Jesus says, "*Whosoever* shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." You certainly ought not to impute narrowness to Jesus.

But when you contemplate Jesus growing up amidst the prejudices of the Jewish people, and speaking and acting as he does, as though those prejudices were totally alien from him, you must find in him an expression of fraternity for man before which yours and mine pales into nothingness, since our education and training have been begun and carried on under the influence of a constant inculcation of that duty by our parents and teachers, as well as by the spirit of the age in which we live. Compare the spirit of Jesus with the spirit of the age in which he lived, and you will never again accuse him of narrowness.

II. In your first letter you said, "To believe that God will go out of his way to put some persons into hell because they do not believe certain propositions, and take others to heaven because of a faith in certain dogmas, is an absurdity that, I beg leave to suggest, is out of harmony with your general character." I denied that these ideas find any support either from the Old or New Testament. You proceed to show me the Bible proof of your words. You quote four

passages. You should have given the words, not the places only where the words could be found. Give us hereafter the language of the passages to which you refer; then we shall be able to see at once whether your language can be found in holy writ.

In Matt. v. 29, 30, not one word is said about "dogmas" or "propositions" of any kind; not one word is said of "believing" or *not believing* anything.

The same is true of your second passage.

The same is true of your third passage, and *the same is true of your fourth* passage. Such proof, my brother, looks quite suspicious.

III. As to the "inspiration" of such beings as Confucius, A. J. Davis, &c., the question nauseates me. It only shows how degraded human reason may become when it finds pleasure in defending so unhappy a theory. I do not allude to your reason, but to the reason of those persons who believe in "inspiration," and that Confucius and Davis were inspired. You do not believe in inspiration at all. With you there is no such anomaly.

You promise me many pages of proof that Moses, Isaiah, &c., were "fallible men." I admit that they were fallible *men*. I deny that they were fallible *prophets*. I deny that their teachings, uttered as *teachings*, are fallible. Of course the proof you promise us will be forthcoming. I remember a little book you once published called God's and the Devil's Mediums—The Contrast. In that document you attempt to array proof of the fallibility of God's prophets. Of course you will reproduce that proof. I desire you to do it. When that promised evidence shall be adduced, you will find me ready to correct you.

IV. In your fourth section you profess to give me some instances in "Judaism and Christianity," showing that modern Spiritualism "is a reproduction of the phenomenal part of all former religions." You, in these instances, allude to certain angel ministrations, and boldly say these find "equals in modern trance speaking." I deny *in toto* your statement. There is no *likeness*, let alone *identity*, in the cases. I do not see how a sane mind can be so oblivious to such significant facts as yours seems to be in viewing the record of Bible phenomena. I shall spend no time on your proof texts now, as this very matter will doubtless be brought before us again, and then your proof shall be effectually ventilated.

V. You ask me, "Then you do think there is authoritative teaching somewhere. Please tell me in your next where it is, and who is the teacher."

I respond, 1. I do so think.

2. Jesus is the teacher.

3. The Scriptures give us the teaching.

The evidences of Christianity are before the people. It does not devolve upon me to defend Christianity by proving it true; it does devolve upon you to prove Christianity false, *if you can*. As you may desire a brief statement of one or two reasons why I answer your query as I do, I submit.

1. The Old Testament proves itself true, consequently authoritative, in proving its author the Om-niscient God.

2. The New Testament proves itself true, and Jesus authority, in proving that he is the Son of God.

If these two propositions be true, — and true they are, — has Spiritualism anything better to offer?

VI. On your sixth point I shall say nothing, any further than this: By "imitation" in your first letter I understood you to mean that Christianity was only an imitation of some imposture preceding its appearance. I think this was what you desired me to understand. But since you have abandoned that idea, I agree with you that "Christianity" is *an imitation of Christ*.

VII. I come now to your "magnitudinous" catalogue of reasons why Spiritualism is better calculated to elevate humanity than Christianity.

Am I to closely and critically try your reasons? You certainly do not expect that. Besides, such an examination is not demanded; for I perceive that the substance of your twenty ponderous reasons has actually been "borrowed" from Christianity.

1. Your first reason says, "Because it (Spiritualism) recognizes the soul as being the highest authority." Now, unfortunately for the claims of Spiritualism, Christ gave to the world the first true ideas of the soul, and its education for time and eternity. Outside of Christianity I know nothing that looks like a doctrine of the soul. I am aware that certain ancients have said some things about the soul; but those things were ever said hesitatingly, and I may say inquiringly. They doubted as to its existence. And as for the higher life of the soul, the perfection of its immortal capacities for endless happiness, I think the idea was totally unknown to them. The true doctrine of the soul is found in the teachings of Jesus.

It is a proposition which you can not prove, when you say the soul is its own highest authority. I would like to see you make good this proposition. If the

proposition is not true, then Spiritualism is welcome to all the advantages of an error. If it is true, it gives Spiritualism no grounds to boast over Christianity. God, even, in the gospel appeals to the soul, and in no instance does it any violence, thus recognizing its total freedom. It is this freedom of the soul that looks so lovely to you, and which you would have me accept as a doctrine of Spiritualism. But this freedom of the soul to choose or reject even what God proffers it is what everywhere finds expression in the soul doctrines of Jesus.

Man has been following his "inspiration" for thousands of years, and I am unable to see anything into which it has "unerringly guided him," unless it has been into folly, excess, crime, and misery. Spiritualism may have all it can gain from its doctrine of universal "inspiration." I feel certain that the doctrine of *special* inspiration has many fruitful advantages over it.

2. Your second reason, when translated into correct speech, is entirely borrowed from Christianity.

3. Your third reason demands a little attention. You say Spiritualism denies the possibility of any pardon for any fault, and that therefore it is better calculated to make men moral and happy than Christianity, which teaches that all sins against God and man may be pardoned. I can not see the advantage claimed here by Spiritualism. The inevitable punishment of sin is a cardinal doctrine of the Bible. The doctrine of Christianity here is clear. It is this: 1. All are here for the formation of *a character* for eternity. 2. Every deed done, word uttered, or thought indulged, *fixes its stamp upon the character*. 3. Hence

all the terrors of an eternally deformed character are held up by the gospel before the wicked to deter them from the pursuit of folly and sin, and to incite them to the cultivation of the soul's faculties for eternal life. Spiritualism can do no more than this. Even this teaching of Christianity, Spiritualism would steal, and parade as its own. But Spiritualism repudiates the doctrine of pardon entirely, you say. Then of course it would take out of the human heart the spirit of pardon, and it would blot out of our vocabulary the term pardon. Shylock's pound of flesh is Spiritualism's principle and spirit. No more pardon on earth, no more pardon in heaven; for the doctrine is full of evil, and the practice is worse than the doctrine. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, blood for blood, is the law of Spiritualism. I do not see how you are to escape these horrible consequences. I rather think the compassionate, forgiving disposition of the gospel will be more in accordance with the wants of the soul, and better calculated to induce bad men to become good.

4. Your fourth reason says, "The evidences of its phenomena are more in harmony with reason," &c.

With whose reason?

Give us some of the "*evidences* of its phenomena, which are more in harmony with reason" than the evidences of Christianity.

Christianity is a logic — a proposition and its homogeneous proof.

Spiritualism is not a logic; it has no proposition with its homogeneous proof. It is a mass of assertions taken from every source, and offered upon the most heterogeneous phenomena. Spiritualists have not de-



terminated what Spiritualism is ; whether it is a science, a philosophy, a religion, or anything else. The phenomena on which they lean are self-contradictory ; their " inspirations " are self-contradictory ; their teachings are self-contradictory ; everything in Spiritualism is self-contradictory, hence false and destructive. If these things be not so, you are the man to show it.

5. Your fifth reason is stolen from Christianity. You say Spiritualism is the *only religion* that teaches the absolute equality of man. Now, sir, you have read the New Testament to little advantage, or you could not have made such an erroneous statement. Jesus was the first to teach the universal Fatherhood of God, and brotherhood of man. The passages alluded to by you all confirm my statement, when they are viewed, as they should be, in the light of Christ's own teaching.

6. Your sixth reason, which is based on the fact that Spiritualism teaches that the crimes and errors of this life *can be* and *will be* corrected in the life to come, I consider unfortunate indeed. In one of your reasons you have every man punished without any hope of pardon, and in this you hold out the prospect of pardon, after a life spent in the most horrid excesses and crimes.

I know no doctrine better calculated to keep men in the practice of crime in this life than that which teaches them that they shall have opportunity for repentance after death. I only know one thing worse than this in its moral effects, and that is, the doctrine of some Spiritualists, that crime and virtue are equally meritorious and praiseworthy.

Christianity teaches us that the human spirit will always progress. Like God in its attributes, infinity of growth is before it. Spiritualism has borrowed even this doctrine from Christianity.

7. I am unable to understand your seventh reason. If you intend to say that Spiritualism is the only religion which has a standard by which every one is to be judged, which can not be removed by anything such as prayer, sacrifices, or the blood of atonement, then I say, your reason is groundless; for while Christianity teaches an atonement effected by blood, and sacrifices, and prayers, yet the standard is always the same, and can not be put out of the way. Will you be so kind as to tell me what the standard is by which Spiritualism has anything judged? What is the judgment of which you speak? Who is the judge? What is the code of law by which actions are to be tried? What are the sanctions of the laws of that code? And what is the power by which the sanction is enforced? I was not before this hour aware that Spiritualism had borrowed even the Bible doctrine of retribution, a judge, a judgment, and a penalty, together with an unerring standard of rectitude. Give us a little "light" here, if you please.

8. Your eighth reason is worded more from imagination than from knowledge of Bible teaching. "Arbitrary tyrant," punishing for "disbelief of a dogma," is a phantom of your own. But that "every man shall here and hereafter receive the consequences of every act" is the doctrine of Christianity. "For *whatsoever* a man soweth, that *shall* he also reap." Gal. vi. 7. "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*; much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. xi. 31.

9. There is more "fancy" in your ninth reason than philosophy. Its spirit pervades Christianity, i. e., the spirit that should impel us to sympathy for the fallen and effort for his rescue. "Brethren," says Paul, "if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, *restore such an one* in the spirit of meekness." Gal. vi. 1.

What kind of medical treatment will cure kleptomania? What kind of physic will cure a murderer of his thirst for blood? If physic or medical treatment can do these moral works, will not Christian physicians do as well as any other? How many kleptomaniacs and murderers has Spiritualism "*elevated beyond the possibility of committing crime*" during the last twenty-five years?

10. Your tenth is taken "body and soul" out of the "*Army of faith*." That is Christianity, not Spiritualism. Please do not spend labor to convert me to my own religion.

11. So also is your eleventh, according to the interpretation of Universalists. Hence you have borrowed the idea of universal salvation from teachers professedly Christian. But you teach a different doctrine from this, when you teach that there is no pardon.

12. Your twelfth reason — universal fellowship — is one of the cardinal items of the gospel. It grows out of the universal Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man, and finds ample statement in the words of the Lord: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that *men* should do to you, do ye even so to them." Matt. vii. 12.

13. Your thirteenth reason is also appropriated from Christianity.

14. I give you all your fourteenth reason can avail you. But with wise men, who have given much study to this matter, it will avail you little.

15. I see nothing in your fifteenth reason which gives Spiritualism any advantage over Christianity; for Christianity teaches that God is the father of all; that man is his workmanship, hence a part of what is called nature; that to study nature is to know God and the works of God; that the Christian's God is the God of nature, and that nature and God are in complete harmony; that the Author of the Bible is the Author of nature; and he who knows nature best is best able to know the Bible. See Dr. McCosh's Typical Forms in Creation.

16. I deny that your sixteenth reason is to be found in the teachings of modern Spiritualism at all, so far as I have been able to examine the documents of your teachers. On the other hand, I can adduce abundance of proof that your teachers advocate an almost unbridled license, in consequence of which one of your luminaries has said concerning the teaching of your Rabbis, —

We are taught that "those that act the worst will progress the fastest;" that "we must go through hell to get to heaven;" that a certain drunken woman of ill fame "will become more noble than she otherwise could;" that "sin is a lesser degree of righteousness;" that "there is no high, no low, no good, no bad;" that "murder is right, lying is right, adultery is right;" that "whatever is, is right;" that "it is wrong to blame any;" that "none should be punished;" that "we must not expose iniquity, because it will harden the guilty;" that "the union of the sexes is a great

help to mediums to get spiritual elements," but "if the parties are not adapted, it is a great evil, and an awful wrong;" that "as people develop, they become unadapted and poison each other;" that "affinities will be perfectly satisfied with each other;" that "to live together without perfect love is worse than prostitution," &c., &c.

What are the results? Just what every student of human nature ought to expect.

And now, as to the principle of self-denial, the gospel lays that down as indispensably necessary to all reformation of life and character, in order to "happiness here or hereafter." I sincerely object to your appropriating gospel livery for the service of Spiritualism.

17. So does Christianity.

18. Your eighteenth reason will demand a little more attention than I have been able to give some other items.

You have, in your various publications and speeches, said much against the character of the God of Moses. But what you have said is by no means original with you. For over eighteen centuries certain enemies of the Bible have endeavored to show that the God of the Jews was a monster of vice and meanness; and yet I have failed to see any evidence that would justify the insinuations and slanders heaped upon the divine name. That Moses and Joshua have recorded some things which *we in this age think* derogatory to the divine character is true. But when those records are viewed in connection with the facts which called them forth, I think they give a proper representation of the mat-

ter, and lose all the horror with which they seem to be clothed.

It was not for Moses to tell the whole truth. The revelation of the divine character in history was a progressive work; and it was left for Jesus to give a full manifestation of the character of God. Your interpretation of the divine character should embrace all that Jesus has disclosed; and I know that he has given such a description of the divine character, as to more than explain and remove the apparent difficulties met with in the Old Testament records. I say apparent difficulties, because I am sure the conclusions you draw from the Old Testament records are not justified by those records. And when you shall present the particular facts constituting your evidence, I shall be ready to show you that they do not justify your reproaches cast upon the divine name.

The Christian documents have given a full exhibition of the perfection of God's character. Nor has Spiritualism a correct idea of God which it has not borrowed from those very documents. If you think I am in error here, you will please inform me of any discovery in this direction for which the world is indebted to your "religio-philosophy."

Your eighteenth reason you thus boldly enounce: "Because it calls the mind away from the *weak, revengeful, passionate, illiterate* HUMAN SPIRIT that the *Bible* calls God, and bids its adherents behold *God in all nature.*" This certainly is one thing which pretentious Spiritualism *does not* borrow from Christianity. And this is one thing, which, to my mind, covers Spiritualism with the most horrible shame. It fairly expresses the *animus* of Spiritualism. It fairly mani-

feats the desperate extremes to which the fallacies of Spiritualism drive its adherents.

I simply affirm that the "*Bible*" knows no such "human spirit" called "God." Of course you will now proceed to repeat, for the ten thousandth time, the distorted, perverted, and unreasonable "facts" which the enemies of "God" have repeated from the foundation of the Christian age, drawn from the ancient Scripture records, in total disregard of legitimate canons of interpretation, and in a total disregard of all other facts in the case, which condemn and overwhelm with confusion the imputations cast upon the Jehovah of the Bible. When your catalogue of stale quotations shall be spread before me, I will give them a proper ventilation.

But your joy rises high enough when you try to persuade yourself and me that Spiritualism "bids its adherents behold God in all nature." That *bid* is an equivocal one. Do you intend to say that Spiritualism "bids its adherents behold" "in all nature" the works of God, a Creator, Governor, and Sustainer? Then I say Spiritualism teaches its adherents to behold *no such thing*, unless it has changed its teachings within the past few weeks. Christianity so bids its adherents. And so the Bible teaches all to learn God "in the works of his hands," "the heavens, the earth, and all things that in them are." If you mean to say that Spiritualism "bids its adherents behold God *in all nature*, God in mud, filth, dung, grass, and flesh, then I say a God made out of a "weak, revengeful, passionate, illiterate *human spirit*" would be inexpressibly the better one. You would ask me to reject Bible Deism for the unphilosophical and degrading belief of Pantheism.

Google

Never, no, never, my brother. Will you tell me wherein your stone-god, mud-god, filth-god, dung-god, vegetable-god, and flesh-god, is better than the all-wise, all-powerful, just, holy, benevolent, merciful, and philanthropic infinite Spirit, called God in the Bible? I wait anxiously your answer.

19. As to your next reason, I will say, —

1. In your repudiating “forms, ceremonies, and memorials,” you declare Spiritualism totally unadapted to *human nature*.

2. Christianity, in providing these, gives to us, as human creatures, what our nature demands in an effective religion.

3. These in Christianity are not only, as you would have me believe, “to remember that there *was once* a Christ on earth.” By no means. But these keep alive that fruitful remembrance, and embody the grand spiritual and philanthropic spirit of Christianity, always stimulating its force in the individual and collective heart of Christians.

4. Spiritualism has nothing of this kind; hence such doleful complaints as these:—

“In addition to an increase of *co-operative unity of method*, and systematized order, Spiritualists need more culture and a *deeper religious baptism*.”—*Year Book*, 1871, p. 25.

“If we wish to spread what we believe to be the truth, we must pursue a different course from the past; if we do not, as a society, Spiritualists *are dead*—*past resurrection*.”—*Year Book*, p. 85.

5. Hear a Spiritualist on Christianity:—

“*Instrumentalities* are as necessary as *principles*. Christianity, considered organically, is, comparatively



speaking, PERFECTION. . . . Spiritualists, therefore, should *adopt the methods of the church.*" Cephas B. Lynn. — *Year Book*, p. 98.

I object to your adopting "the methods of the church," and then trying to persuade me and the world that Spiritualism is *better* than "*perfection.*"

6. Christianity, not Spiritualism, teaches men "now to find Christ sick, afflicted, and imprisoned, and to minister to him," in finding the sick, afflicted, and imprisoned among men, and in ministering to them, whilst I have seen multitudes of Christians doing this work, I never yet have seen a Spiritualist doing it. Why will you, my brother, continue to palm off upon me what you have borrowed from Christianity for "the teachings of modern Spiritualism"?

20. Your twentieth reason is the "cap-sheaf."

I respond, 1. The "living tests" of Spiritualism are worth nothing — for *they prove nothing.*

2. I admit that "no other religion has" them, because "no other religion" needs them.

3. "Ministers" have seen them and do see them, and know that, though remarkable in some respects, they prove nothing good which is not better proved by Bible evidence. In fact they know these "living tests" prove nothing for *any religion.*

As you have given twenty reasons for thinking Spiritualism better calculated to elevate humanity mentally, morally, and spiritually, I will now submit twenty reasons why I think Christianity is better calculated to effect those ends.

1. Because it puts man under the highest *authority* — God.

2. Because it offers to him a social relationship *with* God — "they shall be to me sons."

3. Because it teaches that there is such a thing as *pardon*; and as we desire it, so must we exercise it.

4. Because it gives us all the true phenomena, of which those of modern Spiritualism are base imitations only, better certified, and more consonant with reason and necessity.

5. Because it gives a social organization, in which all are equal, and, bound by the same ties, are under equal obligations to work for each other's good.

6. Because it gives to every one the ideal man whose life was so holy, pure, and exalted, that a repetition of it in the lives of others must make them peculiarly holy, and always growing better.

7. Because it gives a rule of life, speaking to all the same language, by which action may be tried, and thus performed or rejected, as determined to be right or wrong.

8. Because it clearly declares a day in which the deeds of all shall be tried by an unerring standard, and rewarded and punished according to fact.

9. Because it provides for an intelligent judgment, to be determined by an unerring judge.

10. Because there is not a conceivable virtue which it does not enjoin, nor a vice which it does not in principle condemn.

11. Because it expresses a sympathy felt for man; and sympathy being the need of every natural being, and promotive of purity and spirituality, it is excellently calculated to elevate man.

12. Because it teaches the principle of fellowship as nothing else ever did, by which the valuable and desirable acquisitions of one become the joint inheritance of every member of the body.

13. Because it presents to every man an object of individual interest, and thus furnishes a bond attractive to all; and thus bringing all into one fraternity it elevates all by elevating each one.

14. Because, embracing so many documents in such a variety of languages, it necessitates the study of language and the cultivation of letters.

15. Because it establishes a closer relationship between us and God, it forms a link which binds us to nature as the work of God, and therefore truly becomes the legitimate patron and prosecutor of science, — more science in Christianity than out of it, — and out of Christian nations science is hardly known.

16. Because it advocates the *principle of self-denial*, out of which flows all reformation, and holds out incentives to that superior to anything dreamed of in Spiritualism.

17. Because it gives man a basis for faith superior to anything in Spiritualism.

18. Because it gives us a better object of worship — the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

19. Because it gives us *memorials* of which Spiritualism is totally barren.

20. Because it gives us something which has stood the test of nearly nineteen hundred years, and demonstrated its adaptation to the entire race.

Hoping to hear from you again soon, and that you will bring out more clearly the better things of Spiritualism, I am, as ever,

Affectionately yours, &c.,

W. F. PARKER.

## MOSES HULL'S THIRD LETTER.

LOUISVILLE, KY., July 2, 1872.

MY GOOD BROTHER: Yours of June 11 has this day fallen into my hands. Now that our correspondence is to develop into an epistolary discussion for the benefit of the multitude, I will try to let it take more the shape of a discussion, and will agree to limit the number of my letters to twelve, neither of which shall exceed ten pages of foolscap. And with this limitation it will hardly be possible for us to examine every argument and assertion made by each other; so, when I leave points in your letters unnoticed, I trust you will not attribute it to a lack of courtesy, but rather to the fact that I have matter for my space that seems to me more important.

I. I am a little astonished that you should confess yourself "so pleased" with my ideas, that are "so totally out of the pale of truth." I must confess myself better pleased with the few *truthful* ideas you have than the others. Yet I will go as far as I can with you. I am pleased with your mode of expressing even your untruthful ideas.

II. I am truly pleased at your efforts to extend your fraternal feelings. It is magnanimous. What a man you would be if it were not for your religion! In your first letter you say, "I am the brother of every

man for whom Jesus of Nazareth died." But in paragraph marked I., in your second letter, you say, "Your supposition that I consider myself a brother only of a class for whom Jesus of Nazareth died is quite erroneous." My brother, "I accept the amendment." You are nearer the kingdom than you were when you wrote before.

III. And so you think that Jesus indorses my doctrine, that every man does in a certain sense do the will of God. In this you are mistaken. While he acknowledges none as brothers only those who do the will of God, he emphatically denies that all do his will. Have you forgotten Jesus' Sermon on the Mount? You could get instruction from it. Here is an extract: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but *he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven*. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. vii. 21-23. See also Luke vi. 46. You think Jesus' parentage, associates, and education were inclined to be a hindrance to his fraternal feelings for all humanity. If Jesus had been only an ordinary man, that excuse would help the matter; but as the third person in the Trinity, or the plenarily inspired Son of God, such surroundings should not have shrunk him to the dimensions manifested in some of his teachings.

IV. You object to the texts I referred you to, to show that certain persons were to be cast into hell;

that "not a word is said about dogmas, propositions, or beliefs." Very well; here are others.

"He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16.

"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

In Rev. xxi. 8, unbelieving is classed with criminal offenses, and is a reason for casting certain ones into the lake of fire and brimstone.

V. I am heartily glad you have read my little book, "Both Sides." A perusal of that and other such works will help you; but you want proofs of the fallibility of the inspiration of Bible prophets. You acknowledge that as men they were fallible. I am glad you see that they were made of the same material as other men, that if they were at times inspired, others may be, and if others err, they may. Some of these great men supposed their predictions had been fulfilled, but a reconsideration by wiser heads proved that they had not. Thus Joshua said, "Not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof." Josh. xxiii. 14. On this subject the first Christian martyr differed widely with Joshua. Stephen's dying words were, "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: *Yet he promised that he would give it to him* for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child." Acts vii. 5. See also, for a contradiction to this, Josh. xxi. 43-45. For proof that Moses was mistaken,

see his history of the creation, of making woman out of a man's rib, of the flood, the ark and its bill of lading, of Abraham chasing his enemies to a place that did not exist in his day. That he was morally a bad man, is proved by his commands to "spoil the Egyptians;" to deliver a stubborn, rebellious, gluttonous, or drunken son up to death; to put your own child to death for a difference of religious opinion; to sell bad meat to strangers; to buy, own, sell, and sometimes kill slaves; to exterminate male Midianites, and save alive females for themselves. Other points might be mentioned, but space forbids. For proof of each count in this indictment, see Gen. i. 14-19, ii. 18-25, vi. and vii., whole chapters; Gen. xiv. 14; Judges xviii. 29; Ex. xii. 35; Deut. xxi. 18; Deut. xiii. 6-9; Deut. xiv. 21; Lev. xxv. 44; Exod. xxi. 20; Num. xxxi. 17.

If I were to walk naked, as Isaiah did, you would call it strong proof of fallibility. See Is. xx. 2-4. Jeremiah several times confessed that his inspirations deceived him. See Jer. xx. 7.

VI. And so I have proved my insanity, instead of proving the similarity of modern spiritualism to ancient manifestations? Well, that is a cheap way of meeting an argument. Whether it is effectual, our readers must judge.

VII. What queer reasons you have for believing the Old and New Testaments true? "The Old Testament proves itself true, and consequently authoritative, in proving its author the Omniscient God." The Latins would call that a complete *petitio principii*. Suppose the Old Testament proved the omniscient God to be its author; would that make the quail

story, or Jonah and his whale story, true? Would that make Ahaziah two years older than his father, or would it make it right for you to bestow your money for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever your soul lusts after? Num. xii. 31; Jonah i. 17; 2 Chron. xxi. 20, 22, 23; Deut. xiv. 26. So far from the Old Testament having come from an Omniscient God, the God who figures in it always proved himself otherwise. He had to put a bow in the cloud, lest he should forget that he had destroyed the world with a flood! Gen. ix. 16. He had to come down to see the tower which the children of men builded. Gen. xi. 5. He could not believe the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were so wicked until he came down to see whether the report that had reached him was true. Gen. xviii. 21. He could not tell whether Abraham feared him until he tested him. Gen. xxii. 12.

I can not for my life see how Jesus being the son of God has anything to do with the truthfulness of the New Testament, for in your first section you acknowledge that we are all the offspring of God. Your argument would make all books authoritative and true. It is still more strange that *both* should be true. Is the Old Testament correct when it says, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"? Then the New Testament is wrong when it says, "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil."

Your sixth paragraph convinces me that you misunderstood my first letter.

VIII. I hardly expected, when you called on me for a "formulated statement," that you would notice it so slightly; yet the fault was mine. Had I given the subject more thought, I would have seen that you



could do no better than you have. Where did "Christ give the first true ideas of the soul"? Please give chapter and verse. My brother, since our friendly letters are taking the form of discussion, I would advise you to be careful of your statements. Then you deny that the soul is the highest authority? Please in your next point me to a higher authority. Is not your soul the umpire by which you try everything, even the Bible? I think it is.

I hardly know how to understand your doctrine of pardon. On one point *I know* you are mistaken. Your quotation, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, blood for blood," is from your own Bible. Please don't again commit the blunder of calling it Spiritualism. Your "Omniscient God," the author of the Old Testament, originated that saying. If there is a means to escape "the terrors of a deformed character, then that means will incline people to deform their character and use the means. If pardon does not enable them to escape the deformity, then tell me what it does for man.

So far as the "self-contradictory" phenomena, assertions, proofs, and logic of Spiritualism are concerned, they are self-contradictory, just as day contradicts night, the sun the rain, the heat the cold. The sun, by adding more light, does not contradict the moon. The small mind can see contradictions in all nature; the large one sees harmony where others can only see chaos.

IX. Your reply to my fifth proposition is so fully met in the proposition itself, that, until you meet that statement, I will "rest the case." I do not see how it is possible for any one to more thoroughly misun-

derstand anything than you have my sixth proposition. Please read it again. I will not reply to arguments so evidently based on a misunderstanding. You have made the best hit on my seventh reason of any you have touched. Your words are, "I am not able to understand your seventh reason." If you had written that after each one of my propositions, you could have proved your assertion by the other statements you made with regard to them. I think, from your reply to my eighth proposition, you have adopted Universalism. Good: that is on the right road; only don't stop too long at that station. Christian physicians might help carry out my ninth argument, if it were not that *their Christianity prevents their acknowledging the truth*, and applying the remedies for sin. The "Army of Faith" that you accuse me of taking my tenth proposition, "body and soul," from, I never heard of; would like to see it. If it has that much truth in it, it is ahead of ordinary Christian documents. Where did I teach a "universal salvation"? Where did I teach a salvation at all, that would allow an individual to escape the consequence of his actions?

I am astonished that you should say, "Universal fellowship is one of the cardinal items of the gospel." I had understood Paul to say, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness?" 2 Cor. vi. 14. "From such withdraw thyself;" "From such turn away;" and other like expressions are used in the New Testament to show that certain persons should not be fellowshipped.

X. Dr. McCosh's "Typical Forms in Creation" may

be good ; still I had rather you would have referred me to the passage of Scripture that proved my fifteenth proposition, rather than to prove by Dr. McCosh that I had found its substance in the Bible. Your indorsement of my sixteenth reason is good ; but it was spoiled by your quotation from our "Luminary." Why did you not tell us who the "luminary" was? Ah! that would have spoiled the quotation, as our "luminary" would have turned out to be one of your *allies*. Yes, more than an *ally* of yours against Spiritualism, for I do not believe you would *invent* a lie against Spiritualism, and *you know* he would.

I am glad you have come to the conclusion, "that Moses and Joshua have recorded some things derogatory of the divine character." As you "are a nineteenth century man," you will adopt the teachings of the present age, and leave Moses and Joshua where they belong. The world has advanced nearly three thousand years since their day; let us "keep pace with the truth." I am glad to hear you acknowledge that the New Testament is an improvement on the Old Testament, which you inform me had "an Omniscient God for its author."

I think you must have been nervous when you wrote your reply to my eighteenth reason. Does not the heat overcome you? Are you not working too hard this hot weather? Take care of your health. You have introduced the first "dung-god" I ever heard of. You are welcome to him. You know there is no accounting for tastes.

II. You make several very fine quotations from the "Year Book," and seem to think it would be impossible for us to adopt the "methods of the church

without adopting its doctrines." In this you are mistaken. The southern army adopted, as far as possible, the methods of our northern army, but not its principles.

XII. As your twenty statements are simply the converse of mine, our readers will find an abundant reply by re-reading my statements in the concluding part of my second letter. I will not now offer a further reply.

XIII. Permit me to conclude this letter by giving a list of reasons why the teachings of the Old and New Testament Scriptures can not, in the first sense of the word, be morally elevating.

1. They make good works only *secondary* in the development of manhood, urging other things as being of more importance. Proof, Eph. ii. 8, 9; Rom. iii. 20, 27, 28.

2. They love sin, and, in fact, make sin the foundation of all happiness. Proof, Rom. vi. 17; Luke vii. 47.

3. Their best teacher did not himself know how to perform that which was right: how, then, can they teach the right to others? Proof, Rom. vii. 14-25.

4. They teach that a person may escape the consequences of sin. Proof, 1 John i. 7.

5. They lead to war, rapine, and the shedding of blood. Proof, Num. xxxi. 1, 17; Jer. xlviii. 10; Joel iii. 10-14; Luke xxii. 36.

6. They warn against education and philosophy. Proof, Eccl. i. 16-18, vii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 1-4, 14, 38; Col. ii. 8.

7. They urge men to hate and forsake their families. Proof, Matt. x. 34-38; Luke xiv. 26.

8. They lead to intemperance. Proof, Deut. xiv. 26; Prov. xxxi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 28.

A want of space has prevented quoting the Scriptures to which I have referred.

Hoping for an early response, and that *truth* may be the gainer, as the result of this agitation of thought,

I subscribe myself, not only fraternally, but

Controversially yours,

MOSES HULL.

### W. F. PARKER'S THIRD REPLY.

CEDAR HILL, near LA GRANGE, KY., }  
July 8, 1872. }

BROTHER HULL: Your third epistle reached me this morning, and, as usual, I promptly respond.

I. You seem to conclude that you must now suffer our "correspondence to develop into an epistolary discussion for the benefit of the multitude." Well, I am glad of it, as you doubtlessly will now buckle on your armor and come up to your contest with the Bible with courage and effectiveness. Up to this time I have failed to see the strength, or "merit of your cause." And so inconclusive and unfortunate have been your assaults upon the fortifications of my faith in Christianity, that really, unless you do much better in your remaining nine letters, I shall be forced to believe that modern Spiritualism is a greater delusion than I had imagined. You desired to convert me to the "Harmonial Philosophy." To do this you kindly wrote me, and placed before me some of your objections to the Bible and Christianity. I supposed you would lay before my mind something which would

deserve serious consideration, and something, too, which might dispose me to reject the "ancient faith." I am further from Spiritualism than ever. I can not tell how great a distance I shall yet have placed between me and that; but certainly I see no prospect of anything less than an "infinite distance." Still, as you now conclude to descend into the arena of "discussion," I suppose I shall have to feel your athletic *blows* as the champion of the Harmonial cause. Please give us henceforth your strength. Come to the point. Prove to me that spiritualistic writers are *better* than Bible writers; that spiritualistic *writings* are better calculated to make good, happy, prosperous men than Bible writings; that spiritualistic *facts* are better facts, better in their moral, intellectual, and domestic bearings, than the facts of Bible history; in fact, prove to me that Spiritualism has one good thing in it which is not better found in the Bible or Christianity.

II. Of course, when you wrote me your last letter, you did not expect me to notice a large part of it. So I will let many items pass to the "jury" without further remark.

III. I shall notice your third item. You say, "And so you think Jesus indorses my doctrine, that every man does, in a certain sense, do the will of God." No, I did not, and now do not say it. Please read that paragraph again.

Nor did I say that Jesus was influenced by his "parentage, associates, and education," so as to affect "his fraternal feelings for all humanity." I think, on another reading of that passage, you will find that I said that Jesus entertained those fraternal feelings for humanity, in spite of his surroundings; which fact

proves Jesus to have been beyond the laws by which every other person has been prepared for his work in life. You can not find in the surroundings of Jesus anything which can account for his character, teachings, and power. Try it.

IV. As to your fourth item, your proof texts do not prove your proposition at all. The gospel is not a "dogma." It is the *revelation* of a *true life*; it is the *manifestation* of a *true life*; it is an *exemplification* of a *true life*; and if your life and mine be not the true life, then, according to your own showing, eternal punishment is the inevitable doom. Herein is the overwhelming advantage of Christianity over Spiritualism. The former in its *facts* does give us *the true life*; the latter, up to this time, has not yet been able to tell even what a true life is; for the *true life* of one Spiritualist is the *false life* of another Spiritualist: all is dreamy, confused, dark, and totally unsatisfactory.

V. As to your fifth item, I deem it worth while to notice briefly a few points.

1. You fail utterly to show that one of the prophets, who "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," ever failed to foretell the *truth* verified by history.

2. You try to convince me and "the multitude" that certain of the Bible men were mistaken as to the fact in their teaching. You quote Joshua as saying, "Not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake *concerning you*; all are come to pass unto *you*, and not one thing hath failed thereof." Josh. xxiii. 14. Now, to prove Joshua a liar, and consequently the Bible false, you parade before me Acts vii. 5, "And he gave him none inheritance in it; no, not so much as to set

foot on. *Yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child.*"

Did you not know, my brother, when you collated those two passages, that you were perverting the record? Joshua was speaking of one thing; Stephen of another. Joshua was speaking of the promises of God to the Hebrews; Stephen of the promise of God to Abraham. Alas for the cause which must be bolstered up by such logic!

God did give the land to Abraham for a *possession*. As a gift, the land was Abraham's, notwithstanding the fact that at that time he was unable to enjoy it. His seed did enjoy it. And it is universally recognized to-day as the Jews' land, notwithstanding it has been trodden down of the Gentiles for more than eighteen centuries. You, therefore, are wrong again, and the Bible is right.

VI. As to the counts of your indictment, in which you imagine you array many damaging things against the Old Testament, I shall submit against you the words of one, who, in the Harmonial school, stands as "a shining light," and whose decisions are by very many accepted as unquestionable. I allude to Emma Hardinge. In a speech delivered January 2, 1870, at Harmonial Hall, Philadelphia, she says, "In the life of the Jewish lawgiver we find an especial mission to proclaim an external law, *so perfect, so admirable, that every form of life was provided for. It was perfect in its kind, wise, practical, and strictly adapted to . . . every description of morality. . . . Hence you perceive the strict necessity for such laws. . . . All the justice between man and man that was necessary*



*for strict order in social, commercial, and national life, are fully laid down."* Thus, by the words of Spiritualist Emma Hardinge, are the words of Spiritualist Moses Hull condemned. You have not progressed to her sphere.

VII. You seem considerably puzzled over the two reasons which I gave you for believing the Bible a divine book. I do not wonder. Were you as familiar as I am with the fullness of those reasons, you would cease trying to persuade men to reject the Bible. Of course I shall not give you in this correspondence an exposition of those reasons. You may learn their meaning pretty well, if you will take the trouble to read Walter Scott's "*Great Demonstration*." I dare say a candid, thoughtful reading of that valuable book will open your eyes to many of the excellences of Christianity with which you now seem to be totally unacquainted.

VIII. You charge upon me the misunderstanding of your statements. Perhaps I did misunderstand you. I tried hard to get your meaning; and I think I *got it*. I am more obtuse than I desire to be. I can not help it, however, and trust that *in future* you will write so perspicuously as to enable me to apprehend your meaning, certainly after *the third reading*. But if I misunderstood you, why did you not, in your last letter, tell me just what you did mean? I submit your points and my rejoinders to the jury — the "multitude" for whom we write.

IX. I perceive you feel the disastrous effect of my few words on your "eighteenth reason." I see you are ashamed of the Pantheism which you would substitute for Bible Deism. You blush. There is hope

for one on whose cheek can glow the "mantling blush of shame." My brother, why do you not show me by fact, by logic, that Pantheism is better than Theism? What logic is there in this style of writing—"Are you not working too hard this hot weather? Take care of your health." You make God matter, and all matter God. Dung is matter; hence dung is God—according to your advanced "ideas." Get out of it, if you can.

X. You say, "As your twenty statements are the converse of mine," &c. Now, that is dispatching things in a hurry. I do not think—neither will any intelligent man think—that a "re-reading of" your "statements" will be enough to destroy the force of my twenty reasons for preferring Christianity to Spiritualism. I did show that your reasons for preferring Spiritualism were mostly borrowed from the Bible. The only excellences of which you can boast as commending your philosophy, are excellences which do not belong to your philosophy. Do you not know it? Now, in return, show me where I have borrowed anything from the religion and philosophy which I repudiate.

You did not see fit to attack those twenty reasons, because you were conscious that they embody nothing but truth.

XI. I will now attend to your "list of reasons why the teachings of the Old and New Testament Scriptures can not, in the first sense of the word, be morally and mentally elevating."

1. You say, "They make good works only *secondary* in the development of manhood, urging other things as being of more importance. Proof, Eph. ii. 8, 9; Rom. iii. 20, 27, 28."

To which I respond, —

1st. The Scriptures do no such thing.

1. You have quoted the only passages in the Bible which can be tortured into the support of your error.

2. In Eph. ii. 8, 9, Paul says not a word about "good works" being "secondary" to anything "in the development of manhood."

3. But in the tenth verse he says, "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, UNTO GOOD WORKS, which God hath *before ordained, that we should walk in them.*"

4. In Rom. iii. 20, 27, 28, the phrase, "good works" is not once found. Hence your "proof" is no proof.

5. Jesus taught his disciples always that *to do good* is the design of human being.

2d. The apostles invariably inculcated the same doctrine.

1. This is proved by their constant presenting of Christ, "who went about doing good;" their exhortations "to walk in his steps;" and the "good works," enumerated and enjoined by specific commandments, as well as by the fact that eternal life was to be possessed and enjoyed on condition of "patient continuance in *well doing.*"

Hence your first "reason" is dissipated.

2. You say, "They love sin; in fact, make sin the foundation of all happiness." Proof, Rom. v. 17; Luke vii. 4, 7.

My brother, I fear you wrote these words without reflection. They state either an awful truth or a most base and detestable error. No middle ground is possible. Did you expect me to believe your statement? I fear not. Still, as you refer to two passages

of Scripture for proof, I will try to think that you suppose your words to have a partial basis of truth.

Your statement is not true, for the following reasons:—

1st. Your proof texts do not give a shadow of ground on which to base the affirmation.

1. You refer to Rom. v. 17, which reads, "For, if by one man's offense death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ."

You know that this passage is far, very far from teaching that the "Scriptures" "love sin," and make "it the foundation of all happiness."

2. Your other text, Luke vii. 4, 7, does not contain a word concerning sin at all.

3. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament in every sentiment condemn sin, and teach that sin is the foundation of all misery.

1st. They represent God—

1. As hating all sin.

2. As angry with the wicked every day.

3. As destroying the species by a flood because of sin.

4. As inflicting death, temporal and eternal, on account of sin.

5. As manifesting, in every possible way, "the exceeding sinfulness of sin."

6. As holding out all kinds of motives to win men from sins.

7. As devising glorious means to save all men from sins.

2d. They represent prophets, &c., as describing the

horrid features of sin ; as pleading against it ; as denouncing judgment for it ; as crushing it in their own lives ; and as endeavoring, by all legitimate means, to make it exceedingly repulsive to all men.

3d. They represent Christ as going even to the extent of death to condemn it.

4th. They represent the apostles as preaching against it ; mortifying it in their own bodies ; and as teaching the inevitably destructive consequences of following it.

5th. History represents the primitive disciples as loathing it, and abandoning it as the fountain of all earthly calamities, and the sure token of "everlasting punishment."

Hence your second reason is proved a baser figment than your first.

Now, what you charge on the Bible as teaching concerning sin is actually the teaching of modern Spiritualism on that subject.

1. Spiritualistic documents teach me that "whatever is, is right." Sin is ; therefore it is right. Hence to sin is to do right.

2. They teach me that "all actions are morally alike."

3. They teach me that "sin is essential to development."

4. They teach me that "drunkards, liars, prostitutes, &c., occupy higher spheres in the other world than do those who have not been disciplined by crime."

5. They teach me that "man is no more responsible for his actions than for the color of his hair."

6. They teach me that "to obey the appetites, and

yield to the impulses of the flesh, is to secure the highest earthly pleasure, and to be as good as to deny ourselves these indulgences, and devote our lives to piety."

These are a few of the teachings of your Harmonial religion on the subject of sin. *You know these things are taught* in books, pamphlets, and papers. You can not find a sentiment like them in the Bible.

7. Your third reason, for want of space and time, which I can better use, I will allow to go to the jury with its *pretended* proof.

8. You say, "They teach that a person may escape the consequences of his sin. Proof, 1 John i. 7."

1st. You will persist in giving only the place where your proofs can be found. Why do you not quote the words on which you depend? Is it because you know that the large majority of your readers *will not take the trouble to examine the passages* to which you refer, but take for granted that they teach what you say they teach, because you tell only where they may be found?

2d. Any one consulting the passage quoted will see,

1. That the "consequences of sin" are not found in the text.

2. That "walking in the light"—by which the apostle means pure, holy, faithful living—is the condition of the fraternal communion, and the efficacy of "the blood" to cleanse or deliver from all sin, or unholy actions. So much for your text. The doctrine alleged is not found in it.

3. But the Bible teaches, as I have proved in one of my former letters, that the consequences of sin will overtake the transgressor.

Spiritualism is guilty of holding out inducements to sin, by assuring men that there are no grounds to fear the consequences of evil actions. This point I have already proved in this letter. In further proof I will quote from a spiritual revelation, as given to the world in the Banner of Light. "God is just; and the punishment which comes in this world is enough for anybody. So mother may be perfectly at rest, and feel that, however hard her lot is here, it is the hardest part of life. Of course we have some evils there, but compared with the evils you suffer here, *they are nothing*. You can skim over them as lightly as over smooth ice, &c. Don't forget my name. Rose Gerry. Mar. 6."

There are other revelations, which declare that penalties for crimes in this world are unknown in the world beyond.

Perhaps these are Universalist spirits, who are still in the "first sphere."

It is true that other spirits contradict these revelations, and declare that there is a "hell" for crimes committed on earth. For instance, Thomas H. Atkinson, in his message from the "other side," says, "So I went into the other world with a double stain upon my spirit, and *I would not pretend to say I did not go to hell*; that I did not suffer all that was necessary for my spirit to suffer. . . . *I went to hell*, and paid the penalty therefor." Who is right, Rose Gerry or Thomas H. Atkinson? Such is what modern Spiritualism gives us!

"If in your new estate you can not rest,  
But must return, O, grant us this request:  
Come with a noble and celestial air,  
And prove your titles to the names you bear;

Give some clear token of your heavenly birth;  
 Write as good English as you wrote on earth;  
 And — what were once superfluous to advise —  
 Don't tell, I beg you, such egregious lies." — *Saxe*.

4. You say, "They lead to war, rapine, and the shedding of blood. Proof, Numb. xxxi. 1, 17; Jer. xviii. 10; Joel iii. 10, 14; Luke xxii. 36."

1st. Numb. xxxi. 1, 7.

1. God's command to Moses to avenge the Jews on the Midianites, is not held forth as an example to be followed by any person on earth.

2. This was done long before the greatest part of the Scriptures had an existence.

3. It was not done in consequence of the *teachings* of the Scriptures at all. A child can see that.

2d. Jer. xviii. 10. "If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them."

1. Nothing said of "war."

2. Nothing said of "rapine."

3. Nothing said of "the shedding of blood."

Hence nothing said for your cause.

3d. Joel iii. 10, 14.

1. It is a prophecy of war amongst the Gentiles.

2. Not a soul on earth ever attempted "war, rapine, and the shedding of blood," because that prophecy is found in the Bible.

3. Not an intelligent Bible reader on earth supposes that passage to justify "war, rapine, and the shedding of blood for any cause."

How unfortunate your references!

4. Luke xxii. 36.

"Then he said unto them, But now, he that hath a



purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." . . . "And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, *It is enough.*"

Were these two swords for "war," "rapine," and "the shedding of blood"? If so, why did this same teacher shortly after say, "Put up thy sword. He that useth the sword shall perish by the sword"?

I say, concerning this point, "*It is enough.*"

5. You say, "They warn against education and philosophy. Proof, Eccl. i. 16, 18; vii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 1, 4, 14, 38; Col. iv. 8."

1st. Eccl. i. 16, 18.

"I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem; yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge. For in much wisdom is much grief; and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."

If those words "warn against education and philosophy," I am unable to see it. They do teach that education, or wisdom, is not the *chief good*, — that thing which satisfies the longings of the soul. They do teach, in connection with other passages, that intellectual culture can not bring peace to the spirit without religion.

Turn to the book of Proverbs, by the same author, and you hear him exhorting all to "get wisdom, get understanding." "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding (knowledge)." "Take fast hold of instruction; let her not go: keep her; for she is thy

life." Prov. iv. In the light of such passages, and they can be wonderfully multiplied, how dare you say, "They warn against education and philosophy"?

2d. 1 Cor. xi. 1, 4, 14, 38.

1. In the first verse, neither education nor philosophy is mentioned; hence not forbidden.

2. The same is true of the 4th verse.

3. The same is true of the 14th verse.

4. There is no 38th verse in the 11th chapter.

Perhaps you intend the 14, 38, to refer to the 14th chapter, 38th verse: "But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." The correct rendering, from the Greek used by Paul, is this: "But if any man refuse this acknowledgment, let him refuse it at his peril." Hence is swept away another of your errors. See Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, page 453.

3d. Col. iv. 8.

"Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts."

What has this verse to say about "education and philosophy?"

What do you mean by trying thus to mislead the "multitude"? I dare say, from this time forth, the multitude will hardly credit the pertinency and conclusiveness of your laconic "proofs."

4th. Your statement is proved false by the following facts:—

1. Jesus was a teacher who taught the best philosophy the world ever heard, and labored three years to educate a few sound teachers for humanity.

2. So well educated were the apostles, that, though

they have left behind them sundry writings, you can not find one error in all their spoken or written productions.

3. Paul was finely educated in Tarsus, and in the Gamalielian College of Jerusalem.

4. He never denounced his classical and literary acquirements as evil or useless.

5. He was anxious to have his manuscripts always at hand. And when he desired one of his ministers to bring him his cloak for winter, he desired "specially the parchments."

6. He desired Timothy to give attention to "reading," and to "study," &c.

7. Peter commands the primitive disciples to add "to virtue, *knowledge*."

8. The best teachers, during the early centuries, were Christians.

9. The best schools of the early centuries were Christian schools.

10. In all lands where the Bible has gone, schools, colleges, universities, have invariably followed.

11. In this Christian country there are more colleges under church patronage than you will find in all the world where the Bible is not acknowledged as the Book of God.

12. Now, if the Bible "warned against education and philosophy," you would not see Christians so unreservedly devoted to learning and the arts.

Thus is swept wholly away your sixth error concerning the Bible.

7. You say, "They urge men to hate and forsake their families. Proof, Matt. x. 34-38; Luke xiv. 26."

Matt. x. 34-38.

1. The words on which you rely in this reference are these: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me."

2. Not one word said about hating and forsaking one's family.

3. Jesus says, "He that loveth" the family "*more than me* is not worthy of me." He simply requires, in these words, that he shall share the love given to kindred. Love your kindred with devotion, but love me no less, is his idea.

2. Luke xiv. 26.

"If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he can not be my disciple."

1. The word "hate" does occur in the passage.

2. Kindred also are mentioned. Hence you have given one text which looks like "proof."

3. But is it proof?

1. Compare these words with all the other *teachings* of Jesus, and it is evident that he does not enjoin "hate," in our sense of the word.

2. Compare them with his own life, and especially his own devotion to his mother and kindred, and the improbability that he intended to teach what you affirm of the words becomes still greater.

3. Remember, 1. That he commanded his disciples to teach others what he had commanded them to observe.

2. That his disciples did do so.

3. That never did a disciple intimate the doctrine you allege; and,

4. That the disciples have positively, fully, and unequivocally taught and enjoined the *contrary doctrine*; as,

"Husbands, love your wives."

"Children, obey your parents."

"Let the husband love his wife as his own body, for no man ever yet *hated* his own flesh, but *nourisheth* and cherisheth it. . . ." Eph. v. 29.

"Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband." Eph. v. 33.

Much more might be added, but "it is enough."

Thus perishes your seventh error concerning the Bible.

N. B. What you erroneously affirm concerning the Bible is true when affirmed of Spiritualism.

PROOF. 1. Moses Hull, in "Love and Marriage," page 14.

2. Frances Barry, in the "Universe" for July 3, 1869. "Twenty-three years ago I pronounced *popular marriage a system of legalized adultery and prostitution*. Since then I have done what little I could *to oppose and hold up to public contempt* the corruption and tyranny of the accursed system. . . . MARRIAGE IS TO BE CONSIGNED TO ITS GRAVE."

3. Mrs. Corbin. "Marriage . . . is simply an abomination before God."

4. "Light from the Spirit World." "The marriage institution of man is wrong, and must be annulled."

5. J. M. Spear. "Cursed be the marriage institution; cursed be the relation of husband and wife; cursed be all who would sustain legal marriage."

And an infinite abundance of the same kind of spite against the family institution.

"It is enough."

The end is reached.

6. Finally you say, "They lead to intemperance. Proof, Deut. xiv. 26; Prov. xxxi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 23."

1st. Deut. xiv. 26. "Thou shalt bestow thy money . . . for wine or for strong drink."

1. This gives the Jews the privilege to buy "wine" or "strong drink."

2. The principle which the same law applies to prevent *excess* or *abuse* in other privileges applies here; and nothing more is granted than a rational, temperate use of "wine," or "strong drink."

3. If the privilege to purchase these things had been denied, Spiritualists would have charged it upon the *hatefulness* of the "base, wicked spirit of a dead man" — Jehovah.

Alas, my brother!

2d. Prov. xxxi. 6.

"Give strong drink unto him that is *ready to perish*, and wine unto those that be of *heavy hearts*."

1. After what is said above, nothing more need be added here.

2. No drunkard was ever made because of these words.

3. Those who study these proverbs the most diligently, and practice them the most carefully, — the Jews, — never are found amongst drunkards. Though I have seen thousands of Jews, I never yet saw one affected by an intemperate use of "wine or *strong drink*."

3d. 1 Tim. v. 23.

"Drink no longer water, but *use* A LITTLE WINE for thy *stomach's sake* and often *infirmities*."

1. In granting the *use* of "*a little wine*," the use of much, i. e., intemperance, is prohibited.

2. Its use was granted on account of disease, not to encourage drunkenness.

3. A privilege given to *one man* is no reason why another man should claim it and abuse it.

Hence expires your last error concerning the Bible.

But the Bible teaches us that intemperance is hateful in God's sight.

1. It teaches the subtle and destructive tendencies of intemperance.

2. It denounces curses upon drunkenness.

3. It declares that "no drunkard can enter into the kingdom of God."

4. "Drunkenness" is classed amongst the "works of the flesh," with adultery, hatred, murder, and idolatry, and as such discouraged and denounced.

5. Christians who read Paul's letters to Timothy most are known to be of all men *least inclined to intemperance*, which would not be the case if your affirmation were true.

N. B. What you erroneously charge upon the Bible I can prove true of Spiritualism, and will do so if you desire it. I would do so here, if my letter had not already reached an almost unpardonable length.

Let us write shorter letters in future.

Give us fewer points, and better fortified, so that I can get after your logic, and expose it in briefer space.

Hurry up your response, and accept my kindest regards, as your friend,

W. F. PARKER.

## MOSES HULL'S FOURTH LETTER.

LAFAYETTE, IND., July 18, 1872.

BROTHER PARKER: Yours of the 8th instant is here. It is said, "Brevity is the soul of wit." I will try to put more soul into this than in former articles.

I. Permit me, before entering upon the review of your article, to correct the errors that my copyist made, or you made in reading my article.

1. In paragraph X. you quote me, "They (the Old and New Testaments) love sin, in fact make sin the foundation of all happiness. Proof, Rom. v. 17; Luke vii. 47." Then you quote Rom. v. 17, and fail to see the connection between that and the thing I designed to prove. I am not astonished. My proof text was Rom. vi. 17. The text reads as follows: "But God be thanked that ye were *the servants of sin*; but ye obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you." This text, you will see, thanks God for sin.

2. I quoted Jer. xlviii. to prove that the Bible leads to war, &c. In your reply you quoted Jer. xviii. 10, instead of xlviii. 10. The text to which I referred reads as follows: "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood." This will enable you to discover that you were shooting at the wrong mark.

3. I quoted Col. ii. 8, to prove that the Bible is op-



posed to philosophy. In your reply you quote Col. iv. 8. The text I used to prove the Bible opposed to philosophy reads as follows: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and not after Christ."

These three innocent errors have made me appear ridiculous, and cost you a great many useless words. We will try to avoid such mistakes in the future.

II. In your first paragraph, after asserting that Spiritualism is a delusion, you ask me to prove that spiritualistic writers are better than Bible writers; that spiritualistic writings are better calculated to make good, happy, prosperous men than Bible writings; that spiritualistic facts are better facts, &c.

1. Suppose I can not prove anything you ask of me; suppose our writers were no better, our facts no better — would that weigh against Spiritualism, or in favor of the Bible? Certainly not. The Bible writers may have been exactly the writers needed at that time, the biblical facts just the facts demanded by the times; but are they adapted to this age? How can you or I be benefited by Noah's moral character, let him have been as pure as an angel, and the command to build an ark have come from heaven. Let the fact of the flood be a fact, how can you and I be benefited by it?

2. We want *present* truth, the truth of to-day, given under the inspiration of to-day. Should our inspiration of to-day be no better, or not so good, as the past, it is better for us, because it is ours.

3. If you could prove that our rain is not so wet, our dew not so gentle, nor spring showers so genial, as those of Abraham, I would nevertheless argue that

our rain, sun, and dew are better for us, will raise better corn, wheat, and potatoes, than we could if we were to shut our fields away from these blessings, and send an agent to read the history of Abrahamic rain, sun, and dew, to them.

4. Our spiritualistic writers certainly can be no worse than the bloodthirsty robber who is said to have written the first five books of your Bible. Joshua and Samuel were both murderers, and Samuel was a fortune-teller. If our spiritualistic writers are not morally ahead of David and Solomon, they certainly could not be worse. As for Paul's moral character, you yourself would not defend it before he became a Christian; and after that he becomes all things to all men. 1 Cor. ix. 22. Quarreled with Barnabas and Peter. Acts xv. 39; Gal. ii. 11-14. Went to Jerusalem. Acts ix. 26. Afterward denied going there. Gal. i. 17. Preached against circumcision. Gal. v. 2. And yet practiced it. Acts xvi. 3. He committed the double dealing of preaching to the Gentiles a salvation without obedience to the law, and yet, when he went among the Jews, purified himself according to the law. Acts xxi. 18-21, 26, 27. Then afterward denied it, and declared the Jews could not prove it. Acts xxiv. 12. More derelictions in the characters of Bible writers might be given, but my space to me is precious. I submit that our inspired media can not be worse.

III. I believe I will allow you the last word introduced in paragraphs II. and III., except that I will say that Jesus' doctrine was pure, unadulterated Egyptianism. His surroundings, when his father took him down into Egypt, were calculated to develop the very senti-

ments he uttered, as well as to lead to the mode of life he lived.

IV. You deny that the gospel is a dogma, and assert that "it is the revelation of a true life," &c. Will you live the true life preached in the gospel? Please obey the Sermon on the Mount. Abandon public prayer! Matt. vi. 25-31. Please give your cloak to the one who sues you and takes your coat! Go two miles with the one who compels you to go one. Carry out that principle in all things—will you? If you do not, remember eternal punishment is your doom! You can not see how the true life of one Spiritualist should be the false life of another. I can. Can you see how or why one individual should require sleep, and another at the same time wakefulness? Or why, at the same time, one should require rest and another exercise? If so, you may yet develop to where you can see how the true life of one Spiritualist may be the false life of another.

V. You say that I "failed to show that one of the prophets, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, ever failed to foretell the truth, verified by history." I hardly know how to take that—whether you meant to deny that the prophets were moved by the Holy Ghost, or whether you intended to argue that biblical predictions were all fulfilled.

If you wish to show the fulfillment of prophecy, please point me to the history of the fulfillment of Jonah iii. 4: "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." I will ask you another question. Can you show me one biblical prophecy that met a fulfillment in every point? You forgot to tell me how it happened that Abraham chased his enemies to Dan

more than four hundred years before it was built. I perceive that, although you think that Joshua was right in saying that "not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God hath promised," you are willing to think that Stephen told the truth when he referred to the failure of the promise made to Abraham. Though he promised that he would give the land to him and his seed, he gave him "none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." So I was not wrong, after all.

But you spoil it all. You say in the next sentence, "God did give the land to Abraham for a *possession*." You are probably correct! Stephen was mistaken! He says, "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." You acknowledge that "for eighteen hundred years the land has been trodden down of the Gentiles." Yet it was given to Abraham and his seed for an *everlasting* possession.

VI. Your quotation from Emma Hardinge, when taken in its connection, is possibly a good thing. Mrs. Hardinge does say many fine things, yet in point of progress she falls fearfully in the rear. I think she to-day belongs in the church with you more than with the reformers. She has ever made a studied effort to hitch her Spiritualism on to Christianity, even going so far as to get married in the church. To this no Spiritualist would object. Our only objection is, that she should be quoted as a representative Spiritualist in its differences from Christianity. She could be more appropriately quoted as a representative Christian.

VII. I was in hopes you would prove your two reasons for believing the Bible divine, rather than

boast of your familiarity with them. Your familiarity with them I will not deny. I have known people to be familiar with a good many silly things. Walter Scott's "*Great Demonstration*" may exactly do the work. I think our readers would prefer that you would do it. Walter Scott may demonstrate that white is black, or that twice two are five: either proposition is as easily demonstrated as your two reasons for believing the Bible divine.

VIII. Your eighth point demands no reply.

IX. Your ninth is an effort to induce me to worship your "dung God." As I have said nothing on the dung God question, "I pray thee have me excused." "O, come, let us worship." Not any, I thank you. Leave me out!

X. As you persist in urging me to notice your twenty points of superiority of Christianity over Spiritualism, I will devote a little space to them.

1. "It puts men under the highest authority—God."

Does not Spiritualism put men under the authority of God? It does. Christianity does not put a man under the authority of God, but under a man-made Bible. Let a man attempt to obey God in violation of the Bible and you would turn him out of the church.

2. Spiritualism offers the same "social relations," urging that the spirit is the direct "offspring of God."

3. If the gospel teaches *pardon* in any sense that will allow the culprit to escape the consequences of his sins, that is *against*, rather than in favor of it; if it does not, it is not in that respect different from Spiritualism.

4. You say the gospel gives us the *true phenomena*. Please show me any phenomena of a spiritual character in the gospel of to-day. The fact is, you have no spiritual phenomena in the churches. In the Bible no one pretends to have phenomena—only its history.

5. The gospel does not give an equality in a social organization. Its language is, "Let your women keep silence in the churches." "I permit not a woman to speak, or to usurp authority." "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honor." This is not social equality.

6. Its "ideal man" was not perfect. He got mad at the Jews because they could not answer a question. Mark iii. 5. Destroyed a herd of swine. Matt. viii. 32. Cursed a fig tree because it did not bear figs out of season. Matt. xxi. 19. Drove the Jews out of their own meeting-house. Matt. xxi. 12. Even his first miracle was to make wine to treat a crowd that was already drunk. John ii. 1-10.

7. The "rule of life" laid down in the Bible is contradictory, sometimes threatening with death those who are not circumcised, or do not keep the Sabbath, at other times urging that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing," and that no man should judge you with reference to Sabbaths.

8. If any good could grow out of the Bible's proposed judgment day, it puts it so many quintillions of years in the future that it loses its effect. It waits for judgment until "*the last day*." That is a great way ahead. You have heard of the thief who stole the half of a hog, and was told by the owner that he should pay the penalty at the day of judgment. The

thief responded, "If you will wait until that time, I will steal the other half."

9. Your ninth proposition is only a continuation of the eighth.

10. Show me where the gospel prohibits a man from marrying his sister, having a dozen wives, or owning slaves — will you?

11. True, the gospel expresses a sympathy for men, but not for *every* man; it even forbids prayer for certain ones, and urges that some are doomed to remain filthy.

12. Your twelfth I have before answered.

13. In presenting "individual interest to every one," the gospel is not peculiar. Every institution in the world does that. All appeal to man's selfishness.

14. Its "numerous documents," contradicting each other as they do, are very much against it. Its "variety of languages" never can be comprehended.

15. From your fifteenth one would think that a man could not have been "bound to nature" before he had heard the gospel. Men are bound to nature even in China, and if no gospel had ever been written, could not get away from nature.

16. Please give some proof of your sixteenth proposition. The gospel always appeals to man's selfish interest. Even its Jesus died, not for man's interest, but "for the *joy* that was set before him." Heb. xii. 2.

17. The gospel may give a "basis for faith;" Spiritualism supplies the place of faith with knowledge.

18. You think it gives a better object of worship. Is it your "dung God"? I can not argue that question.

19. The gospel gives us memorials. We would be in a nice fix if it was giving us memorials of things which never happened. My brother, your memorials are to-day leading the church to a system of unpardonable idolatry. Throw them away, and take principles, duties, in their place.

20. Probably the gospel has stood the test of *nineteen hundred* years. Sin has stood the test of that many thousand; but I can not reverence it for its age. You may. Please tell me in your next what the gospel has done during its long existence. Has it, or has it not, abolished sin?

XI. Next you take up my list of reasons for believing the Old and New Testaments, not in the first sense of the word, elevating; on this you have done a good job. I wish I had *the space* to reply to you. As I have not, I will only correct your most glaring mistakes.

In the references I gave, which speak disparagingly of good works, you say, "In Eph. ii. 8, 9, Paul says not a word about good works." I answer, Paul was preaching salvation by grace. His words are, "*Not of works, lest any man should boast.*" True, he speaks about being "created unto good works;" but what are they? Nothing but the forms, ceremonies, and church ordinances by which they are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Your mistake with regard to my second proposition, as well as some others, grew out of your getting the wrong text. I wish I had the space to quote all my scriptures in full. You are right; the Bible does teach that sin is the foundation of all misery. It also teaches that it is the foundation of salvation, for, "Where sin abounded,



grace did much more abound." The fact that they were sinners gave a chance for the exercise of "gospel grace," which made the gospel so lovely, and caused Paul to thank God that the Romans had been sinners. Rom. vi. 17. Did you know that the logic by which you try to use up the "Whatever is, is right" doctrine of *Pope*, could be applied to your own Bible? Let me treat you to a syllogism of your own kind.

1. All that God made is very good. Proof, Gen. i. 31.

2. God made evil. Proof, Isa. xlv. 5-7; Amos iii. 6.

3. Therefore evil is good.

The difference between my syllogism and yours is, I present the proof of mine, and you do not of yours; indeed the *silly* part of yours is easily seen; the remainder is not so apparent.

"Spiritualism teaches that sin is essential to development:" that is true. The military strength of the North was developed by the sins of the nation. The sin of slavery developed the sentiments of freedom. The sins of the churches and the ministers have developed a holy warfare upon them, which will result in their extermination. In that sense it is essential to development.

You say that "Spiritualists teach that drunkards, liars, prostitutes, &c., occupy higher spheres in the spirit-world than do those who have not been disciplined by crime." My brother, have you not got the wrong book? It was your "blessed Jesus," who said to the virtuous church members of his day, "Publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Matt. xxi. 31.

Don't get things mixed. The passage of Scripture that you find fault with me for quoting, states that "the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin." My point was, that if the blood of Christ cleanses from sin, then we are not cleansed by any effort of our own — that if we can be cleansed from sin at all, it is an excuse for indulging in sin. We often handle filthy things we would not handle if we did not know that it would wash off. You make another mistake in my quotations. You refer to 1 Cor. xi. 1-4, for 1 Cor. ii. 14. "That alters the case."

You speak again about the "grand philosophy taught by Jesus." Will you obey it? Will you preach for a church who would obey it? Go without purse or scrip! Take no thought for to-morrow! Give up your earthly possessions, forsake houses, lands, and all other things that Gentiles seek after, for his sake! If an enemy strike you, turn the other cheek! I fear you would use the language of another Christian — "This Jesus doctrine is played out." Give up your wife and children as he commanded; follow his example of celibacy. You know that while "publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God," those who marry are not worthy to obtain that world, or at least, it is the unmarried, or those who neither marry nor are given in marriage, that are accounted worthy to obtain that world. Come, brother, stop this eulogizing Jesus' philosophy, and commence obeying.

You make a mistake in your quotation of Matt. x. 34. You quote verse 37. Verses 34, 35, say, "Think not I am come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man

at variance against his father, and the daughter against the mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law." I am astonished that you should so frequently get the wrong quotation.

I know the Bible enjoins upon men to love their wives in the same sense it would a slaveholder to love his slaves, or a man to love his horse; that is, take good care of them, give them enough to eat, all for purely selfish motives. "*No man ever yet hated his own flesh.*" It is not to a man's interest, pecuniarily, to abuse his wife. You quote from Frances Barry and Mrs. Corban, to get the Spiritualists' views of marriage. I am personally acquainted with both parties, and never mistrusted that either of them was a Spiritualist. You *can* beat me finding Spiritualists.

XII. My space is occupied. In my next I promise you a dissertation on biblical and spiritual marriage. I discover that you are not disposed to deny the spiritual phenomena. I am glad of that; it saves me a deal of hard labor. This will allow more space to be devoted to its nature and tendency.

Hoping that the same spirit of candor may obtain in all our correspondence, and that the public may take a much interest in reading as I do in writing,

I remain, as ever, your brother,

MOSES HULL.

## W. F. PARKER'S FOURTH REPLY.

"CEDAR HILL," NEAR LA GRANGE, KY., }  
 July 19, 1872. }

BROTHER HULL: In response to yours of July 13, I submit the following:—

I. As to errors of your copyist.

1. I am forced to read and reply to your letters as I receive them. I regret the occurrence of such things, as I dislike to waste time or labor. But really, I sometimes think that your errors regarding the Bible are so palpable, bold, and self-confuting, that I waste paper, ink, and time in opening them out for public inspection. In fact, I sometimes think that you do not, that you can not, believe your own representations of the Bible. Still, in spite of this unfavorable impression, I will consider you sincere, and seek, by a kindly style and sound reason, to correct your untrue conclusions.

2. In casting my eye upon the proof texts you intended to submit to me, I can not see that they are any more favorable to your proposition than the texts which your "copyist" substituted. Both fail entirely to be of any service to you.

II. I will now present, in fair detail, your proof texts.

1st. You desire me to believe that the Bible "*loves sin; in fact, makes sin the foundation of all happiness.*"

To prove the truth of this, you say you really quoted Rom. vi. 17, not Rom. v. 17. You unequivocally concede that your doctrine is not in Rom. v. 17. I can not see how you can see any of it in Rom. vi. 17. "But God be thanked that you were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you."

1. This passage does not say a word about *loving sin*.

2. It does not intimate that "*sin*" is "the foundation" of anything — not even of happiness.

3. Had you not first *desired* to find such a doctrine in the Bible, you would never have dreamed of quoting this passage.

4. You try to find the doctrine in the fact that Paul "thanked" God that the Roman Christians had been at one time of their lives "the servants (slaves) of sin."

1. Admitting, *for the sake of argument only*, that Paul did thank God because the Romans had been sinners (which is not true), did he say anything about the "foundation of happiness" in connection with their sins? No. Truly, no.

2. Paul really teaches that "*sin*" is the ground or reason of pain, penalty, or punishment — misery; not of happiness. Hear him.

To the Romans: 1st. "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth (i. e., do right), but obey unrighteousness (i. e., do wrong, sin), indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." Rom. ii. 8, 9.

2d. Paul says men slandered him in his day by saying of him what you say. "As we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm we say, *Let us do evil*

(sin) THAT GOOD MAY COME, whose damnation is just." Rom. iii. 8.

This one passage for ever brands your proposition, so far, at least, as Paul is concerned, with falsity.

3d. Again, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid." Rom. vi. 1, 2. Which he could not have said had he believed sin to be "the foundation of happiness."

4th. Again, "The wages of sin is *death*" (Rom. vi. 23), not happiness, as you affirm.

More evidence to show your statement false need not be given.

5th. What does your text really mean? If you would read it as candidly as you do even a newspaper paragraph, you could not fail to see that Paul thanked God, not for the fact of the Romans having been wicked once, but that they had been saved from that wickedness by obedience. Really and clearly he thanked God for their obedience to the gospel. On consulting the "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," by Conybeare and Howson, I find my idea proven correct by their better translation of the passage: "But God be thanked that you, who were once the slaves of sin, obeyed from your hearts the teaching whereby you were molded anew." See the work alluded to, p. 558.

Is there anything in such language to justify your charge against the Bible? Not a word.

As you profess to love the truth and reason, I think you should never again quote Rom. vi. 17 to prove that the Bible loves sin, and makes it the foundation of happiness.

III. Your second text. You say, "I quoted Jer. xlviii. 10, to prove that the Bible leads to war."

Well, your copyist gave me Jer. xviii. 10, and so far as your proposition goes, it may just as well remain Jer. xviii. 10.

Still, I will give Jer. xlviii. 10 proper attention, and remark, —

1. That, though that passage has been in the book so long, you can not, nor can any man, show that any man or any nation ever dreamed of quarreling or going to war on the strength of that passage.

2. Wicked men may have quoted it, like yourself, for a wicked purpose; but they never did so because they believed it *taught* them or anybody else to make war.

3. It is an element of Jeremiah's remarkable prophecy against Moab. He foresees the time when the consequences of Moab's bad religion and bad politics would develop a terrible fruitage of crime, blood, war, and devastation. Under the afflatus of the prophetic impulse he cries, "Give wings unto Moab, that it may flee and get away; for the cities thereof shall be desolate, without any to dwell therein. Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

4. The Assyrians were the destroyers whom the prophet foresaw and of whom he spoke. And certainly you will not presume to say the Assyrians destroyed Moab or any other country because Jeremiah said, "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

5. I am, and have been, a life-long believer in the entire Bible. I believe it to be truth, without admixture of error. And I assure you that I see

nothing in the passage which would justify me in making war on anything. And if an uncompromising Bible believer like me can see nothing in the passage teaching me the duty of blood shedding, I think it is because no such thing is inculcated in the words.

IV. Your third text. You say, "I quoted Col. ii. 8, to prove that the Bible was opposed to philosophy."

"Beware lest any one spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and not after Christ."

To which I submit, —

1. You know that Paul speaks here not of all *philosophies*, but of that thing which was called "philosophy" in his day.

2. If you could prove that Paul meant by that term just what you mean by it, then the text would have some connection with your proposition. What you mean by "philosophy" is "knowledge, learning." Paul did not mean that.

3. You know that there are many philosophies; as, 1. Natural philosophy; 2. Philosophy of Language; 3. Mental philosophy; 4. Platonic philosophy; 5. Epicurean philosophy; 6. Aristotelian philosophy; 7. Harmonial philosophy; 8. Philosophy of Religion, &c., &c., &c.

4. You know that some of these philosophies are worthless for all good purposes.

5. You know that there is such a thing, and ever has been, as false philosophy, which does more evil than good to its devotees.

6. It was this false philosophy of his time that Paul discouraged and opposed.



7. For the same reasons which moved him to condemn it, the enlightened mind of this age has repudiated it, so that one now teaching the materialism of Epicurus, or the vaporings of the Gnostics, would be considered quite *non compos mentis*.

So it seems to me that these three correct quotations make you appear just as "ridiculous" as did the "three innocent errors."

I hope you will keep your promise that you "will try to avoid such mistakes in future."

By all means do so—both mistakes in texts, and especially the *sense* of texts.

V. 1. I am glad you so candidly confess that Spiritualism can not give us better "writers," or writings, to make better, happier, or more prosperous men; or facts, or moral principles, or spiritual phenomena, than are furnished us by the Bible, which I conceive to be a total surrender of the question.

2. Your "present truth" has no meaning, to my mind, apart from all past truth.

3. "Should our inspiration of to-day, &c., . . . it is better for us, because it is ours."

1. "Our inspiration." My friend, do you have any regard for language? Please, then, say no more about "our inspiration." To a man of sober sense, such abuse of language and reason is lamentable indeed.

2. Suppose I grant you an "inspiration;" your principle that it is best for you because it is yours, is absurd. Carry out your principle, and a pretty world this will be in one century. The squalid Egyptian would be content still with his rags and filth because they are his, rather than clothe himself in the ancient

garments of the Pharaohs, because they were made in an ancient day. O, no; your principle will stop all growth in arts, sciences, and literature. The past is full of glorious things, many of which modern art has been trying, yet in vain, to reproduce.

But the past inspiration is ours — is ours embodied in imperishable, expressed thought; and it will live forever. Your "inspiration" will die with you; yea, often dies before your mediums die. Your inspiration is a delusion. You claim it, but have no signs of it. I think your letters clearly demonstrate that *inspiration*, with you, is a minus quantity.

3. Your defense of spiritualistic writers, on the plea that they "can be no worse than the bloodthirsty robber who is said to have written the first five books of the Bible," &c., is unfortunate for your cause.

Does the blackness of biblical characters take the stain out of spiritualistic characters?

In your repeated flings at the names of the men who are more universally revered than any others of history, is a signal betrayal of the unmerciful, untruthful, malignant, and persecuting spirit of Spiritualism. What you do to those men who are dead, because they gave to us the Bible history and its honors, which are the inveterate adversaries of your vain philosophy, you would do to all living opponents if you had the power, and dared do so. This you may deny; but the persistent calumny heaped upon sacred characters by you and your colleagues indicates the activity of an awful principle, which needs only favorable conditions to stab, hang, and burn; for the man who will maliciously and knowingly kill one's reputation will, if need be, kill one's

body and soul, if possible to be safely done. Such is the spirit which is betrayed by modern infidelity in its treatment of Bible men. I trust you are a better man than your faith justifies one to expect; indeed, I know you are.

I must notice some of your attacks upon the historical characters of the Bible.

1. Moses. He was not a bloodthirsty man.

He killed an Egyptian in defense of one of his fellow Hebrews. This you love to call a murder. It was not murder. It was done in heat of blood. It was manslaughter, and, I dare say, wholly unintentional. And had he not killed the Egyptian, but attacked him, as a Hebrew he would have been infamous. Knowing this fact before he made the attack, he discreetly looked around to see if any one was seeing the matter. No witnesses being in view, he attacked the Egyptian, slew him, and then hid his body in the sand. Thus was the crime completed; and he fled for fear. I have no disposition to deny, nor to get rid of these facts. I regret his folly; but he was punished for it by a banishment of forty years. I regret the existence of the record, because the enemies of the Bible so abuse it. Yet I am thankful for the record, because it clearly proves the impartiality and honesty of the document. The good is told; the bad is not suppressed.

Moses, viewed from the stand-point of his own times, in connection with the circumstances surrounding him, and judged by the moral standard according to which his conscience was developed and molded, will at once be pronounced as great for his goodness as he was great for his courage and sagacity. And

the same rule being applied to the characters you allude to will fully vindicate them.

2. Solomon. His wickedness and folly are admitted. But they teach the best lesson the world ever had on the vanity of sensual pleasures and pursuits. He does not tell us to do as he did, but makes his experience the warning and lesson of all persons of all ages.

3. David. He, too, erred; sometimes woefully. Yet his life is full of resplendent nobility, and, like others, he saw a time when repentance for past errors made him well calculated to become a teacher of all good things. Judge him with a just judgment—Christians ask no more.

4. Paul. This noble hero's life is so well known as to need no defense. Up to the time of his persecution of disciples, his life was blameless. But he became a persecutor, thinking he was then doing right. When convinced of his error, he stopped; and he heaped blessings upon what he had before injured.

As to his becoming all things to all men, there was nothing wrong in that. Your inspired Confucius says of the "superior man," "In a position of wealth and honor, he does what is proper to a position of wealth and honor. In a poor and low position, he does what is proper to a poor and low position. Situated among barbarous tribes, he does what is proper to a situation among barbarous tribes. In a position of sorrow and difficulty, he does what is proper in a position of sorrow and difficulty. The superior man can find himself in no position in which he is not himself." — Chap. from *Bib. of the Ages*, p. 60.

In this sense, Paul was all things to all men, — in no other. Paul is right, and Moses Hull is wrong.

His misunderstanding with Barnabas was no crime or fault.

The other things alleged against Paul need no remark; they have only to be seen in the Scripture to convict you of doing violence to the record, — as usual.

You claim Buddha as being one of your inspired ones. In connection with your attacks upon the good men of the Bible, you should remember one or two of his oracles.

He says, "A wicked man who reproaches a virtuous one is like a man who looks up and spits at Heaven; the spittle soils not Heaven, but *comes back and defiles his own person.*"

Again, "He is like one who flings dirt at another against the wind; the dirt does but return on him who threw it. The virtuous man can not be hurt. The misery that the other would inflict comes back on himself." — Chap. from the *Bib. of the Ages*, p. 36.

5. You do admit, then, that Jesus did have a doctrine? Thank you. But why spoil the appearance of candor here, by affirming that his doctrine "was pure, unadulterated Egyptianism," and that "his surroundings, when his father took him down into Egypt, were calculated to develop the very sentiments he uttered, as well as to lead to the mode of life he lived"?

Jesus went down into Egypt under two years of age, and remained there not more than one year, at furthest. How his surroundings could develop so

much in so young a child and in so short a time, no one but a progressive Spiritualist can see.

6. Your comments on the Sermon on the Mount are as desperate as all else I find in your logic.

1. Jesus does not require the abandonment of public prayer. He only discourages its prostitution to base ends. He forbids praying, "standing in the synagogues or corners of the streets," *to be seen of men*. Really the privacy of the closet is the place to pray. Private prayer belongs to the closet. An ostentatious parade of devotion in public is, and always has been, disgusting.

2. In Matt. vi. 24-34, Jesus only dissuades from covetousness — an over-anxiety for material comforts. He would have men first holy, then attentive to other duties. It is a sweet assurance that God so cares for us, that he will not let us perish from want, if we be pure, holy, and faithful to life's duties.

He urges us (verse 33) to seek "his righteousness," i. e., perfect life, and "all" needed "things shall be added" to us, as a consequence of our correct life.

3. As to giving the cloak to the one who by law takes the coat, it is only correcting evil by doing good. The principle is a sound one. Even Buddha, one of your "inspired" men, inculcated this natural principle in these words: —

"Let a man overcome anger with love, let him overcome evil with good, let him overcome *the greedy by liberality*, the liar by truth."

Certainly you should not condemn Jesus and praise Buddha.

Act on the injunction of Jesus, and you will soon learn that his suggestion is not folly.

VI. No, I do not see how the true life of one Spiritualist can be the false life of another. Your comments give me no light. One Spiritualist teaches that the true life consists in chastening our appetites, controlling and correcting them; another says the true life consists in yielding to the appetites. One Spiritualist says the true life consists in living in obedience to the "angels" — ghosts. Another says it consists in controlling and developing the "spirits." I know no two spiritualistic writers who are able to agree or have agreed as to what the true life is. I am not able to find a true life in Spiritualism anywhere. But the gospel gives us the exemplification of a true life in Jesus. In this fact we see the extreme superiority of the gospel over "Harmonialism."

VII. I see no evidence in anything you present for believing that a solitary prediction of the prophets has ever failed.

1. Jonah. "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown."

It was not destroyed in forty days; ergo, Jonah failed.

No. He preached to the Ninevites in order to lead them to reformation. The subversion of the city was to be the result of impenitency. But they repented; ergo, the city was not destroyed.

2. In your remarks on the promise made to Abraham you seem to lose sight of the difference in the meanings of the Bible words "possession" and "inheritance." While the "ownership" or "possession" of the land was in Abraham, yet during his life he did not have the sovereignty over a rood of it. His seed possessed, by descent from him, the land,

and they enjoyed it until they were cast out of the enjoyment, to hold the land only as a granted possession. Every Jew living feels that a portion of Palestine is his, that the Gentile is a trespasser, and that ere long he will be put into the enjoyment of his "possession."

There is no conflict between Joshua and Stephen — the "possession" will last forever. The *claims* of every Jew to-day is a *literal fulfillment of prophecy* made three thousand six hundred years ago.

VIII. You seek to kill the influence of Mrs. Emma Hardinge by making her out a Christian, not a Spiritualist. I do not wonder. Her statement was fatal to your impeachment of the Bible; otherwise she had been "a distinguished Spiritualist."

IX. Read Walter Scott's "Demonstration of the Authority of the Bible," and impeach it if you can.

I am not controverting with you the evidences of Christianity. The world needs no more argument for that until infidels fairly respond to those already in print.

X. As to that "dung God," I see you are wounded. You flutter.—you grow sick. I do not censure you. You only shrink from the horrors of your favorite Pantheism.—your God of matter.

XI. You touch lightly and with uncertain pen my twenty reasons for believing Christianity better for man than Spiritualism.

Those reasons I hastily noted down, not as our best reasons, but as a few of our good reasons.

If my good reasons give you so much trouble, I know not what you could have said if I had enumerated *our best reasons*.



I. 1. Spiritualism does not put man under the authority of God, nor anything else.

2. Christianity does put man under the authority of God.

3. It does not put man under a man-made Bible, but under the authority revealed in that Bible and in Nature.

II. Spiritualism, as taught by all the documents I have read, has no God; hence, can know no such relation with him as sons. You feel the importance of this social relationship in the work of human elevation; hence you would claim it for Spiritualism, that ridicules the idea of a God that can be socially related to man.

III. The gospel teaches pardon, not to take away all the consequences of sin, but to overcome evil with good. Spiritualism, you say, knows no such principle. I know it. Hence it is a bloody Shylock, claiming his pound of flesh; — no mercy, no forgiveness in the code of Spiritualism. Draco had a clean spirit in comparison with it.

IV. I am not talking about "the churches of to-day." I said Christianity — the documents of Christianity — "gives us all the true phenomena (of which those of modern Spiritualism are base imitations only); better certified and more consonant with reason and necessity." This fact you can not controvert. Your play on "history" is empty.

V. You seem disposed to deny that "Christianity gives a social organization in which all are equal, and bound by the same ties, are under equal obligations to work for each other's good."

I do not wonder that you should seek to prove this

truth an error. But failure will overwhelm you here, as it does everywhere in your war upon the Bible.

1st. Your first reason for denying my fifth ground of preference for Christianity is based upon these words: "Let your women keep silence in the churches."

1. Because silence is demanded of women, there is no evidence that they are not socially equal with men in the Christian organization.

2. Your spirit-inspired Menu, by whom you had rather be governed than by Paul, has laid down the oracle that "A woman is never fit for independence." — Chap. from the *Bib. of the Ages*, p. 28.

3. A correct reading of the New Testament will show that women were allowed to talk, and pray, and sing, and eat, in the Christian assemblies, with the same freedom of the men, but they were under the same restrictions also.

2d. Your second reason reads, "I permit not a woman to speak or usurp authority."

Why did you not quote the rest of the sentence — "over the man"?

The idea with Paul is this: "If one of two persons, a man and a woman, is to speak, which shall have the preference? The man. In disputed cases like this, there must be some rule. Either the man or woman must yield. And Paul, in deciding this nice point in favor of man, I do not think denies the social equality of woman; but I think the social equality of woman is thereby plainly manifest.

3d. Your third reason reads, "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honor."

1. The Christian Scriptures — even Paul — teach

that "in Christ" there is "neither male nor female, bond nor free, Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian; but all are one, and every one members one of another."

2. When Paul sent the slave Onesimus back to his master Philemon, he thus wrote: "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds, who in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me; whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive him, that is, mine own bowels. . . . For perhaps he, therefore, departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him for ever, not *now as a servant*, but *above a servant*, a BROTHER BELOVED."

3. In the Masonic fraternity, master and servant can and do stand on the *same level*, without destruction of the relation of master and servant. So also is this done in the Christian fraternity; in the church, both stand on the same foundation, and both have the same master.

Enough.

VI. You try to get rid of my ideal man.

1. You should show that Spiritualism has something better than an *ideal man* to offer to men, as a rule for the development of a true character and life.

2. You try to get rid of Jesus as the ideal man, by trying to show that he was an imperfect man. I can not see how the passages you quote show any such thing.

A. "He got mad." — Mark iii. 5.

1. Mark does not say "He got mad:"

2. He does say, "And when he looked round about on them with *anger*."

- (a) Is "anger" necessarily an evil thing?
- (b) Can not one be angry and sin not?
- (c) Was not the anger of Jesus, then, sinless?

I think so, because Mark said, "he looked round about on them with anger, being *grieved* for the hardness of their heart."

1. Grief does not cause a sinful anger.

2. Jesus' anger ended in the healing of a palsied hand. Sinful anger never ends in the simple accomplishment of good only.

The anger entertained by Jesus at this time was of a kind that the more there is of it in the world, the better for the world.

B. "He destroyed a herd of swine." — Matt. vii. 32.

You are in error. He only suffered the "spirits of dead men" to make spiritualistic mediums of the hogs, when the mediums committed suicide.

Why do you fight pork eating, whilst the "spirits" seem to be so partial towards swine?

C. "He cursed a fig tree." — Matt. xxi. 19.

1. He simply said that the tree should never bear fruit; in consequence of which the tree died. Is it any more harmful to destroy a tree by a word than by an axe?

2. The very record you quote commends my ideal man as worthy of love and unbounded reverence.

D. "He drove the Jews out of their own meeting-house." — Matt. xxi. 12.

1. Perhaps they deserved it. Then he only did his duty.

2. The Jews, in their quietly submitting to the offense, confessed that he did right.

E. He made wine for "a crowd that was already drunk." — John ii. 1-10.

1. You admit the wine-making from water.

2. There is not a fact in the record to show that a soul at the feast was "drunk."

3. You will have to search more diligently for blemishes in the character of my *ideal man*, before you can persuade me that Spiritualism has anything better to offer the world.

VII. I submit this item "to the jury."

VIII. Is also submitted.

IX. Also.

X. Also.

XI. Also.

XII. Also.

XIII. There is some difference between an "object of individual interest" and "selfishness." When you attempt an answer to my 13th reason, I will reply.

XIV. Submitted.

XV. Also.

XVI. You say, give some proof of your 16th proposition. I will.

1st. Jesus says, "If any man will come after me, let him *deny himself*," &c. — Matt. xvi. 24; Luke ix. 23.

1. Paul says, "Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." — Col. iii. 5.

2. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." — Gal. v. 24.

3. "Teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

2d. The incentives are, —

1. Personal purity and happiness.
2. The good of others.
3. The honor of the gospel.
4. The glory of Christ.
5. The glory of God.
6. The inheritance of temporal good.
7. The response of a "good conscience."
8. Assurance in trial.
9. Triumph over the fear of death.
10. A resurrection from the dead.
11. A heavenly body.
12. An everlasting home with God.

Has Spiritualism incentives to self-discipline superior to these? If so, show them.

XVII. Submitted.

XVIII. Also.

XIX. Also.

XX. Also.

In concluding this part of my letter, allow me to say, that your reply to my twenty reasons is very much like a confession of total defeat on your part. You have not displayed your usual courage and strength. You seem to wither when you approach them; but I can not blame you.

1. Accept my thanks for your honest acknowledgment that I did a "good job" in my animadversions on your twenty reasons for Spiritualism. I wish I could return the compliment, but candidly I can not.

2. As my letter is already so long, I shall not notice the "mistakes" which your "copyist" has compelled me again to make.

3. Your syllogism.

I admit that "all that God made is very good."

I deny that "God made" all "evil."

Hence your conclusion may or may not be true; as, "therefore," some "evil is good."

Your proof texts.

1. Isa. xlv. 5-7.

"I . . . create evil;" not *all* evil.

2. Amos iii. 6.

1. This passage *seems* clearly to favor your position.

2. "Evil," in your sense, means "sin," as well as pain; for that reason I deny your minor.

3. If you mean by "evil," physical calamities or affections only, I will even grant your minor, and then show that your conclusion that *evil is good* is true; for every pain felt is an evil, and, if properly interpreted, must develop good.

I will close this letter by hurriedly noticing a few points with which you conclude yours of the 13th inst.

1. "The sin of slavery developed the sentiment of freedom."

No. An abuse of "freedom," rather, developed the sentiment of slavery.

2. War was made upon the churches before their "sins" outraged anybody.

3. You think the Bible teaches "that drunkards, &c., occupy higher spheres than do those who have not been disciplined by crime."

Your proof is, "Publicans," i. e., tax-gatherers, "and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." — Matt. xxi. 31.

1. Publicans were not sinners because they were publicans.

2. Their discipline as publicans did not fit them for the kingdom.

3. Publicans forsook their publicanism before entering the kingdom.

4. In the kingdom they mourned the fact that they ever had been sinful publicans.

So with the harlots.

1. They forsook that life.

2. They deplored that life.

3. They entered the kingdom to avoid that life and its fruits, not to enjoy them.

4. No Bible writer ever intimates that one of these characters occupies a "higher sphere" in the kingdom in consequence of their former sins.

The Bible specially says that no "liar, drunkard, adulterer, fornicator, or unclean person," shall *inherit* the kingdom of God, which it could not say if those sins disciplined any one for that kingdom.

Defeated again.

Finally: your fourth letter has been read and duly weighed. Still, I have seen not one good reason for forsaking the Bible for Spiritualism. You are not converting me. I know I shall continue in the "darkness of the old superstition," — a stranger to the glories of Harmonialism — unless you begin soon to display some of the excellences of the system.

You promised me argument. I have not seen it.

Can you not give one good argument in support of Spiritualism ?

If so, display it.

Wishing you health,

I am, as ever,

W. F. PARKER.



## MOSES HULL'S FIFTH LETTER.

BOSTON, MASS., August 8, 1872.

BROTHER PARKER: Your fourth letter was received more than a week since, but being just on the eve of a camp-meeting where I had to conduct all of the business, and do the principal part of the speaking, I have not had time, until this morning, to read it. Now I will try to jot down a reply.

I. I remember my promise to say a few words on the biblical and spiritual ideas of the marriage question. You seem to be in a terrible fear that Spiritualism will overthrow the sacred institution of marriage. Does your marriage hang on so slender a thread that Spiritualism could snap it in twain? If so, the quicker it is sundered, the better. You know that Christianity shook off all that could then be shaken of Jewish institutions; and promises, "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are (or may be) shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which can not be shaken may remain." Heb. xii. 26, 27. Now, if your marriage can not be shaken, it will remain. If it can be shaken to pieces, it should not remain. Let us have the bonds that bind two souls in one so strong and so natural that nothing can snap them asunder. Your fear that true marriage will suffer from Spiritualism is kin-

dred with the fear so often expressed in former times, that, "If the niggers are set free, they will all come right here among us, and marry our sons and daughters." I always answered, "No doubt your sons and daughters will find their level; that is a matter that does not depend upon the abolition of slavery." So, my dear brother, I answer you: If love is stronger than all things else, it will hold you to your wife. If love should prove strong enough to hold you to your wife, you will not need the aid of any institution to strengthen the bonds. If love is not strong enough, cursed be the institution that forces you to live with one for whom you have no love. Have no fear; Spiritualism does not design to cut any ropes that lift humanity heavenward. *It only designs to sever those that bind the soul back from truth, progress, and heaven.*

II. I will not speak for others, but my Spiritualism is certainly opposed to the system of marriage taught in many places in the Bible. The old bachelor Paul did not believe in marriage at all. He believed there were other worse institutions, and would accept marriage as an alternative — on no other ground. He said, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman; nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2. As little as Paul thought of the marriage institution, he thought he would prefer it to going to hell. His words are, "I would that all men were even as I myself (that is, unmarried); but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that. I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, *It is good for them that they abide even as I. But if they can not contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.*"

Verses 7-9. Paul thought, to avoid fornication it was necessary to marry. I think that what passes for marriage is one of the poorest preventives in the world. David had a few wives of his own; then a batch of Saul's wives were given to his bosom (see 2 Sam. xii. 8); but they were not all enough to prevent fornication. See ii. 11, 1-5. The marriage system, though Abraham had beautiful Sarah for a wife, was not enough to prevent fornication in his case, for he left his wife's bed, and went to that of his servant girl. But he set an example for many of his Christian followers of abandoning his paramour and her illegitimate offspring. Gen. xvi. 4, xxi. 14.

Solomon was married seven hundred times, and had three hundred concubines, or paramours, thrown in, and yet he was not satisfied. These and other such instances of marriage recorded in the Bible are not indorsed by the great body of Spiritualists.

At a convention in Vermont, the Spiritualists handed the world a resolution embodying my views of marriage. Here it is:—

*“Resolved, That the only true and natural marriage is an exclusive conjugal love between one man and one woman; and the only true home is the isolated home based upon this true love.”*

And you really oppose the Spiritualists' views of marriage! Do you? or are you only trying to frighten your ignorant brethren who may read this discussion? Probably your views of marriage would be better expressed in Num. xxxi. 17: “Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath . . . . But all the women children that have not . . . , keep alive for yourselves.”

That is a system of marriage (or concubinage; which do you call it?) opposed to modern Spiritualism. So was that practiced by Rev. Robertson of Louisville, while you were writing your last letter to me on the evils of Spiritualism.

You will remember how the tribe of Benjamin got their wives. They *stole* them, trapped them, and took them without so much as their own consent—lay in ambush and caught them as you would a wild animal, or a panther does its prey. If that is biblical marriage, I prefer another kind. See Judges *xxi.* 7-23.

Pardon me, dear brother; I have occupied so much space in the fulfillment of my promise, that I must pass many of the smaller points of your letter without notice. That, however, is hardly to be regretted, as many of your points are so self-refuting that no words of mine could hasten their destruction. All the *ad captandum* about "your not believing your own arguments," "insincerity," &c., you may consider thrown in. I have no space for such remarks, nor to reply to such charges in your letter.

I made no "concession" one way or another with regard to Rom. v. 17. I have not attempted its discussion in any way. Don't be in too big a hurry for concessions and victories; you may "catch a Tartar." Rom. vi. 17, thanks God that the church had been "the servants of sin." The texts you quoted about "obeying the truth," "obeying unrighteousness," &c., referred to church forms and ceremonies. It made no difference how good a man was—he did not obey the truth, but lived in unrighteousness, if he failed to comply with the forms, ceremonies, and ordi-

nances preached by Paul. It was simply Jesus' obedience, and a belief in that, that made people righteous in Paul's estimation. See Rom. v. 19. It was Abraham's *belief*, and not his good works, that made him righteous. Rom. iv. 3. And the righteousness preached by Paul was imputed, not the real right-doing of the person. See verse 11. The "babes and sucklings" of the gospel were sinners as really as others; but they had a blessing that common people have not. *Their iniquities were covered*, and the Lord would not impute or account their sins to them. See Rom. iv. 7-8.

Conybeare and Howson saw the difficulty, and tried to dodge it in the way you speak of. Alexander Campbell invented another and better dodge. Dr. Clarke still another. They are all capital illustrations of "twisting and turning," nothing more. You are a scholar, and know as others can not, that they are all only artful dodges.

III. And so you think I am like other wicked men, and quoted Jer. xlviii. 10, "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood," for a wicked purpose. Complimentary — ain't you?

I have no reply. When I want to know the meaning of a passage of Scripture, I must refer to "an uncompromising Bible-believer" like yourself. The Bible can certainly have no meaning that you have not seen. I like the compliments you bestow on yourself better than those you give me.

IV. You think Paul did not warn against knowledge or learning, when he admonished his brethren to "beware lest any man spoil them through philosophy." In this you are mistaken; he was always very

careful to warn against "excellency of speech or wisdom," even resolving every question back to the power of God, in contrast with "the wisdom of men." For himself, he determined to ignore all knowledge, save "Jesus Christ and him crucified." 1 Cor. ii. 1-5.

Your division of philosophy into eight different classes does not help the matter. Paul did not specify any class of philosophy. In the absence of any specifications, I submit that he meant anything that could come under the term.

V. You forget that this is a written discussion, and thus render yourself liable to the charge of misrepresentation, when, if my words were not written, you might escape a just visitation for some of your sins.

Here is an illustration. In section III. you say, "I am glad you so candidly confess that Spiritualism can not give us better writings or writers or make better, happier, or more prosperous men, or facts, or moral principles, or spiritual phenomena, than are furnished by the Bible, which I conceive to be a total surrender of the whole question."

Here it is! Surrendered again! You are an adept at gaining victories! This is about the hundredth time you have whipped me out of my boots since these letters commenced, and yet I seem to have them on! Now, it is unfortunate for your victory, but the confession you quote from me I never made, publicly or privately, with pen or voice. You should read my letters before replying to them.

The term "present truth" has no meaning to your mind. It ought to have. So "uncompromising a believer in the Bible" as yourself ought to have read

it enough to have formed the acquaintance of such phrases. You will find this, to you meaningless expression, in 2 Pet. i. 12.

You can not see that an inspiration which comes to us is ours, and think I murder the English language. I can not be responsible for your obtuseness.

The "squalid Egyptians," of whom you speak, could not, if they would, get "the garments of the Pharaohs." The best they could possibly do is to read the history of their garments. I incline to think that their "filthy rags" would render them more practical service in a cold day than a gilt-edged bound history of Pharaoh's old clothes. So I think our inspiration, though it may not amount to very much, is better for us than the history of that which came to Moses or Isaiah. I am a man as really as was Moses of old; and though, for the sake of the argument, I grant that Moses' inspiration was perfect, I, by virtue of my manhood, demand an inspiration for myself. Your prophecies about our inspiration dying with or before the mediums, comes by inspiration from a not-very-far-seeing class of spirits.

VI. Your defense of the robber and murderer who wrote the first books of the Bible is such as one would expect in the first effort of a pettifogger who was taking upon himself the rôle of a lawyer. The reader who could not see through the groundwork of your pettifogging is not worth an effort to enlighten.

Brother, had you not better take out a warrant for me, and bind me to keep the peace? You are so much afraid that I will "kill your body and soul"! I am dangerous, and if I were not a coward, would probably attack you! Don't you get tired of such

nonsense? Can't you see far enough to know that all such talk must recoil upon your own head? Your readers are not all fools. They demand argument. If you have it, for Heaven's sake bring it along. If you have none, show yourself a man, by laying down your pen, and yielding the controversy.

VII. So you defend Paul in becoming "all things to all men." The effort to defend him is laudable, the arguments inconsistent. The quotations from Confucius, Buddha, and other heathen writers are splendid. You will profit by studying these authors. None of the quotations are parallel to those I made from Paul. There is a vast difference in adapting one's self to the circumstances of the poor and the rich, and the material circumstances of those by which one is surrounded, and becoming lawless when among those who are without law. It will do for a minister to "weep with those who weep," suffer with those who suffer, and adopt the physical, but not the moral, condition, of those by whom he is surrounded.

VIII. Please give your proof that Jesus was in Egypt only once, and then only one year. You can thus enlighten the world. Even admitting that this is true, it does not militate against my position that Jesus' doctrine was pure, unadulterated Egyptianism.

IX. How do you know that Jonah preached to the Ninevites in order to lead to a reformation? There was not a word said about it in his preaching. And why was it necessary to preach a lie to reform those people who did not know their right hand from their left? Why should Jonah lament the failure of his prophecy when they repented, if their repentance was



to cause the salvation of the city? Was Jonah's prophecy conditioned on the wickedness of the people? Is the reformation of the people generally the cause of all the failures of prophecy? Your argument on the Abrahamic promise will fall of its own weight. I will not kick a *dead* argument just to convince it of after-death punishment.

X. Did I say Emma Hardinge was not a Spiritualist? Did I hint such a thing? Please read my letter again. I never said or thought such a thing. I do say she is not a representative of American Spiritualism in its differences from Christianity. She is a Spiritualist of the English type — one who hitches Spiritualism on to Christianity.

XI. Next you seek to shirk the controversy by inviting me again to read Walter Scott's "*Great Demonstration of the Authority of the Bible*," and impeach it if I can. I know you would prefer to have me after Walter Scott, rather than W. F. Parker. I prefer at present to follow my own opponent. I presume, however, that you have read Walter Scott, and boiled his arguments down, and put them into your letters. If they were as *sickly* when used by Walter Scott as when put into your articles, "The Great Demonstration" is in feeble argumentative health. You must call in your doctors of divinity! That thought that "the world needs no more arguments for Christianity," is a happy one. If you had thought of it just before you undertook to defend it, it would have been well for your cause.

XII. Now that your twenty arguments for Christianity have proved worthless, you decide that they are not your best arguments. Why did you not hand

out your best? Were you only "funnin'"? Please in your next give us a sample of your *very best*. I think I will yet extort the confession from you that all your arguments are worthless.

XIII. You still stick to your "ideal man." Well, while you only aim as high as Jesus, you will surely not ascend beyond him. I want all the good there was in Jesus, and more. I do not want it because Jesus or any other person had it, but I want it because it is *good*. Even the *mistakes* in Jesus' life I want to use as illustrations, to save others from the same.

You think those hogs that Jesus converted, who committed suicide, were mediums; you are mistaken; they were members of your own church; they believed in faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, and as soon as they made "the good confession," that you to this day require of all your converts, viz., that Jesus was the Son of God, they went to the sea for the purpose of being baptized, and in their eagerness to attend to the ordinance, they got into so steep a place that they could not get out. Brother Parker, these poor prototypes of yours were the first Christian martyrs. I notice many Christians to this day imitate these ancient hogs in swinishness, if not in other particulars.

XIV. In the record of the wine-making, you think "there was not a fact to show that a soul at the feast was drunk." Let us see. "The governor of the feast, supposing that the bridegroom had furnished the wine, called him, and said, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk (or are well drunk), then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now." John ii. 10.

What can that mean but that he had departed from the usual custom of giving them the good wine at the beginning, and had kept it until they were well drunk? If they were not "well drunk," that is, very drunk, then there is no meaning in that text. Enough of your ideal man.

XV. The best argument you have made is your reply to my seventh and fifteenth paragraph inclusive. Here it is: "I submit this item to the jury." If you had said that at the first of your letter, and then written the word "also," after each of my items, your case would have stood in a more favorable light.

XVI. In your incentives to Christianity, many of which are very good, you have not given one but that is purely selfish; thus you have proved my words true. The most of them I obey. I do it from the purely selfish motive of being better and happier. I am after happiness, and will do anything that will bring it. As nothing wrong will bring lasting happiness, I will try to refrain from doing wrong.

Your twelve propositions could be embraced in one or two at the furthest. I will embrace the incentives Spiritualism offers for purity in one proposition — *the elevation of humanity*.

XVII. You next admit that all that God made is "very good," but you deny that God made *all* evil. That admits that God made *some* evil. Very well; here is a syllogism: —

1. All that God made is *very* good.
2. God made *some* evil.
3. Therefore *some* evil is good.

But to your argument. You deny that God made *all* evil; tell me how it began to exist.

1. Evil or sin, if you please, exists.
2. Evil either exists by God's power and consent, or contrary to God's power and consent.
3. If it exists by his power, then God is the author of sin and evil, and responsible for it.
4. If it exists contrary to, and in spite of, his power, then God would put it down, but *can not*.
5. If God can, but will not, put evil down, it is because he sees that it is best it should exist, and is, therefore, good, or God is malignant.
6. If God would, but can not, put evil down, then evil is king, and God is no longer God.

My brother, you can not believe that absolute evil exists without believing that God is either weak or wicked. Which is it?

In conclusion, you ask for one good argument in support of Spiritualism. I suppose by that you mean one argument in favor of the spiritual phenomena. You shall have it in my next.

As ever, your brother,

MOSES HULL.

## W. F. PARKER'S FIFTH REPLY.

CEDAR HILL, near LA GRANGE, KY., }  
August 15, 1872. }

DEAR BROTHER : Your letter, dated August 7, came duly to hand, and its contents have been duly considered.

Your remarks on "marriage," which find place in the first part of your letter, I will leave unnoticed un-

til I shall have paid due attention to the other matters spread out in your communication.

I. I must say you have a speedy way of disposing of serious difficulties. How easy it is to say, "As many of your points are self-refuting, no words of mine could hasten their destruction"! I would like to have you take the trouble to show some few of my "self-refuting" "points." And as to my charges of *insincerity*, &c., I will say I am not aware that I have hastily made any such charges. I am ready to give you the credit of being sincere in the most glaring perversions of Scripture record, if you avow your "sincerity." But I do honestly think your cautious readers will find many statements in your documents which it will be difficult to believe bear the stamp of "sincerity." But let this kind of talk pass. Our readers will form their own conclusions, and I think will not need our aid in making up their verdict.

Still, as you undertook to lead me out of the fogs of Bibleism into the ethereal light of Spiritualism, and as your arguments are directly for my conversion, I submit that it is allowable that I should pronounce my judgment on the arguments by which you would convince me. I did not expect to re-convert you to Christianity. That would be, I dare say, a hopeless task. For to such ones as yourself I believe the words of Paul forcibly apply:—

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them

again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Heb. vi. 4-6.

Now to your arguments.

1. "It was no matter how good a man was; he did not obey the truth, but lived in unrighteousness, if he failed to comply with the forms, ceremonies, and ordinances preached by Paul."

This is a "hefty" declaration, and if it were true, would, in my estimation, certainly damage the teaching of Paul. But it is not true. Nowhere do I find Paul putting "forms, ceremonies, and ordinances" before purity of heart and life. According to my reading, Paul gives forms, &c., the last and most insignificant place. When you adduce a bit of proof to sustain this assertion, I will give it respectful consideration.

2. "It was simply Jesus' obedience, and a belief in that, that made people righteous in Paul's estimation. See Rom. v. 19."

I have examined your proof text, and do not find your statement in it. Here it is: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

Now, it would be just as rational for you to affirm that "it was simply Adam's disobedience, and a belief in that, that made people wicked" in Paul's estimation, as to utter the statement you do.

3. "It was Abraham's belief, and not his good works, that made him righteous. Rom. iv. 3."

1. Your text reads, "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." You have excepted

good works here, which Paul has not. He does not specially mention them. But he makes his statement in full view of "what saith the Scripture"?

2. The words of the apostle James are conclusive against you in this particular: Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. James ii. 21-24.

You do not, so far as I am able to judge, understand Paul's doctrine of righteousness at all. And it seems to me to be a waste of time to controvert what proceeds from a total misapprehension of the great apostle's doctrine.

Your whole effort appears to be, to make me believe that Paul looks upon sin as the foundation of all good in human life and history. I think I have conclusively shown the erroneousness of this position, and by barely referring to the proofs submitted, I am willing to let the matter pass for the judgment of our readers.

3. Your supposition that Conybeare and Howson "tried to dodge" the difficulty in Rom. vi. 17, merits no attention whatever.

II. I shall suffer your reply to my explanation of Jer. xlviii. 10, to pass for what it is worth. I think, however, it would be better to show wherein my explanation was wrong, than to enter upon a general

work of scolding me for so successfully meeting your position. Until you do show, by sound reasoning, that my disposition of that passage is incorrect, I shall take it for granted that you feel the correctness of my views.

III. I deny again that Paul was an enemy to learning, in any sense. He did condemn that pedantic pride of the so-called philosophers of his day, which did not suffer them to take into proper consideration the grand facts developed by the gospel.

I do not think you strengthen your cause by alluding to 1 Cor. ii. 1-5. When Paul elevates the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power," he does not declare the inutility of science, knowledge, and art. Circumstances alter cases. Paul was writing to a body of Christians, some of whom were inoculated with the speculations of Grecian and Oriental philosophy. That philosophy was more of imagination than of fact. Indeed, it was in the way of fact. When Lord Bacon published to the world his "*Organum*," then the inutility of speculation was clearly enunciated. From that time, learning was less in *word*, more "in deed and in truth;" i. e., more the result of experiment, fact. So Paul would have the Corinthians less beguiled by the imagination, and more under the control of demonstrated facts. In fact, I see in Paul's communication to the Corinthian church the seed which afterward found so full fruitfulness in the canons of Lord Bacon. Thus Paul, to my mind, instead of being the foe of all learning, is really the father of the true inductive philosophy.

It is strange the infidel Lyttleton, when he was sifting the conversion and life of Paul for evidence



to condemn Christianity, did not see as you do the apostle's hostility toward learning, which he certainly would have done had Paul been really opposed to true philosophy in any sense. The noble lord not only failed to find this fault in the apostle, but he also found developed in his history overwhelming reasons why he should cease from infidelity, and become a devout Christian.

IV. I am aware of the fact that this exchange of friendly letters has assumed somewhat of the character of a written discussion. But I am not fearful of having fixed upon me any "misrepresentations" of facts. I think I indite my thoughts with moderate care, and I seldom venture to make a statement until I feel secure in making it.

When, therefore, I said, in my fourth letter to you, "I am glad you so candidly confess that Spiritualism can not give us better writers," &c., &c., than are given us by the Bible, I certainly said, what I then felt justified in saying, and what I now feel justified in repeating. I asked you to show me that Spiritualism could give us better writers, facts, principles, &c.; and as you made not the least effort to do so, but evaded the point *in toto*, by a "suppose I can't," &c., I took this plain evasion to be a clear confession of inability to do so. And I shall be obliged to believe Spiritualism herein a failure, until your catalogue of better things shall be forthcoming.

There are, remember, more ways than one in which a confession may be made. What if you have not "with pen or voice" said, in so many words, that Spiritualism fails to give the world better authors, facts, promises, commandments, &c., than the Bible;

still, when I ask you fairly to give us the better things of Spiritualism, you fail or refuse to do so. What can I consider this other than a plain confession of inability to do so?

V. You accuse me of pettifogging in order to shield Moses from the imputation of murder. I freely admit the killing on the part of Moses, but I positively deny the damning circumstance of the fact—"malice aforethought." And besides, I say, Justice will try the man by the moral standard of his own day, and not by that of a thousand years after his death. Moses Hull, tried by the conscience and law of A. D. 3000, will fall far short of "holiness." So with the best men of all ages. Compared with the men of his day, Moses has nothing to fear. And by the justice of his own day he falls or stands, and not by any verdict either you or I can pass upon him.

The second paragraph in your sixth section shall pass unnoticed.

VI. I shall say no more touching the point in controversy in your seventh section.

VII. You desire me to give proof "that Jesus was in Egypt only once, and then only one year."

I hardly think the burden of proof devolves upon me. You affirm that Jesus taught Egyptianism, and that he learned it in Egypt. In reply to this gratuitous and unsupported assertion, I intimated that the only reliable documents on earth that give the facts in the history of Jesus clearly show that he was in Egypt only once, and then for not probably more than one year. Hence your charge of Egyptianism is without proof.

Matt. ii. 14, says Joseph "*took the young child,*"

and departed into Egypt. Matt. ii. 20, says, "He arose and took the *young child* . . . and came into the land of Israel." Nothing is said as to the length of time between these two events. Only one thing is certain — that a *young child*, and the same *young child*, went down into and was carried up out of the land of Egypt. His stay there may have been one year or two years; but it was not long enough for him to be schooled in Egyptianism. Now, if you have good proof that Jesus was ever afterward, and for a longer time, in Egypt, please adduce it.

VIII. You ask me, "How do you know that Jonah preached to the Ninevites in order to lead to reformation?"

1. I know it from the fact that his preaching produced that effect upon the king and his subjects. See Jonah iii. 5-10.

2. Again, Jesus said the Ninevites "repented at the preaching of Jonah." Matt. xii. 41.

3. I have said on this point all that need be said; but to avoid the possibility of your using my silence as an indication of the difficulty of your other questions, I will proceed to answer them in detail, even at the risk of repeating what I may have said before.

1st. "Why was it necessary to preach a lie to reform those people who did not know their right hand from their left?"

1. This is, to my mind, "a foolish question."

2. The preaching was not to reform that class of "people," for they needed no reformation.

3. He did not preach a lie. He simply denounced a judgment, which was conditional, as is evident from the passage already indicated.

2d. "Why should Jonah lament the failure of his prophecy when they repented, if their repentance was to cause the salvation of the city?"

1. Jonah was a servant, and sent to preach the city's destruction. He had but one thing to do, and he did it.

2. God was under no obligation to give Jonah a knowledge of all his intentions, any more than I am compelled to instruct my messenger, whom I send on a special errand, with all of my intentions.

3. I dare say Jonah did not know all of his Master's intentions, and he wept because of that fact.

4. Jonah was evidently quite unmerciful toward the heathen; but this error was subsequently demonstrated to him.

5. You seem to find fault with God, and to accuse Jonah of being a false prophet, because God did not destroy "that great city," "wherein were more than six score thousand persons that could not discern between their right and their left hand, and also much cattle." Jonah iv. 11.

6. But suppose God had done just what Jonah denounced against the city; what would you have said? Would you have been better satisfied? In that case you might have given Jonah the credit of having been a true prophet, but you would have accused God with perpetrating an abominable and indiscriminate murder. I do not see how it is possible to satisfy you or your colleagues.

3d. "Was Jonah's *prophecy* conditioned on the wickedness of the people?"

Allow me to assure you that you have no authority for calling Jonah's preaching "prophecy." Jonah

does not call it "*prophecy*," nor does the historian of Jonah call it so; nor does any other Bible writer known to me call it so. Neither should you call it *prophecy*. There is a wide difference between *preaching* and *prophesying*. Jonah was a preacher, but not a prophet. He was no more a prophet, in the true sense of the term, when he simply denounced judgment upon the city for its wickedness, than is a Methodist preacher who denounces "hell" upon the impenitent at death. First prove that Jonah was a prophet, prove that he made any pretensions to that office, and then you may have perhaps a shadow of a basis for your charge of failure upon him. Until you do make good at least one of these points, your affirmations will deserve no further notice.

4th. Your third question deserves no attention.

IX. As to Mrs. Hardinge I have no more to say. I am glad you say she is a Spiritualist. That fact is all I want; for it proves that the Bible by at least one "star" in the spiritualistic heavens is treated with becoming respect—that in her estimation the Jewish law, which you consider so abominable, was simply "perfect" and accomplished its end.

X. Walter Scott's Demonstration may be scoffed at—it can not be answered. I perceive that you have a happy way of getting out of logical difficulties. When your knowledge of the matter in dispute is exhausted, and when an unanswerable document is offered for your inspection, you simply invent a ridiculous evasion, and drop the subject. This is an old trick, in which there is now no deception.

I have borrowed nothing from Walter Scott in this controversy, as I have yet no need of borrowing capi-

tal. You put me to a very limited expenditure of resources, and I assure you I have ample means on hand of my own to meet all the demands you can make upon me.

When the evidences for Christianity come legitimately before us, you will find me sufficiently prepared.

XI. Those hogs nevertheless were spiritualist mediums; for a medium is one possessed of a demon—a dead person's spirit. This you can not deny. I shall admit that those spirits in pork did do two things—confess Jesus as the Son of God, and immerse themselves. All that is clear; but their immersions were their destruction. Hence I learn that even the performance, by spiritualistic mediums, of some things enjoined on others for salvation, is everlasting destruction to said mediums. If those hogs got into my church, as you say, remember they got into it to perish; let your mediums see the point, and be careful never to be found where they must *as mediums* forever perish.

XII. Your comment on "well drunk," is too glaring a perversion to need further notice. I affirm again that there is not a fact in the entire passage that a soul was in any degree of intoxication at any period of the feast. Your manufactured "that is," is Moses Hull, and not John the apostle.

XIII. I am glad you consider my submissions to the jury good arguments. I agree with you they are my best arguments for this reason, that to submit what you frequently write to persons of common sense is to at once seal its doom. I am glad you are aware of this fact.

XIV. Your eighteenth item introduces the question of "Evil." I do not see how the discussion of the question, "How did evil come into the world?" will be any advantage to either side at this time. I think I am fully able to show, 1. That some "evil" is really good, because its consequences are good only; 2. That some "evil" (sin) is really bad, because its present and future consequences are bad only; 3. That God is the author of certain instruments and agents by which "evil" (suffering) and "evil" (sin) are produced: the first "evil" (suffering) is directly from his laws, and always good in its design and consequences; the second "evil" (sin) is exclusively the act of the created agents (man), it being, to my mind, impossible for God to make man, and yet to deny him the power to sin, if he desires to do so. This power to sin denied to man, he would not have been man—he would not have had *human nature*; 4. That "evil" (sin) can be and is in the world, and that neither the goodness nor power of God is therefore compromised. I think your captious question, "God is either weak or wicked—which is it?" proceeds from a want of understanding. But I am prepared, at the proper time, to admit the presence and power of "evil" in the world, and to prove that that fact does not justify the supposition that therefore "God is either weak or wicked." I think you had better be bringing out the beauties of Spiritualism for our inspection, than wasting your time in profitless questions, far from the object of your letters.

XV. The last part of your letter, which was written on a slip of paper, is lost; and hence I must pass it

without remark. If there was anything of importance in it, please notify me in your next.

XVI. In conclusion, allow me to say, that I have not time just now to pay attention to your views on marriage. Perhaps you will develop them more fully in your sixth letter. If you do, I will then pay them respectful attention.

Yours, truly,

W. F. PARKER.



## MOSES HULL'S SIXTH LETTER,

BOSTON, MASS., September 14, 1872.

BROTHER PARKER: Your reply to my last was a long time getting written, and still longer getting to me. The accompanying reasons for tardiness are accepted as all-sufficient. While your letter seems to lack the vigor and logic of former letters, the most of it makes up in candor what it lacks in argument. As I have important matter to bring out, and the most of your letter only touches points already before the jury, you will pardon me if I remain silent on many of them.

I. You and Paul give me the consolation of knowing that my case is hopeless. "Impossible to renew them again to repentance." Well, be it so; until I hear something better than you have presented, it will indeed be impossible. I have done just what Paul told me to do. I have "left the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, and gone on unto *perfection*, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and the laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Heb. vi. 1, 2. Probably Paul knew as well as yourself that when a person renounces the nonsense preached in the name of Christianity, he hardly ever returns to it. Christianity is like the small-pox; it seldom attacks the same person twice.

II. You miss it terribly in quoting James' words to show Paul's belief with regard to "good works." Please let Paul represent himself. Paul's religion consisted almost wholly of forms and ceremonies, while James had little or no use for them. His religion was to "visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world." James says, "Ye see, then, how that *by works* a man is justified, and *not by faith only*. Jas. ii. 24. Paul says, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. *Not of works*, lest any man should boast." Eph. ii. 8, 9.

III. You have made the important discovery that Paul, instead of being opposed to wisdom, as he teaches, is a true philosopher—really "the father of the true inductive philosophy." O, shade of Bacon! Philosophers will consider that the best joke of the season. Brother, you are acknowledged to be a good joker; but such jokes on so serious a matter, and at the expense of Lord Bacon, are just a little out of season.

IV. You err in taking my evasion of certain points you undertake to make for confessions that you are right. When I confess a point, it is for argument sake, or because it is true. I evade points because they are entirely irrelevant to any issue between us. As there is no dispute between us yet as to which was the best medium, David, Paul, Swedenborg, or A. J. Davis, the only point being, are the latter inspired at all, I have not as yet found it necessary to dispute as to who has given us the best writings. Were you to deny that the rain which is falling to-day is wet, I should not undertake to prove that it was more wet than showers which fell upon Abraham. I should be

content with proving its moisture. Then you, by your course of reasoning, would torture that into a confession that there was more moisture in water in Abraham's day than now! You would, as in this case, be welcome to all you would make.

V. Why do you contrast the moral standard of Moses' day with that of the present? If it was as good as that of to-day, there is no room for a contrast; if not, why urge me to give up present inspiration for the past? My great objection to the Bible is, that it is but the child of the moral, mental, and theological standards of the nations and times in which it was written. We could now make a better one.

VI. If you will investigate the history of Jesus from the time he was twelve years old until he was thirty, you will find the burden of proof on the side of his having spent that time in Egypt.

VII. You discover that my sole aim is to be brief. All you have said about Jonah needs no reply; its falsity or truthfulness can not affect the issues between us; but as you demand positive proof that Jonah was a prophet, you shall have it. The proof is the following:—

1. He prophesied. Jonah iii. 4.

2. Jesus said, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it but the sign of the *prophet Jonas*." Matt. xii. 39. Brother, be more careful of your assertions; your repeated assertion that Jonah was not a prophet, like many other things you say, will hurt you.

VIII. It is strange that you should introduce the doctrine of "whatever is, is right," as a principal objection to Spiritualism, and, when I meet you at every

point, reply with, "I think you had better be bringing out the beauties of Spiritualism for our instruction than wasting your time with profitless questions." Why did you not think of these "questions" being "profitless" when you introduced them? Now that you have, after exhausting your store of arguments against them, found them to be "profitless," I hope you will confine yourself in the future to questions that can profit somebody.

IX. There, I have gone through your letter, and though I found no point in it really deserving a reply, I have taken every sentence that could be tortured to look like an argument against my position, and reviewed it. The other points in your letter are so perfectly irrelevant, and such outrageous quibbles, that they need no aid of mine to throw them down.

X. I remember my promise to lay before you in this letter some of the reasons for believing in the spiritual phenomena. I believe you already understand that I was a materialist, or soul-sleeper, before Spiritualism came to my rescue. I had searched the Bible in vain for evidences of immortality. If I found historical records of phenomena in that book that went far toward proving the return of the dead, I always found positive authoritative declarations, in the same book, denying the immortality of the human soul. Thus my phenomenal evidences were balanced by what I regarded as being more positive and perfect inspiration. Did the Bible talk of Samuel's return (1 Sam. xxviii.), — it also said, "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten, also their love and their hatred, and their envy is now perished. Neither have they any

more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Eccl. ix. 4, 6.

Did the Bible speak of the handwriting coming from Elijah the prophet (2 Chron. xxi. 12), — it also said, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom is no help, for his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. cxlvi. 3, 4. Did the Bible speak of the return of Moses and Elias, or John's brother (Matt. xvii. 1-5; Rev. xxii. 8, 9), — this evidence to my mind was neutralized by the declaration concerning a dead man. "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; they are brought low, and he perceiveth it not of them." Job xiv. 21. Thus my belief in the infallibility of those authoritative declarations destroyed my faith in the *historical facts* to which I have just referred.

XI. More mature reflection has convinced me that biblical writers would be more likely to be correct in recording historical facts than in giving hypotheses concerning them. This taught me to accept their facts as such, and their statements with regard to the state of the dead, the gods, angels, devils, and, in fact, any theoretic statement, as theory, — nothing more. This gave me a new mode of interpreting the Bible, and all other ancient books. I then went into a comparison of ancient and modern phenomena, and found them the same, and that either, when corroborated by the other, contained a sufficient proof of the immortality of the human soul.

Brother Parker, I withstood the batteries of the pulpits and press; all the eloquence and logic that could be brought to bear was not sufficient to make me be-

lieve in immortality until I saw this harmony between science and modern Spiritualism. In this I am only a representative of a large class who have reached the "knowledge of eternal life" through the same source. Can you take it from us? Will you? If so, there is nothing left for us but materiality, mortality, death, annihilation!

XII. Evidences of the spiritual phenomena are so numerous that there are few now who would deny them. Here is an extract which I clip from this morning's Providence Journal. It contains proof enough to show the return of those whom we call dead.

"A young lady from New York has been visiting relatives in Providence, living on the west side, during the past two weeks, and had made all arrangements to return home last Friday night, having a strong impression upon her mind that she must go home without delay. For the sake of the company of a relative on her journey, however, she was induced to postpone her departure till Monday morning last. Sunday morning last, after a quiet night's rest, she was suddenly awakened between three and four o'clock; and, as soon as she was aroused, she saw a figure distinctly, or was convinced she did, standing in her room, near a door, looking toward her, which bore an exact resemblance to a sister that she had left at home in New York in her usual health, and had not been informed of her being ill. The young lady was not alarmed by the vision, or apparition, but got up and went toward it, when it disappeared. She then opened a window and looked, but saw nothing more of the figure, or anything else unusual enough

to attract attention, returned to her room, retired, and feel asleep again. In a short time she was awakened, and saw the apparition of her sister again, with the same life-like appearance, and in the same position as before, and got up again ; and as she advanced toward it, it receded from her approach and disappeared as before. Again she looked about from room to room, and out of the window, but saw nothing more of it. Being now too much excited to sleep longer, she dressed herself, and remained sitting up in her chamber, waiting for daylight to come. Her uncle, who is an early riser, heard her moving about her room ; and on his inquiring why she was up so early, she related her experience and vision as stated above, and when the family had all risen it was the subject of general remark and comment. Sunday noon the young lady received a dispatch from New York informing her that her sister, whose presence she thought she saw twice in her chamber, at four o'clock in the morning, had died at home quite suddenly, *at that hour.*"

I will not comment on this extract. I have not given it because it is the best I have, but because it is the *first* at hand, and from a secular paper.

XIII. The following letter from Mrs. T. B. Cranz, in a recent number of the Banner of Light, speaks for itself:—

"I feel I can not too publicly proclaim the wonderful tests given through Dr. Slade, of 210 West Forty-Third St., New York city, and of the perfect spirit pictures taken by W. H. Mumler, of West Springfield St., Boston. I was a firm Orthodox ; was a member, with my husband, of the Dutch Reformed Church here for twenty years. One year ago last

September, I sat at the death-bed of my husband's sister, who was a member of the same church with myself.

"As she was dying, the scales dropped from her eyes; she saw the shining ones around her bed, and called them by name. Among the number were our two little ones, Willie and Linda, who had passed over several years before.

"She called them by name, and declared they, with many others, were with her; and in bidding farewell to her little boy, who was in tears at her bedside, she said, 'Cheer up, my boy, and remember that although you may not see mamma, yet God will sometimes let my spirit come down, and hover around my little ones.' This made such an impression on me that I mentioned it to a friend who happened to be a Spiritualist. She directed me to Dr. Slade. I went last May, and there I received some beautiful communications, written on the slate, with my dear little ones, names signed in full, with a request that I should go to Mr. Mumler's, and they would try and show themselves to me. The doctor was an entire stranger to me. I had never met him before; it was impossible for him to know who I was. Then, in August last, I went to Mr. Mumler's. I had never met the artist before; and it was impossible for him to know whom I hoped to get in spirit form.

"He asked me no questions; I sat alone for my picture; and when he brought the plate to me, I was struck with wonder.

"A complete group surrounded me. On one side of me stood our darling Linda, and on the other our dear Willie, close nestled at my side; and a lit-



tle back stood my father, yet plain to be seen ; and with her arms clasped around my neck is my aunt, whose face I at first could not recognize, as she died when I was very young ; but it has been fully recognized since by those who knew her."

With an extract from Rev. T. B. Taylor, A. B., M. D., in the same number of the Banner of Light, I will close this letter.

"Another form of mediumship is doing a great work in this country, as well as elsewhere ; and that is, the power to heal the sick.

"Not long ago I removed a tumor, or wen, from the shoulder of one of our leading citizens of this city, a Mr. George W. Crane, of the firm of Crane & Byron, without the dissecting-knife. It created quite a sensation. Modesty forbids me to speak of many other cases of as wonderful a character ; but I can with propriety speak of the still more wonderful mediumship of that strangely endowed man, Dr. P. B. Jones, of Atchison, Kan. There seems to be no disease that flesh is heir to which does not yield readily to his wonderful magnetic powers. I know him and his works. They testify of him. Here he has rebuked fevers, lockjaw, St. Vitus Dance ; withered hand and arm have also been restored ; so that, in this 'staid old Orthodox town,' people exclaim, 'How strange!' Mediumship is what the people want. May there be many more laborers called into this field."

The difficulty with this whole question of the spiritual phenomena is, the proofs are so abundant, that the chief trouble is in culling from the vast mass of material. Volumes ten times the size of our letters, all combined, might be filled.

—Google

In these extracts you find not only the proof of spirit identity, but some of the good being done by spirit communion.

Hoping to hear from you soon,

I am, as ever, yours, &c.,

MOSES HULL.

---

### W. F. PARKER'S SIXTH REPLY.

"CEDAR HILL," DEER LA GRANGE, KY., }  
September 25, 1872. }

BROTHER HULL: Your letter, dated at Boston, 14th inst., was put into my hand when I reached home last night. I shall now reply to it as fully as the time will allow, and as your matter shall demand.

Your letters are getting remarkably short, which may be an improvement, provided you make each one "brief, but strong." I do not know whether you are failing to find material to keep up your usual volubility, or are disposed to give us your documents in a concentrated form, but with more frequency. If the latter, I am pleased with your idea, and shall henceforth expect sterner pleading for the claims of Spiritualism than we have heretofore had.

But on carefully inspecting your last letter, I do not see that it manifests any more strength than do its predecessors; in fact, your sudden determination to abbreviate has shattered your logical strength, and the document before me seems to be a "sick child." Your next one will be better.

Always bear in mind that the object of your writing is to convert me from the fables of Christianity to the better things of modern Spiritualism. I thank you for making this effort. If I love anything on earth, it is truth; and I am independent enough to embrace it, whenever and wherever found. If I am in error, I desire to know; and for me to know an error, is to reject it at once and forever.

Up to the present time, I have failed to see, in all that you have said, any reasons why I should reject the Bible for the documents of modern Spiritualism. You will not point out to me the superior characteristics of the inspiration of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Hardinge, Wheeler, Peebles, &c., &c. Unless I can see in them something more deserving my veneration and confidence than I can see in Paul, Peter, and other apostles, I shall remain quite unwilling to exchange my "prophets." I wish you would pay some attention to this particular, and show me by unanswerable testimony that my morals and safety will be more secure by following either one of your colleagues named than by following the teachings of the New Testament teachers.

I had hoped to find in your second letter a fuller presentation of your views of marriage. But as you have added no more, I shall not spend space by controverting what you have said.

I will now pay a little attention to the points which you enumerate in your last letter.

I. Your first point is burdened, to my mind, with a strange error. You seem to assume that Christianity, once rejected, is never again adopted. Paul knew nothing like this. And the experience of multitudes

is against it. Many have rejected Christianity for Spiritualism; and again have rejected Spiritualism for Christianity. And these changes have been sincere ones, too.

Christianity, to be enjoyed, must be understood. Many, not understanding it, have tried something called "Christianity," and have rejected that. But I never knew a man to reject Christianity who really understood it. Nor do I believe you would to-day be fighting the Bible if you really had apprehended what that Bible teaches to humanity. Now, to show you that the above remarks are true, allow me to place before you the following letter from Joseph Barker.

Mr. Barker at one time, in England, was known as a champion against the opponents of the Bible, and he published a work there entitled "*Christianity Triumphant*." He afterward rejected Christianity, and became an avowed Atheist. But he returned, after his trial of "deism" and "atheism," to Christianity again, and five years ago wrote to C. Collins, Jr., the following letter:—

VICTOR PLACE, WILLIAM STREET, SOUTHPORT, }  
LANCASHIRE, ENGLAND, NOV. 21, 1867. }

REV. C. COLLINS, JR., PHILADELPHIA.

MY DEAR SIR: I am happy to be able to say that I have "entirely renounced the views I formerly held with regard to the divine authority of the sacred Scriptures," and that I have now for nearly five years been advocating "the gospel of Christ as the only antidote for sin, and the sovereign remedy for the healing of the nations."

The change did not take place suddenly; it was

spread over several years; nor can I trace it to any one event, or man, or book. I believe it commenced while I was in Nebraska, and advanced somewhat irregularly from that time to its happy consummation in 1863.

A correspondence which commenced between me and the Rev. Dr. Cooke, of London, in 1862, was of great service in accelerating the change, and bringing it to a happy issue.

But to give you an account of the process in a letter would be impossible. I am thinking of preparing a statement for the press, and when it is published, I shall be glad, if you desire it, to forward a copy or two to your address. If the post office regulations allow me, I will forward to you, along with this letter, copies of the pamphlets I have published since my return to Christ. I would send you one I published on the Bible, but it is out of print. I have often wished to write to Dr. Berg, but I was told he had left Philadelphia.

I expected to return to Philadelphia before this, but the state of my wife's health has thus far rendered it impossible.

I desire very much to have an opportunity of making known to my former hearers and readers the change which has taken place in my views and feelings, and the considerations and influences by which, under God, it has been effected.

You are perfectly at liberty to publish this statement in any way you think well. So far from having any objection to its publication, you will greatly oblige me by giving it as extensive a circulation as possible. All I should ask is, that if my statement

be accompanied with any remarks, they shall be such as shall have no tendency to exasperate my old unbelieving friends. Many of them were very kind to me; and in every case, meekness, and gentleness, and love, are best calculated to win skeptics and unbelievers to Christ and his cause.

I am in connection with the Episcopal church, though my labors as a lecturer and preacher have been mostly in connection with the primitive Methodists and other dissenting denominations.

Lamenting that I should ever have erred, but rejoicing that I have been so happily restored, I am,  
my dear sir, Yours, most respectfully,

JOSEPH BARKER.

In addition to the foregoing, I desire to call your attention to another extract, taken from a speech of Mr. Barker since his return to Christianity.

"To you, young men, who are beginning to entertain skeptical views, let me offer a word of counsel and warning. I assure you, you know not what you are doing. The path on which you are entering may seem right to you in your present state of mind, but the end thereof is death. You are preparing for yourselves matter for bitter repentance.

"I have trod the dreadful path, from beginning to end. I know it all. It is a weary and dismal road, and it leads to wretchedness and ruin. I have seen the terrible effects which infidelity produces on men's characters. I have had proof of its deteriorating influence in my own experience. Its tendency is to utter debasement. I have studied both sides, and what is more, I have tried both, and the result is a

full assurance that infidelity is madness, and that the religion of Christ is the perfection of wisdom and goodness.

"I think of my wanderings in the dark shades of doubt and unbelief with unspeakable sorrow. I would give a world if I could have my time to live over again, that I might avoid the dreadful mistake I made in turning my back on Christ and his cause, and joining the ranks of his enemies. The only comfort I have is, that I was permitted to return while in the fullness of my health and strength, and in the full vigor of my mental powers; that I am allowed to speak for Christ and Christianity once more; that my family are all happy in the love of God, and in the faith of the gospel; and that my large and varied experience enables me to speak of the infinite excellency of religion with an assurance, and to substantiate what I say with a kind of evidence which, without such an experience, might have been impossible.

"I have no inducement to address you thus but regard to your welfare, and to the welfare of those over whom your influence may extend, and a sense of duty to that great, good God who is the Father of us all. I owe it to you, I owe it to all, to make known the result of my life-long experience; and this is the reason why I speak. I know that virtue is necessary to happiness, and that religion is necessary to virtue, and that Christianity is religion, and virtue, and happiness, in their highest and divinest forms. I have proved its power, I have felt its worth, I have tasted its blessedness, I have seen its elevating and cheering power in others, near and dear to me, in the hour of grievous suffering. It is—as

the best and dearest creature I know on earth said to me not long ago, when apparently drawing near to death—it is ‘the pearl of great price; the one thing needful.’

“I could say more; my heart is full, and would fain pour forth itself in prayers and entreaties to you to return to Christ. The man that leaves the religion of Christ for unbelief, or sinful pleasures, or worldly gains, makes a dreadful exchange. He leaves the fountains of living waters for cisterns that hold no water. Like the prodigal son, he leaves the home of his soul, and the love of the Father, for a far country, where, after his short, delusive pleasures, he must encounter the horrors of friendlessness and starvation. The prodigal was beside himself, and so are they who imitate his example. When the prodigal came to himself, he returned with shame and sadness to his father and his home again, and when you come to yourselves you will do the same.

“God grant that it may be soon. God grant that you may be brought to see things in their true light, and to seek his mercy, and give yourselves to his service without delay.

“Infidelity, and sin, and all that they can give, are but vanity and vexation of spirit; but a life of faith on the Son of God, and of obedience to his gospel, ‘is profitable unto all things, having promise both of the life that now is and of that which is to come.’”

Joseph Barker is only one in tens of thousands. I need refer to no more. His testimony is to the point. He repudiated Christianity, and the result was “death.” He returned to Christianity, and “lives again.” Why, then, should you say, “Christianity is



like the small-pox ; it seldom attacks the same person twice" ? I expect to see the day when Moses Hull will feelingly retract all that he has said against God, the Bible, and Christianity, though he may be a Spiritualist still.

II. I do not think, as you say, that I missed it when I quoted James to show that Paul believed in "works." Paul and James held the same opinions on the point in debate ; and the very fact that every one of Paul's letters is full of injunctions to do good things, proves to a demonstration that Paul taught "good works" just as much as faith. Look at this : "Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith ; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering ; or he that teacheth, on teaching ; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation : he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity ; he that ruleth, with diligence ; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil ; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another ; not slothful in business ; fervent in spirit ; serving the Lord ; rejoicing in hope ; patient in tribulation ; continuing instant in prayer ; distributing to the necessity of saints ; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you ; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. Repense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest

in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." Rom. xii. 6-18.

Some thirty good works are enjoined in this extract, and no man repudiating good works could possibly enjoin such things upon his disciples. This, brother, is a stern fact, and settles the dispute. Paul does not make good works secondary to anything—but love.

You quote Eph. ii. 8, 9: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

And of course the effect of that quotation is to make superficial readers conclude that Paul really ignored "works." But had you dealt with Paul just as you desire to be treated, you would have quoted just what he did say in this place on "good works." The very next verse says, —

"For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

Now, it would be difficult to dissuade from "good works" one taught that he had been created for the purpose of "good works." You had best surrender this point. You can gain nothing by kicking against the goad of Paul's own testimony.

III. Yes, I am still of the opinion that the inductive philosophy is older than Lord Bacon. If I understand Bacon, he would have all theories tested by *experiment*. If I understand Paul, he, too, would have his followers demonstrate their "theory" by *experience*, or experiment. Paul would have them

"prove your own selves," and he would have them "*prove* all things," holding fast to that which experiment has demonstrated "good." Lord Bacon caught the idea, and gave us the "*Novum Organum*." Now, before one of our scientists will accept any theory, it must be "proved" by "*experience*," or experiment. In spite of your laugh about my being a "joker," I am still where I stood, and reaffirm that Paul was before Bacon as an *inductive philosopher*.

IV. But there *is* a dispute between us about "which was the best medium (prophet), David, Paul, Swedenborg, or A. J. Davis." I think this is, and has been, the dispute. I think you have affirmed that the two latter are just as good mediums as the former; in fact, I think your readers have inferred from your letters that you hold out the "inspiration" of the latter as better far than that of the former. I think I have denied clearly that either of the latter was "inspired" "at all." I use the word "inspiration" perhaps in a sense different from that which you give to it. Before we can argue this question at all, we must agree on the signification of the terms employed. Tell me what you mean by "inspiration." Give me the reasons why you believe Davis and Swedenborg to be "inspired at all." Let us come to the point, and "try the spirits."

Why do you accuse me of *torturing* your statements into confessions? I do not intend any such thing, and I can not believe I do so, until you shall give me a clear evidence of it. It is, my brother, much easier for you to say, "you torture," — I presume my *points* are afflictive, — than for you to disprove my positions.

V. You say, "Why do you contrast the moral

teaching of Moses' day with that of the present? If it was as good as that of to-day, there is no room for the contrast; if not, why have me give up present inspiration for the past?"

I do not know that I have "contrasted" these standards. I think I have taken this position, and I think it a correct one:—

1. That the race is progressing;
2. That the era in which Moses lived was fourteen hundred years short of the era in which Christ lived; and
3. That as the race grows up to a standard, a new one will be provided, until that which is perfect is come.

You can not find any fault in these positions, unless you deny the great Christian doctrine of growth in the race. Moses killed an Egyptian; hence you call him a "bloody murderer." I admit the fact, but I deny that he was a "murderer," in the Christian sense of that word. All killing is not murder. Some killing has no guilt at all attached to it; other is justifiable, and some is excusable. Moses killed one in heat of blood, even though he "looked this way and that way;" still it was done in heat of blood, in defense of a "brother." That killing, too, had a meaning, which the Jacobite slaves did not understand. But I do not propose to vindicate Moses. I am willing to grant he perpetrated manslaughter; but I affirm he did that at a time when his deeds can be made no plea against his claims as a prophet.

My brother, I think I see hanging about you an error which you should speedily put far from you. That error is the dragging up of evil history to blacken the

reputation of human beings. You do not like Moses nor his religion—specially do you not like his religion. You desire to kill the moral influence of his name and of his teachings. Now, how do you proceed? Why, you try to show that he was a *bad man*; you drag out and brand every one of his faults; you call him hard names indeed, and you infuse your hatred of him into the hearts of those who hear you. This course I do not like. It is too much like the conduct of some who profess to be Christians. These persons forget the cardinal rule of charity, and blacken the names of their brother Christians, by digging up every crime and fault which had been done “in sin.” A religion which can not be blind to errors and faults is no religion for humanity. True Charity will never repeat the sorrowful paragraphs in any individual’s history. The fact that many Spiritualists so persistently and systematically proclaim the faults of the dead and of the living, is no commendation of the *animus* of Spiritualism.

As for past standards, the New Testament gives us the last which has ever been given to the world. How long humanity will need that standard depends upon the moral growth of the race. We need no new one until the old one is outgrown. To say that the standard erected by Christ is outgrown, is to utter a proposition which no man can prove; is to affirm that humanity has outgrown itself, and an infinitely perfect will is incapacitated to legislate for man. Alluding to the law of Christ as a fabric of the past, you say, “We could now make a better one.”

1. Who are the “we” to whom you allude?
2. In what would that “better” consist?

3. If "*we could* (can) now make a better one," why have we not done it?

4. If "*we*" means Spiritualists, I have not yet seen any evidences of their ability to give us a "*better one.*"

5. Suppose in your next letter you give me an outline of the better moral standard which "*we could now make.*"

6. Until you do so I must say "*we*" can do no such thing. And "*we*" will need Christ's standard for some time yet to come.

7. The "*spirits*" have said many things, but I am not yet aware that they have given to the world any moral principle not found in the Bible, although they have taken pains to decry many of the principles in that book enforced.

"If you will investigate the history of Jesus from the time he was twelve years old until he was thirty, you will find the burden of proof on the side of his having spent that time in Egypt."

Well, as investigation is my business, I will thank you if you will tell me where I can find the authentic documents to study. What eye-witnesses have given to the world their testimony? Please give me "*light,*" and dissipate my darkness.

VI. This statement is true: "*You discover that my sole aim is to be brief.*" This discovery I made at the beginning of your letter; but I fondly hoped you intended to make brevity strong also; now you take away from me my wish, and leave me a prey to my worst fears, that your "*sole aim is brevity.*" Can "*brevity*" prove that Spiritualism is true? Nay. Your "*sole aim*" should have been sound reasoning—not brevity.

As to Jonah, I will further say, —

1. Jesus does call him a "prophet." Did I ever say he does not?

2. The word "prophet" in the New Testament means sometimes simply "preacher," and in this sense I think Jesus used it; for he does not call what Jonah uttered "prophecy," but "preaching." "The men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the *preaching* of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." Matt. xii. 41.

VII. Your 8th and 9th sections demand no notice; hence I give them none.

VIII. You approach the "phenomena" of modern Spiritualism with considerable caution. I do not blame you for that. I am anxious to see the process through which you were carried from the damps and gloom of soul-sleeping, up into the warm sunshine of Spiritualism. Your first faith is just as unaccountable to me as your last. I see, so far, no more evidence for the one than for the other.

You say, "I had searched the Bible in vain for evidences of immortality. If I found historical records of phenomena in that book that went far toward proving the return of the dead, I always found positive authoritative declarations in the same book, denying the immortality of the human soul."

I have no doubt you "searched the Bible in vain for evidences of immortality." Still, that does not prove that there are no evidences there. Others have found evidences there; and I am amongst them. In fact, the Bible seems to me to be full of the doctrine of immortality; so full that all the phenomena claimed

by Spiritualists can add nothing to my faith. A good deal depends upon how the Bible is read. You confess that the "historical records" looked fully in the direction of immortality, but your trouble arose out of "positive and authoritative declarations in the same book denying the immortality of the human soul;" and you quote, "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten, also their love and their hatred, and their envy is now perished. Neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Eccl. ix. 5, 6.

Now, suppose I should say that there is no truth in your quotation, and that it was never spoken as a truth. Now, allow me to say, that this book of Ecclesiastes was written for the express purpose of showing the folly of materialism. Hence the author imagined himself a sensual materialist, and he talks like a sensual materialist. It would be just as reasonable to quote Paul's words, "Eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," to prove materialism, as to quote the passage you do. Paul's words, read in connection with his argument, are easily understood. So of Solomon's. It seems to me impossible for one to consider the passage quoted by you, when viewed with the design and construction of the argument, to have any countenance for non-immortality.

Take into consideration Solomon's views of the being and attributes of God; his views as a Jew of the "spirit;" his views of "hades," i. e., "sheol," &c., and then consider his words, "Then shall the dust (body) return to the earth as it was (before it became a body), and the spirit shall return unto God who gave



it." These words, from a Jew, admit only one interpretation—God gives to a body a spirit; when that body dies, God takes the spirit, or it returns to him, i. e., to his custody.

Again, had Solomon spoken the words you have quoted as truth, he could not afterward have told the "young man," "God will bring thee into judgment." Judgment with the Jew was after death. See Josephus on "hades."

The next point you quote as an authoritative denial of immortality is, "in that day his thoughts shall perish." It is one thing to say of a man in dying, his "thoughts shall perish," and quite another to say the man shall perish. These words were spoken of "princes" who boast much, and promise and threaten much. Death stops their ambitious career, and the moment in which they die sees all their ambitious schemes (thoughts) fail (perish) forever. Their designs failing does not prove the princes annihilated.

I am glad you state so freely that you found a new mode of interpreting the Bible; for I had long ago made up my mind that you could have reached the conclusions you now hold only by adopting a *new method* of interpreting the Bible. Herein I think you err. The Bible is a book written in human language, and by men for man. It must be studied as any other book is studied. The laws of interpretation common to men govern the Bible as well. These laws are as old as language.

Nor do I believe that the writers of the Bible form any theories concerning the human soul or its destiny. "Hypotheses" are something in which Bible writers deal with a sparing hand. I can see exact correspon-

dence between the *facts* written by Bible men and the deductions drawn from them. If the phenomena of the Bible do not prove spirit incorruptibility, you can not find the doctrine taught by phenomena anywhere.

You quote Job, but he talked about matters of which he was ignorant. This Job himself declares. Hear him.

"Then Job answered the Lord, and said, I know that thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. Who is he that darkeneth counsel without knowledge? therefore have I uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not. Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak: I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me. I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." Job xlii. 1-6.

Job talked volubly about man and his soul. Yet he says, "I uttered that I understood not." Before this the Lord had said to him, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel *by words without knowledge?*" Job xxxviii. 2. Now, certainly to me the authoritative denial of man's immortality by Job would pass only for "words without knowledge."

You speak feelingly of "the harmony between ancient and modern Spiritualism." I believe, too, that there has ever been a "spiritualism" which was true; also, I believe there has been and is a Spiritualism that has been and is false in the extreme. I do not say your Spiritualism is the latter. I trust it is not. So I am certain that there have even been sensible evidences of the incorruptibility of the human spirit.

L. 1891

They have never appeared to me, but others have witnessed them, and I am confident their testimony is true.

You do not tell me wherein that "harmony" consists. I would like to get full information just here. You can not give me too much of it.

Your quotations touching the modern phenomena which are presenting themselves, I need not notice fully. I have given them consideration, and now say, —

1. I admit the occurrence of the facts.

2. I deny that they are the work of spirits.

Now, prove that *spirits* do the work, if you can. Please do not attempt to get out of this difficulty by asking me, in your next letter, "If these things are not done by spirits, then what does them?" At present I am not on the affirmative. You say these wonders are caused by spirits out of the body. I deny it, and call for the proof.

I shall ask you now to peruse the following pages, which I cut from a book handed down to me from my grandfather. It contains facts which no rational man will dare dispute. One case like this, properly attested, comes clothed with power. It occurred one hundred and fifty years before "Spiritualism" was born, and was not invented for the purpose of making converts to a new "superstition."

*A Relation of the Apparition of Mrs. Veal.*

This thing is so rare in all its circumstances, and on so good authority, that my reading and conversation have not given me anything like it. It is fit

to gratify the most ingenious and serious inquirer. Mrs. Bargrave is the person to whom Mrs. Veal appeared after her death; she is my intimate friend, and I can vouch for her reputation, for these last fifteen or sixteen years, on my own knowledge; and I can confirm the good character she had from her youth to the time of my acquaintance; though since this relation, she is calumniated by some people, that are friends to the brother of Mrs. Veal, who appeared, who think the relation of this appearance to be a reflection, and endeavor what they can to blast Mrs. Bargrave's reputation, and to laugh the story out of countenance. But by the circumstances thereof, and the cheerful disposition of Mrs. Bargrave, notwithstanding the ill usage of a very wicked husband, there is not yet the least sign of dejection in her face; nor did I ever hear her let fall a desponding or murmuring expression; nay, not when actually under her husband's barbarity, which I have been witness to, and several other persons of undoubted reputation.

Now, you must know Mrs. Veal was a maiden gentlewoman, of about thirty years of age, and for some years last past had been troubled with fits, which were perceived coming on her by her going off from her discourse, very abruptly, to some impertinence; she was maintained by an only brother, and kept his house in Dover. She was a very pious woman, and her brother a very sober man, to all appearance; but now he does all he can to null or quash the story. Mrs. Veal was intimately acquainted with Mrs. Bargrave from her childhood. Mrs. Veal's circumstances were then mean; her father did not take care of his children as he ought, so that they were exposed to hard-

ships; and Mrs. Bargrave in those days had as unkind a father, though she wanted neither for food nor clothing, whilst Mrs. Veal wanted for both, insomuch that she would often say, "Mrs. Bargrave, you are not only the best, but the only friend I have in the world; and no circumstance in life shall ever dissolve my friendship." They would often condole each other's adverse fortunes, and read together Drelincourt upon Death, and other good books; and so, like two Christian friends, they comforted each other under their sorrow.

Some time after Mr. Veal's friends got him a place in the custom-house at Dover, which occasioned Mrs. Veal, by little and little, to fall off from her intimacy with Mrs. Bargrave, though there was never any such thing as a quarrel, but an indifferency came on by degrees, till at last Mrs. Bargrave had not seen her in two years and a half; though above a twelvemonth of the time, Mrs. Bargrave hath been absent from Dover, and this last half year has been in Canterbury about two months of the time, dwelling in an house of her own.

In this house, on the eighth of September, one thousand seven hundred and five, she was sitting alone in the forenoon, thinking over her unfortunate life, and arguing herself into a due resignation to Providence, though her condition seemed hard. And said she, "I have been provided for hitherto, and doubt not but I shall be still, and am well satisfied that my afflictions shall end when it is most fit for me." And then took up her sewing work, which she had no sooner done, but she hears a knocking at the door. She went to see who was there, and this proved to be

Mrs. Veal, her old friend, who was in a riding-habit. At that moment of time the clock struck twelve at noon.

"Madam," says Mrs. Bargrave, "I am surprised to see you, you have been so long a stranger;" but told her, "she was glad to see her," and offered to salute her, which Mrs. Veal complied with, till their lips almost touched; and then Mrs. Veal drew her hand cross her own eyes, and said, "I am not very well;" and so waived it. She told Mrs. Bargrave she was going a journey, and had a great mind to see her first. But says Mrs. Bargrave, "How came you to take a journey alone? I am amazed at it, because I know you have a fond brother." "O!" says Mrs. Veal, "I gave my brother the slip, and came away, because I had so great a desire to see you before I took my journey." So Mrs. Bargrave went in with her into another room within the first; and Mrs. Veal sat her down in an elbow-chair, in which Mrs. Bargrave was sitting when she heard Mrs. Veal knock. Then says Mrs. Veal, "My dear friend, I am come to renew our old friendship again, and beg your pardon for my breach of it; and if you can forgive me, you are the best of women." "O," says Mrs. Bargrave, "do not mention such a thing. I have not had any uneasy thought about it; I can easily forgive it." "What did you think of me?" said Mrs. Veal. Says Mrs. Bargrave, "I thought you were like the rest of the world, and that prosperity had made you forget yourself and me." Then Mrs. Veal reminded Mrs. Bargrave of the many friendly offices she did her in former days, and much of the conversation they had with each other in the times of their adversity; what books they read, and what com-

fort, in particular, they received from Drelincourt's Book of Death, which was the best, she said, on that subject, ever written. She also mentioned Dr. Sherlock, the two Dutch books which were translated, written upon death, and several others; but Drelincourt, she said, had the clearest notions of death, and of the future state, of any who had handled that subject. Then she asked Mrs. Bargrave whether she had Drelincourt. She said, "Yes." Says Mrs. Veal, "Fetch it." And so Mrs. Bargrave goes up stairs, and brings it down. Says Mrs. Veal, "Dear Mrs. Bargrave, if the eyes of our faith were as open as the eyes of our body, we should see numbers of angels about us for our guard. The notions we have of heaven now are nothing like what it is, as Drelincourt says. Therefore be comforted under your afflictions, and believe that the Almighty has a particular regard to you, and that your afflictions are marks of God's favor; and when they have done the business they are sent for, they shall be removed from you. And believe me, my dear friend, believe what I say to you: one minute of future happiness will infinitely reward you for all your sufferings; for I can never believe (and claps her hand upon her knee with great earnestness, which indeed ran through most of her discourse), that ever God will suffer you to spend all your days in this afflicted state; but be assured that your afflictions shall leave you, or you them, in short time." She spoke in that pathetical and heavenly manner, that Mrs. Bargrave wept several times, she was so deeply affected with it.

Then Mrs. Veal mentioned Dr. Horneck's *Ascetick*, at the end of which he gives an account of the lives

of the primitive Christians. Their pattern she recommended to our imitation, and said, "Their conversation was not like this of our age; for now (says she) there is nothing but frothy, vain discourse, which is far different from theirs. Theirs was to edification, and to build one another up in faith; so that they were not as we are, nor are we as they were; but (said she) we ought to do as they did. There was an hearty friendship among them; but where is it now to be found?" Says Mrs. Bargrave, "It is hard indeed to find a true friend in these days." Says Mrs. Veal, "Mr. Norris has a fine copy of verses, called *Friendship in Perfection*, which I wonderfully admire. Have you seen the book?" says Mrs. Veal. "No," says Mrs. Bargrave; "but I have the verses of my own writing out." "Have you?" says Mrs. Veal. "Then fetch them." Which she did from above stairs, and offered them to Mrs. Veal to read, who refused, and waived the thing, saying, "holding down her head would make it ache;" and then desired Mrs. Bargrave to read them to her, which she did. As they were admiring friendship, Mrs. Veal said, "Dear Mrs. Bargrave, I shall love you forever. In these verses there is twice used the word *Elysian*." "Ah!" says Mrs. Veal, "these poets have such names for heaven!" She would often draw her hand cross her own eyes, and say, "Mrs. Bargrave, do not you think I am mightily impaired by my fits?" "No," says Mrs. Bargrave; "I think you look as well as ever I knew you."

After all this discourse, which the apparition put in much finer words than Mrs. Bargrave said she could pretend to, and as much more than she can re-



member (for it can not be thought that an hour and three quarters' conversation could all be retained, though the main of it, she thinks, she does), she said to Mrs. Bargrave she would have her write a letter to her brother, and tell him she would have him give rings to such and such; and that there was a purse of gold in her cabinet, and that she would have two broad pieces given to her cousin Watson.

Talking at this rate, Mrs. Bargrave thought that a fit was coming upon her, and so placed herself in a chair just before her knees, to keep her from falling to the ground, if her fits should occasion it (for the elbow-chair, she thought, would keep her from falling on either side); and to divert Mrs. Veal, as she thought, took hold of her gown-sleeve several times, and commended it. Mrs. Veal told her it was a scoured silk, and newly made up. But for all this, Mrs. Veal persisted in her request, and told Mrs. Bargrave she must not deny her; and she would have her tell her brother all their conversation, when she had opportunity. "Dear Mrs. Veal," says Mrs. Bargrave, "this seems so impertinent that I can not tell how to comply with it; and what a mortifying story will our conversation be to a young gentleman! Why," says Mrs. Bargrave, "it is much better, methinks, to do it yourself." "No," says Mrs. Veal; "though it seems impertinent to you now, you will see more reason for it hereafter." Mrs. Bargrave then, to satisfy her importunity, was going to fetch a pen and ink; but Mrs. Veal said, "Let it alone, now, but do it when I am gone; but you must be sure to do it." Which was one of the last things she enjoined her at parting; and so she promised her.

Then Mrs. Veal asked for Mrs. Bargrave's daughter ; she said she was " not at home ; but if you have a mind to see her," says Mrs. Bargrave, I'll send for her." " Do," says Mrs. Veal. On which she left her, and went to a neighbor's to see for her ; and by the time Mrs. Bargrave was returning, Mrs. Veal was got without the door into the street, in the face of the beast-market, on a Saturday (which is market-day), and stood ready to part, as soon as Mrs. Bargrave came to her. She asked her why she was in such haste. She said she must be going, though perhaps she might not go her journey till Monday ; and told Mrs. Bargrave she hoped she should see her again at her cousin Watson's before she went whither she was going. Then she said she would take her leave of her, and walked from Mrs. Bargrave in her view, till a turning interrupted the sight of her, which was three quarters after one in the afternoon.

Mrs. Veal died the 7th of September, at twelve o'clock at noon, of her fits, and had not above four hours senses before death, in which time she received the sacrament. The next day after Mrs. Veal's appearing, being Sunday, Mrs. Bargrave was mightily indisposed with a cold and a sore throat, that she could not go out that day ; but on Monday morning she sent a person to Captain Watson's, to know if Mrs. Veal was there. They wondered at Mrs. Bargrave's inquiry ; and sent her word that she was not there, nor was expected. At this answer Mrs. Bargrave told the maid she had certainly mistook the name, or made some blunder. And though she was ill, she put on her hood, and went herself to Captain Watson's, though she knew none of the family, to see if Mrs.

Veal was there or not. They said they wondered at her asking, for that she had not been in town; they were sure, if she had, she would have been there. Says Mrs. Bargrave, "I am sure she was with me on Saturday, almost two hours." They said it was impossible; for they must have seen her, if she had. In comes Captain Watson, while they were in dispute, and said that Mrs. Veal was certainly dead, and her escutcheons were making. This strangely surprised Mrs. Bargrave, when she sent to the person immediately who had the care of them, and found it true. Then she related the whole story to Captain Watson's family, and what gown she had on, and how striped; and that Mrs. Veal told her it was scoured. Then Mrs. Watson cried out, "You have seen her indeed, for none knew, but Mrs. Veal and myself, that the gown was scoured." And Mrs. Watson owned that she described the gown exactly. "For," said she, "I helped her to make it up." This Mrs. Watson blazed all about the town, and avouched the demonstration of the truth of Mrs. Bargrave's seeing Mrs. Veal's apparition. And Captain Watson carried two gentlemen immediately to Mrs. Bargrave's house, to hear the relation from her own mouth. And when it spread so fast that gentlemen and persons of quality, the judicious and skeptical part of the world, flocked in upon her, it at last became such a task that she was forced to go out of the way; for they were, in general, extremely satisfied of the truth of the thing, and plainly saw that Mrs. Bargrave was no hypochondriac; for she always appears with such a cheerful air, and pleasing mien, that she has gained the favor and esteem of all the gentry; and it is thought a great favor if they

can but get the relation from her own mouth. I should have told you before, that Mrs. Veal told Mrs. Bargrave that her sister and brother-in-law were just come down from London to see her. Says Mrs. Bargrave, "How came you to order matters so strangely?" "It could not be helped," said Mrs. Veal. And her brother and sister did come to see her, and entered the town of Dover just as Mrs. Veal was expiring. Mrs. Bargrave asked her whether she would drink some tea. Says Mrs. Veal, "I do not care if I do; but I'll warrant you this mad fellow (meaning Mrs. Bargrave's husband) has broke all your trinkets." "But," says Mrs. Bargrave, "I'll get something to drink in for all that;" but Mrs. Veal waived it, and said, "It is no matter, let it alone;" and so it passed.

All the time I sat with Mrs. Bargrave, which was some hours, she recollected fresh sayings of Mrs. Veal. And one material thing more she told Mrs. Bargrave — that old Mr. Breton allowed Mrs. Veal ten pounds a year; which was a secret, and unknown to Mrs. Bargrave till Mrs. Veal told it her.

Mrs. Bargrave never varies in her story, which puzzles those who doubt of the truth, or are unwilling to believe it. A servant in the neighbor's yard, adjoining to Mrs. Bargrave's house, heard her talking to somebody an hour of the time Mrs. Veal was with her. Mrs. Bargrave went out to her next neighbor's the very moment she parted with Mrs. Veal, and told her what ravishing conversation she had with an old friend, and told the whole of it. Drelincourt's Book of Death is, since this happened, bought up strangely. And it is to be observed, that notwithstanding all the

trouble and fatigue Mrs. Bargrave has undergone upon this account, she never took the value of a farthing, nor suffered her daughter to take anything of any body, and therefore can have no interest in telling the story.

But Mr. Veal does what he can to stifle the matter, and said he would see Mrs. Bargrave; but yet it is certain matter of fact, that he has been at Captain Watson's since the death of his sister, and yet never went near Mrs. Bargrave; and some of his friends report her to be a liar, and that she knew of Mr. Breton's ten pounds a year. But the person who pretends to say so has the reputation of a notorious liar among persons whom I know to be of undoubted credit. Now, Mr. Veal is more of a gentleman than to say she lies; but says, a bad husband has crazed her. But she needs only present herself, and it will effectually confute that pretense. Mr. Veal says, he asked his sister, on her death-bed, "whether she had a mind to dispose of anything;" and she said, "No." Now, the things which Mrs. Veal's apparition would have disposed of were so trifling, and nothing of justice aimed at in their disposal, that the design of it appears to me to be only in order to make Mrs. Bargrave so to demonstrate the truth of her appearance, as to satisfy the world of the reality thereof, as to what she had seen and heard, and to secure her reputation among the reasonable and understanding part of mankind. And then again, Mr. Veal owns that there was a purse of gold; but it was not found in her cabinet, but in a comb-box. This looks improbable; for that Mrs. Watson owned, that Mrs. Veal was so very careful of the key of the cabinet, that

she would trust nobody with it. And if so, no doubt she would not trust her gold out of it. And Mrs. Veal's often drawing her hand over her eyes, and asking Mrs. Bargrave whether her fits had not impaired her, looks to me as if she did it on purpose to remind Mrs. Bargrave of her fits, to prepare her not to think it strange that she should put her upon writing to her brother to dispose of rings and gold, which looks so much like a dying person's request; and it took accordingly with Mrs. Bargrave, as the effects of her fits coming upon her, and was one of the many instances of her wonderful love to her, and care of her, that she should not be affrighted; which indeed appears in her whole management, particularly in her coming to her in the daytime, waiving the salutation, and when she was alone; and then the manner of her parting, to prevent a second attempt to salute her.

Now, why Mr. Veal should think this relation a reflection (as it is plain he does, by his endeavoring to stifle it) I can not imagine; because the generality believe her to be a good spirit, her discourse was so heavenly. Her two great errands were to comfort Mrs. Bargrave in her affliction, and to ask her forgiveness for the breach of friendship, and with a pious discourse to encourage her. So that, after all, to suppose that Mrs. Bargrave could hatch such an invention as this from Friday noon till Saturday noon (supposing that she knew of Mrs. Veal's death the very first moment) without jumbling circumstances, and without any interest too, she must be more witty, fortunate, and wicked too, than any indifferent person, I dare say, will allow. I asked Mrs. Bargrave several times if she was sure she felt the gown; she

answered modestly, "If my senses be to be relied on, I am sure of it." I asked her if she heard a sound when she clapped her hand upon her knee; she said she did not remember she did; but said she appeared to be as much a substance as I did, who talked with her. "And I may," said she, "be as soon persuaded that your apparition is talking to me now, as that I did not really see her; for I was under no manner of fear, and received her as a friend, and parted with her as such. I would not," says she, "give one farthing to make any one believe it: I have no interest in it; nothing but trouble is entailed upon me for a long time, for aught I know; and had it not come to light by accident, it would never have been made public." But now, she says, she will make her own private use of it, and keep herself out of the way as much as she can; and so she has done since. She says she had a gentleman who came thirty miles to her to hear the relation; and that she had told it to a room full of people at a time. Several particular gentlemen have had the story from Mrs. Bargrave's own mouth.

This thing has very much affected me, and I am as well satisfied as I am of the best-grounded matter of fact. And why we should dispute matter of fact, because we can not solve things of which we can have no certain or demonstrative notions, seems strange to me. Mrs. Bargrave's authority and sincerity alone would have been undoubted in any other case.

I will make no comments now on the foregoing. I desire to perpetuate its remembrance, and hence have

mutilated an ancient volume in order to give these pages again to the world. In my next I may give you more on the subject of "phenomena."

Hoping for a speedy response,

I am, as ever, &c.,

W. F. PARKER.



## - MOSES HULL'S SEVENTH LETTER.

NEW LONDON, CONN., }  
October 7, 1872. }

BROTHER PARKER: Yours of the 25th ult. greeted me on my arrival here Saturday night. I can not say of your letters as you do of mine, "Your letters are getting remarkably short." Indeed, you seem to have entirely ignored "the soul of wit." As your ideas thin out, your letters become more prolix than before. In this I shall not imitate your example. As long as one half of all you say is on my side of the question, and half of the remainder is irrelevant matter, I will indulge you in an extra amount of *verbosity*.

I. I am heartily glad to see the expressions of willingness to investigate and step out on truth wherever found. I think them sincere, and shall take courage, and labor more earnestly for your conversion.

II. You have not as yet been able to see why you should "reject the Bible for the documents of modern Spiritualism." Brother, please read my letters again, and see if I have ever asked you to "reject the Bible," or receive the documents of "modern Spiritualism." All I ask of any one is to receive the *truths*, and reject the *errors* of both. You seem to think it is impossible to embrace Spiritualism without rejecting the Bible, or see anything good in the writings of A. J. Davis without first seeing that those of Paul and Peter are all bad. In this you have failed to understand me

and a great majority of spiritualistic writers. I do not point out the errors in the Bible to claim that the Bible is all error; only to show that, like other books, it is liable to err. I would not advise you to trust your "morals and safety" with Paul, Peter, A. J. Davis, or J. M. Peebles. On this subject "call no man master." Take W. F. Parker for your guide.

III. And so you ignore the marriage question! Well done. You first assaulted Spiritualism on that; now that I have repelled the attack, and given you some samples of biblical marriage, you think it well to drop that part of the controversy. On that, silence for you is the best argument.

IV. One element, almost indispensable to a good debater, you lack; that is memory. In letter V., and section I., you say, "I did not expect to reconvert you to Christianity. That would be, I dare say, a hopeless task. For to such ones as yourself, I believe the words of Paul forcibly apply." You then quote Heb. vi. 4-6. In your last letter, section I., we have the following: "Your first point is burdened, to my mind, with a strange error. You seem to assume that Christianity, once rejected, is never adopted. Paul knew nothing like this, and the experience of multitudes is against it." Again you say, in the same section, "I expect to see the day when Moses Hull will feelingly retract all he has said against God, the Bible, and Christianity."

Does that look any like Parker *vs.* Parker? Which of these prophecies shall I believe?

V. I can not imagine why you wish to burden our readers with that gossip letter from Joseph Barker. It contains the fact that he has joined one church and

preaches for another. He has changed, but does not, and confesses he can not, tell why. No "event, man, or book" brought it about. He hopes to be able some day to make known "the change which has taken place in his views and feelings, and the considerations and influences which, under God, brought it about." If Mr. Barker can not make it known, some of his old friends can. How strange it was that simultaneously with his conversion to Christ he renounced his abolitionism, his reformatory sentiments, became an aristocrat, and went to Europe to plead the cause of the rebels against the best government in the world. Brother Parker, you are welcome to him, especially till he gives some reason for his faith, or accepts the challenge of some of his former associates to meet the issue.

The long extract you give from Barker's speech is as good, and no better, than if Parker, instead of Barker, had said it. Where is the argument in it? What fact does he state? What irresistible conclusion does he draw? What is there in it more than a vulgar appeal to ignorant young men, to frighten them from investigation? If you will compare it with Mr. Barker's own speeches, made while he was an infidel, you will never again be guilty of using it as argument, or even as *ad captandum*. It will not frighten thinkers. Is it possible that Mr. Barker has labored ten years to produce nothing better than the two extracts you produce from him? And is this the Joseph Barker before whom not a Christian on earth could stand? Who would have believed that such a giant could in his dotage have become such an imbecile? "Let him that stands take heed lest he fall."

VI. The lengthy quotation you make from Paul in Rom. xii. is good. Paul did say many good things. Yet in this, the best chapter Paul ever wrote, good works are secondary. The first thing in importance, as well as in the order laid down, is prophecy, faith, ministry, exhortation, &c. Then good works follow as a secondary consideration. You think Paul's argument, "created in Christ Jesus unto good works," squarely against me. So it would seem; but if you will read the remainder of the chapter, you will learn what the good works were. They were simply the work of accepting the blood of Christ, and "building upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Eph. ii. 13-20.

VII. You still think Paul the father of the Baconian system of philosophy, because he believed in testing things by experiment. That is a new argument, but it does not fit your case, since Moses, Joshua, and David all argued the same thing.

VIII. I have heard nothing about the "dispute between us about which was the best medium, David, Paul, Swedenborg, or A. J. Davis." That dispute has been a one-sided affair. I have not said which was the best. The dispute on your part has been whether Swedenborg and Davis were mediums at all. The *quality* of their mediumship is an after consideration.

You ask for my definition of *inspiration*. The following, taken from a book you will find almost everywhere, is as good as I have:—

"*Inspiration*. 1. Act of inspiring, breathing in, infusing, and the like; inhalation.

2. An extraordinary elevation of the powers of the soul.

3. The result of such extraordinary elevation in the thoughts, emotions, or purposes inspired.

4. *Specifically*, a supernatural divine influence on the sacred writers, by which they were qualified to communicate moral or religious truth with authority."

The second in this series of definitions would tell better than either of the others what I mean by the term in this debate. You want proof that Davis and Swedenborg are inspired at all. My dear brother, you will find it in their writings.

IX. You really are a convert! You have learned that the race has progressed a great way since Moses' day; that even since the introduction of Christianity it has grown not a little. Good! Now, will you tie me back to the dark ages of Moses and Jesus? Shall I put the new wine of present inspiration into those old bottles? Brother, let us be consistent! You again undertake to defend the murderer, Moses—that is a great undertaking! I know you hate to have me "drag up history to blacken the reputation of human beings;" but has the thought occurred to you, that I could not "drag up evil history" if it had not been written? You have been holding up those men and their inspirations as perfect. I, from their own history, show you their imperfections, and then you accuse me of dragging up evil history! My brother, while you have a perfect right to object to my course, please don't slander me, by accusing my course of being too much like that of some Christians!!

The following paragraph looks good, but it certainly comes with a bad grace from one who has said

so many mean things of Spiritualists as have fallen from your lips and pen. I can hardly resist the temptation to say, "Physician, heal thyself." But to the paragraph. Here it is: "A religion which can not be blind to faults and errors is no religion for humanity. True charity will never repeat the sorrowful paragraphs in any individual's history."

And this is the way, after denouncing Spiritualists and Spiritualism as you have, you would beg for mercy in behalf of the Bible-makers. Well, he must indeed be hard-hearted who would be deaf to so humble a prayer!

X. You say, "Alluding to the law of Christ as a fabric of the past," that I said, "We could now make a better one." Did I? Read that again. It is strange I should say that, when Christ never made a law at all. Christ was neither a law-maker nor enunciator of new principles. No; here is what I said: "My great objection to the *Bible* is, it is but the child of the moral, mental, and theological standards of the nation and time in which it was written. We could now make a better one." When I say that, I do not mean we can find better principles than some there are copied into the Bible, but we can leave out some of the bad ones.

XI. I do not really suppose that any "eye-witnesses" ever saw Jesus in Egypt, or anywhere else, between the ages of twelve and thirty, or at any other time. Yet I promise you that when I can get access to my library, I will produce as much authority for saying Jesus spent those days in Egypt, as you can that he spent any time there. You certainly are not so poorly posted as not to know that an ancient

argument against Christianity was, that he learned his tricks and received his education of Egyptian magicians.

XII. And now your cause is damaged by your bad memory again. You say, "As to Jonah, I will further say, —

1. Jesus calls him a prophet; did I say he did not?

2. The word "prophet" in the New Testament means, sometimes, simply "preacher."

In order that you may answer your own argument, and convince yourself that you flounder around and place yourself on all sides of every question, I will let you read your own words as recorded in your sixth response, section VIII. "Allow me to assure you that you have no authority for calling Jonah's preaching prophecy. Jonah does not call it prophecy, nor does the historian of Jonah call it so, nor does any other Bible writer known to me call it so; why, then, should you call it prophecy? *There is a wide difference between prophecy and preaching. Jonah was a preacher, but not a prophet.*"

There, brother Parker, as they say in your state, "How is that for high?" I will not comment. "Brevity is my sole aim."

XIII. You say, "Others have found evidences (of immortality) there (in the Bible); and I am amongst them. In fact, the Bible seems to be full of the doctrine of immortality, so full that all the phenomena claimed by Spiritualists can add nothing to my faith."

I answer, —

1. The Bible may be full "of the doctrine of immortality," and yet lack the *evidence*. It is evidence, and not doctrine, we want.

2. It is not *faith*, but knowledge, we are after. You confess yours is but faith. Spiritualists claim more.

3. Please tell me where the Bible teaches immortality. I defy you to prove immortality by that book without proving Spiritualism.

My quotations from the Bible you think amount to but little, as the author of the book of Ecclesiastes wrote on "purpose to show up materialism," and Job "uttered things he understood not." As to the latter, I have no doubt of the truth of it. There never was a Bible writer in the world but that uttered things which he nor no one else could understand. But what a nice way you Christians have of disputing a Bible text! When I differ with any of these old fellows, I am at once denounced as an infidel; when you dispute them, it is, "O, they did not understand themselves."

By the by, what a strange way that book of Ecclesiastes has of "showing up materialism;" it argues it from first to last. The only text opposing it you quote. But Dr. Clarke and other eminent critics tell us that is an interpolation. What a pity that the only text in all the book that hints toward another world should be interpolated, and of heathen origin. If more heathen texts had got into the Bible, it would have been a better book.

You refer me to Solomon's views of the attributes of God, but you do not tell me how you learn them. You quote, "Then shall the dust return to the dust as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." But to the scholar that means nothing, as all scholars argue that the original word rendered *spirit* is the same as in Ps. cxli., "His breath goeth forth." When



the objection is urged that the breath does not go to God, that is met by a writer in the book of Job, who declares that if he gathers to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, &c. Job xxxiv. 14, 15. It is laughable for you to send me to Josephus for Solomon's views of *Hades*. Did you not know that Josephus and Solomon were two different persons, living in different ages of the world? Josephus was after the Babylonish captivity — after Jesus. No one disputes but that the Jews learned important lessons from their captors. Then Jesus, with his Egyptianism, may have taught Josephus some important lessons.

XIV. You next come to the sage conclusion, that, "if the phenomena of the Bible do not prove spirit incorruptibility, you can not find the doctrine taught by phenomena anywhere."

That may be true. The phenomenon of the return of Samuel to Saul may be as good to him as the phenomenon of the return of Alexander Campbell would be to you. But it is not the same to you.

1. It is Saul, and not W. F. Parker, who saw the sight.

2. The circumstances may not be all recorded.

3. There may be errors in their translation.

4. Saul may not have been so competent a witness as yourself.

5. The statement is only historical; you could not swear to it as you could if your eyes had been the witnesses; and,

6. You don't know who wrote the history.

I submit that the phenomena themselves are better evidence than their mere history could possibly

be ; in the Bible you have the history of the manifestations ; in Spiritualism, the manifestations themselves.

XV. I must take this opportunity to thank you for the admission you make in the latter part of section IX. You believe there is and always has been a true Spiritualism. You also believe the phenomenal facts I quoted did occur, but deny that they were the work of spirits. A man of your ability certainly would not deny without a reason ; he might doubt, but could not deny.

You ask me to prove that spirits do the work. Will you prove that Mr. Parker writes the letters I get from him. They look to me much like " machine " letters, and I rather question whether he ever wrote them. In fact, I "*deny*" it ; now, will you prove it ?

Here are some of the evidences that the manifestations are from spirits.

1. They are intelligent.
2. They universally say they are spirits, as you say you are W. F. Parker.
3. They sign names of friends well known in earth life, and in many instances not known to the medium.
4. They give tests, such as the relation of incidents only known to the sitter and the one purporting to give the communications ; and,
5. They often relate circumstances not known to the sitter, but known to the spirit, which afterward prove to be true.

Permit me here to relate one instance. I met a medium in Boston about a month since, who said, " Who is Eddie ? " I replied, " I had a brother-in-law Eddie

killed in the war." "O, it is not he," said the medium; "this Eddie is not over two years old; and here is little Victoria with him, not over ten months old; they are brought here by your sister Harriet. They have been in the spirit world but a few days." I went to Springfield the next day, and received a letter from my brother, D. W. Hull, informing me of the birth of his little Victoria into the spirit world, and one from my wife, informing me of the death of my little nephew, Eddie Earle. Will my brother give an explanation of this?

XVI.\* I am very glad indeed you give me that twelve page extract from that old document. I could not have asked you to indulge me in so lengthy an extract, and as it is a positive proof of Spiritualism, and a proof of my proposition that these phenomena always have existed, I hope it will have the effect to open the eyes of your brethren. It certainly will go further than if it had appeared in my letter instead of yours. Brother, you will never overcome the argument in that extract.

Permit me to relate one incident as stated by Rev. J. G. Fish, in his debate with Mr. Dunn, which I trust will go far toward convincing you of the identity of the spirit communicating. "I once visited a celebrated medium — Mrs. Robinson, of Massachusetts. I went into her room. I had never seen her. She

\* Since the MS. of this letter was sent to Mr. Parker, I have ascertained that there are strong probabilities that the facts in Mr. Parker's twelve page document, are apocryphal. It was written by De Foe, the author of Robinson Crusoe. Though De Foe was a Spiritualist, he undoubtedly wrote this for the same purpose he did many other apocryphal stories.

addressed me as my mother. I had a recent letter from my mother in my pocket, and knew nothing of her death, and so stated to the medium; but she replied, 'Yes, I am your mother.' I called for some test by which I might know if it were she. She replied, 'In my last conversation with you I told you I regarded you as deluded, but I pledged you that if Spiritualism were true, I would seize the first opportunity after my decease to come to you. My son, you are right — Spiritualism is true; and I, your mother, who would not shake hands with you, now greet you from my immortal home.'

"I felt disgusted, almost. I did not believe one word of it; did not believe I had a mother in the spirit land. It is true the letter I had was ten days old when I received it; but she was, at the time of the writing of it, alive and well. Five days after this, while debating with Elder Grant, of Boston, I was passing the post-office, and received a letter; thrust it into my pocket, and went to the hall. I opened the letter there, and judge of my surprise, on reading it, to find that my mother passed into spirit life on the 29th of January, five days before she came to me through the medium. She did not sleep beneath the clods of earth."

I still expect to hear of your conversion to Spiritualism.

As ever,

MOSES HULL.

## W. F. PARKER'S SEVENTH REPLY.

CEDAR HILL, near LA GRANGE, KY., }  
October 31, 1872. }

BROTHER HULL: I ought to have answered your letter of the 7th inst. before to-day; but I have been so fully pre-occupied that delay with me has been a matter of necessity.

From this time forth for some months I shall be fully occupied, and our correspondence will be compelled to drag heavily. I therefore propose that we close further writing, and let the case go to the jury.

I will say, however, that I have not seen fit to discuss the phenomena of Spiritualism, from the fact that I know nothing about them. I have heard of things remarkable said to have been done by spirits. So, recently, I have heard of remarkable miracles in Europe done by Roman Catholic priests. I do not believe either class of reports, as they come to me. But that unusual facts have manifested themselves both among the Spiritualists and Papists, I am willing to accept on the word of those who say they have witnessed them. I do not and can not feel any interest in these matters.

That "ghosts" have been seen by some persons I have no doubt; but what of it? You may say it is a demonstration of immortality. Well, that demonstration, then, has been in the world for six thousand years,

and we are not indebted to modern Spiritualism for it. I can not become a Spiritualist for this reason.

I have read your letters carefully, and I think dispassionately, and I see no reason why I should cease to be a follower of Jesus of Nazareth. I am satisfied with my understanding of the teachings of prophets and apostles, and shall cleave to them until I see better reasons than I have seen in the writings of any Spiritualist, Infidel, or Atheist, for abandoning them.

I can not, in all the world of Spiritualism, find *one new truth*; nor one old truth put into a more acceptable form.

My brother, you have my kindest regards; and hoping that our labors for the common good may not be in vain,

I am, as ever,

W. F. PARKER.

# **"EXETER HALL,"**

By WM. McDONNELL.

Author of "The Heathens of the Heath."

A beautiful, tender, delicate, pathetic, and most convincing composition. A beautiful exhibit of the many mischievous effects growing out of religious dogmas founded upon the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible. It strongly denies the divine character claimed for that book by its mistaken devotees, and shows up in vivid colors the practical effects of superstition and religious fanaticism.

"Altogether, it is the most searching book ever published in America since the 'Age of Reason.'"

Price, in paper, 60 cents; in cloth, 80 cents. Sent post-paid by mail. Address

D. M. BENNETT, Publisher,  
835 Broadway, New York.

---

## **TWELVE TRACTS,**

BY B. F. UNDERWOOD.

Underwood's Prayer; Paine Hall Address; Design Argument Refuted; Marples-Underwood Debate; Questions for Bible Worshipers; Jesus Not a Perfect Character; Prophecies; Bible Prophecies Concerning Babylon; Ezekiel's Prophecies Concerning Tyre; Evolution; From the Homogeneous to the Heterogeneous; Darwinism; The Christian's Creed.

Containing in all over 100 pages. Price 20 cents.

---

**Innocent Amusement for the Young.**

---

## **BLAKEMAN'S 200 POETICAL RIDDLES.**

These Riddles embrace a large variety of subjects, and will be found very entertaining to children, as well as to those of larger growth.

They will assist materially in affording amusement to social parties, as well as to the fireside family circle.

Price, 20 cents by mail.

D. M. BENNETT, Science Hall,  
141 Eighth street, New York.

**SOW THE GOOD SEED.**

---

## **LET YOUR LIGHT SHINE.**

---

**CIRCULATE TRUTHFUL DOCUMENTS! PASS  
AROUND THE TRUTH SEEKER TRACTS,**  
and other Liberal publications to do missionary work, and  
help to open **THE EYES OF THE BLIND!**

---

### **THE TRUTH SEEKER TRACTS**

are furnished at prices very low, so that Societies and generous individuals can buy them for gratuitous distribution.

#### **LARGE DISCOUNTS**

to those who purchase by the quantity. [See Price List.]

Probably a few dollars can be expended for spreading **TRUTH and LIGHT** in no way so effectually as in dispensing broadcast.

#### **THE TRUTH SEEKER TRACTS.**

Let Liberals exercise liberality enough to give away thousands and tens of thousands of these Tracts. They are well designed to do missionary work, and in spreading the glad tidings of truth. If a proper enthusiasm is enkindled in the breasts of the lovers of Freethought and Mental Liberty much good can be accomplished.

Prices range from one cent to ten. From one to one hundred may be ordered of any of the various numbers, and a heavy discount made to those who buy by the quantity.

Friends, invest \$5 or \$10 in this way, and see how much good it will do. We certainly ought to be as zealous in promulgating truth as our adversaries are in disseminating error.

The series of Truth Seeker Tracts, comprising more than one hundred Tracts and Leaflets, and making nearly 1,600 pages, are bound in three volumes, and sold low. In paper 60 cents per volume, or \$1.50 for the set; in cloth, \$1.00 per volume, or \$2.50 for the set. Sent postpaid.

Published by **D. M. BENNETT**, Science Hall,  
141 Eighth street, New York.





## THE TRUTH SEEKER

Is the largest, boldest, and cheapest Radical paper published in the world. Devoted to Science, Reform, Progress, and Human Happiness. It earnestly seeks the truth and does not fear to avow it when found. It has no confidence in the myths, theological fables, and superstitions which have cursed the world for thousands of years. It is not a friend to kingcraft, priestcraft, or tyranny of any kind. It advocates mental and physical freedom—especially freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the mails, sternly opposing any infringement of these constitutional rights of the people.

Price, including postage, **\$3.00** per year, or **25** cents per month. Sent on trial to new names for **50** cents for three months. Sixteen large pages, published weekly. Try it three months.

## RADICAL PUBLICATIONS.

**The Truth Seeker Library.**—All large octavo volumes of a thousand pages each. Cloth, **\$3.00**; leather and red edges, **\$4.00**; morocco and gilt edges, **\$4.50**. If the whole five are taken and sent by express, **25** per cent is deducted. The books are, *The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers*, *The Champions of the Church*, *Thomas Paine's Great Works* (theological and political), *Lord Amberley's Analysis of Religious Belief, and Supernatural Religion*, by Prof. W. K. Clifford. The latter is **\$4.00**, **\$5.00**, and **\$5.50**.

**Other Radical Works.**—Greg's Creed of Christendom, **\$1.50**; Paine's Political and Theological Works, published separately, **\$1.50** each; *Thirty Discussions, etc.*, **75** cents and **\$1**; *Truth Seeker Tracts*, five volumes of 500 pages each, **60** cents and **\$1**—by the set, **50** cents and **75** cents; *Humphrey Bennett Discussion*, **\$1**; *Bennett-Teed Discussion*, **30** cents and **50** cents; *Interrogatories to Jehovah*, **50** cents and **75** cents; *Burgess-Underwood Debate*, **50** cents and **80** cents; *Underwood-Marples Debate*, **35** cents and **60** cents; *Addresses and Proceedings at the Watkins Convention*, **\$1.25**; *Truth Seeker Collection*, **75** cents; *Dr. J. Simm's System of Physiognomy*, 8vo, **\$3**, **\$4**, and **\$4.50**; *Heathens of the Heath*, **\$1** and **\$1.50**; *The Darwins*, **50** cents and **75** cents; *Amberley's Life of Jesus*, **35** cents and **60** cents; *Career of Religious Ideas*, **50** cents and **75** cents; *Holy Bible Abridged*, **30** cents and **50** cents; *Holy Cross Series*, thirteen numbers, anti-papal, **10** cents to **50** cents and **75** cents; *Influence of Christianity on Civilization*, **25** cents; *Last Will and Testament of Jean Meslier*, a Catholic priest, **25** cents; *Chronicles of Simon Christianus*, **25** cents; *Religion not History*, **25** cents; *Resurrection of Jesus*, **25** cents; *Bell's Life of Jesus*, **15** cents; *Christianity and Materialism*, **15** cents; *Anthony Comstock: his Career of Cruelty and Crime*, **25** cents; *Sepher Toldoth Jeschu*, the Book of the Generation of Jesus, **20** cents; *The Jamieson-Ditzler Debate*, **50** cents and **75** cents; *What Liberalism offers in the place of Christianity*, **10** cents; *Truth Seeker Tracts*, nearly two hundred varieties, from **1** cent to **10** cents each; *Truth Seeker Leaflets*, thirty-two kinds, **8** cents per set, **25** cents per hundred, **\$2** per thousand. Radical and miscellaneous books of all kinds furnished to order. Send for a catalogue. Address, **D. M. BENNETT, 141 Eighth street, New York.**