6217
16.16.4
2102

DISCUSSION

ON

SPIRITUALISM AND IMMORTALITY,

AT THE

MEIONION (TREMONT TEMPLE,)

ON THE

EVENINGS OF MAY 1, 2, 3, AND 4, 1860,

BETWEEN

ELDER MILES GRANT AND REV. J. S. LOVELAND.

FORM OF QUESTIONS.

FIRST:— *Is Man's Immortality taught by the Bible, Science, and Philosophy; or proved by Spiritualism?*

SECOND:— *Is Immortality a gift of God dependent upon the character of the receiver?*

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING THE AFFIRMATIVE OF A DISCUSSION BETWEEN

DR. E. L. LYON AND ELDER MILES GRANT,

AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT.

QUESTION.

Is it possible, probable, and absolutely certain that departed human spirits can and do communicate with mortals in the form, or earth life?

REPORTED, PHONOGRAPHICALLY, FOR THE "BANNER OF LIGHT,"
BY E. P. ACKERMAN.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY BERRY, COLBY, & COMPANY.
1860.

DISCUSSION

ON

SPIRITUALISM AND IMMORTALITY,

AT THE

MEIONION (TREMONT TEMPLE,)

ON THE

EVENINGS OF MAY 1, 2, 3, AND 4, 1860,

BETWEEN

ELDER MILES GRANT AND REV. J. S. LOVELAND.

FORM OF QUESTIONS.

FIRST: — *Is Man's Immortality taught by the Bible, Science, and Philosophy; or proved by Spiritualism?*

SECOND:— *Is Immortality a gift of God dependent upon the character of the receiver?*

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING THE AFFIRMATIVE OF A DISCUSSION BETWEEN

DR. E. L. LYON AND ELDER MILES GRANT,

AT BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT.

QUESTION.

Is it possible, probable, and absolutely certain that departed human spirits can and do communicate with mortals in the form, or earth life?

REPORTED, PHONOGRAPHICALLY, FOR THE "BANNER OF LIGHT,"

BY E. P. ACKERMAN.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY BERRY, COLBY, & COMPANY.

1860.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by
BERRY, COLBY, & CO.,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Stereotyped by
COWLES AND COMPANY,
17 Washington St., Boston.

DISCUSSION.

FIRST EVENING.

THE meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Grant, after which the Chairman, Rev. Joshua V. Himes, of the Advent Church, Hudson Street, this city, read the following notice: —

We have been called together this evening for the discussion of the following questions: —

First: Is Immortality taught by the Bible, Science, or Philosophy; or proved by Spiritualism?
Second: Is Immortality a gift of God dependent upon the character of the receiver?

Rev. Mr. Loveland takes the *affirmative*, as I understand —

MR. LOVELAND. — Of the first question, sir.

CHAIRMAN. — Mr. Grant, the negative. The discussion will now proceed by the opening address of

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I deem myself happy this evening in standing before you as the advocate of man's immortality; and, though no argument *pro* nor *con*, will add to, or diminish from, our real immortality, yet, if I succeed in showing to you how every mind demonstrates its *own* immortality, I shall have furnished the basis whereon rests all our affirmations of human unity and equality, and the sure basis, or ground, for universal charity.

This discussion, so far as essential principles are concerned, is no new one, though somewhat new in form. JESUS, in his day, taught the doctrine of immortality, or eternal life, in opposition to the Sadducees of his day; and, in this latter age, the old question is again revived. We stand here to discuss this question this evening. "The natural man discerneth not the things of the spirit; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The natural, or sensuous mind, enveloped in the misty veil of mere external tangibilities, fails entirely to grasp the invisible and spiritual beauties of the universe, and firmly denies their existence unless their dimensions can be estimated by geometry, or their gravity be determined by the steelyard or balance.

That immortality *does* exist, I shall endeavor to sustain; and my first proposition this evening is: The dual or triple nature of man is the grand basic

doctrine of all religions; is the recognized fact of all science, and the fundamental principle of all philosophy.

That this is the fundamental doctrine of the Jewish and Christian religion, no one can doubt who has examined, even cursorily, the records of the Testaments. Take, for instance, the Mosaic account of the creation. It is said, "God created man of the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life (or *lives*) and man became a living soul." Here the idea of a dual nature is clearly expressed. Man is formed by God, first as to his body, from the ground; *then* his soul, or spirit, is breathed or inspired into him by the Deity, and he becomes the dual or complex being we assert. The same is taught where it is affirmed of God "He formeth the spirit of man *within* him;" and again, "There is a spirit *in* man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." It is said of a certain young lady whom Christ raised from the dead, that "her spirit *came* again." Paul prays "your whole soul, spirit, and body be preserved," etc.

You will all see the palpable distinction between the soul and body as indicated in these passages, but one or two more will state the fact (if possible) still *more* strongly.

Jesus said to his followers, "fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul;" and Paul directs "to deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

Not only have Jews and Christians held this duality in man's nature, but agreeing with them have been the Egyptians, Hindoos, Greeks, and Romans; indeed, *all* religions recognize this distinction as fundamental.

Science fails not in all her classifications to adumbrate this great fact. In species and germs she recognizes the existence of an invisible power which gives the various orders and classes those specific characteristics which entitle them to be called by the same generic or specific name. Coming to the highest science, that of medicine, where *humanity* is the subject, we find, as we should expect, the most marked avowal. The old physicians were compelled to admit the existence of the "*Vis Medicatrix Naturea*" as an important agent.

But now, mental symptoms claim precedence in many instances over those merely physical. The dual nature forces a recognition from the man of science if he would have success in his calling.

Philosophy commences with this idea. It has no foundation or sphere of existence elsewhere. It deals with principles, — principles are real potencies, all potentiality resides in spirit, — for it is *found* nowhere else.

That all religions sanction what science recognizes and philosophy rests upon, is also the affirmation of the common sense of mankind. Men everywhere, in all their literature, forms of speech, — colloquial or classical, — avow their recognition of the duality of their nature. They have *souls* as well as *bodies*.

My second proposition is: That the universe is a system of means and ends, of instruments and uses; otherwise, *cause and effect*.

Everywhere means and ends reveal themselves as the explanation of the great law; instrumentalities employed secure uses; causes produce their effects. Everywhere this occurs. Means indicate ends, causes point to effects. A cause created, an end, or effect, *must come.* Ends presuppose means, and means always suggest ends; effects include causes. The ends of one department become means to another. The ends or ultimates of the mineral become the means for the vegetable, that in its highest ends means for the animal, and *all* are means for the use of man.

When we reach the ultimate of any world we may be sure that all else is means to that as an end so far as that world's productions or creations are concerned. Man is the end, the culmination of this earth. He is the highest of all forms of creation here. He is over all else by the appointment of the God producing him. All time, all change have been the preparations, the herald prophecies of his advent and destiny; there *is*, there can *be* on earth none *higher* than man.

My third proposition is: That the scheme of the universe is one of exact and even justice. Justice is but higher causation — the correspondence between results and the causes producing them.

As a universal principle it is applicable to all departments of the universe. In the lower forms of existence there is a marked immediateness in the justice which there rules. Bring together two chemical substances and instantaneously a coalescence follows — justice is done — the power which links effects and causes, means and ends, has performed its mission. But, in proportion to the ascension in nature is the involution of method in rendering justice, and, because we often fail to *see* the iron-linked chain by which cause and effect are wedded together, we do not understand the justice of the universe. Because our bounded vision may take in only a segrement of the mighty circle of cause and effect, shall we therefore conclude that in the very constitution of the universe the great principle of justice is not incarnate? Effects are wedded to their causes by a power which defies *all* attempts to separate them; for, the power which instituted their relation is above all mere outer nature, and resides *within* the soul itself; nothing can resist it. Vainly do they dream who hope to escape the operation of this principle, that in some way, or by some other means, they can escape those results which pertain to legitimate causes. Man, the many-sided being, cannot be fully approached by any single act or event. There must be the lapse of time, — the meeting and concatenation of events, — experience, and consequent growth in knowledge, in order for man to see and realize fully the character and bearings of his dispositions and actions. Years, ay, ages, may elapse before the causes in human nature and action can by possibility work out their legitimate results. But though it wait it will *come*, and no skill or power of mere men can prevent the consummation.

My fourth proposition is: That all revelation is mediate or immediate; direct or indirect.

By immediate revelation I mean that which is given directly to man himself, the sensitive, feeling, seeing, thinking soul. By mediate, I mean that which comes through other existences. The immediate is that which is to the man, the person, who intuitively perceives it as coming from the person or being making it, without the aid of any intermediate agencies, as though the speaking or revealing power were within the person receiving it. By mediate revelation I mean that which comes through intermediate channels, those revelations that are made by words and things, all of which are symbols, or *mediate* instrumentalities by which the feelings or the thoughts of one being are, more or less correctly, brought to the consciousness of another. The nature of things and beings constitutes the *primary* revelation. There was no revelation before *nature*. The revelation first made to man was the universe that God created, that he might look out upon it. There *could* be none *prior* to this — that which first made His goodness visible to that thinking soul. Hence, there could have been no prior revelation; all, therefore, of word-revelations must agree with this primary one, made by God, through nature. And hence, all verbal revelation must agree with this primary one made by nature, and, as nature is amenable to science, and, must consequently cassify its means by and through science, that which must agree with it is thus made amenable to the same test, and *being* made amenable thereto, its mistakes can only be corrected *by* science. And thus it *has* been. Verbal revelation for ages led man to suppose this earth to be the centre of the universe; but the theory of *Copernicus* and the telescope of Galileo corrected the mistake, in spite of all the fears for religion and anathemas against the venturesome sage. So also the Jewish and christian world for ages, on the strength of verbal revelation, affirmed that the whole creation was accomplished in *six literal days;* but science corrects *this* mistake by showing that uncounted ages slowly passed while the earth was passing through those changes which have fitted it for the residence of man, so that, as we open the leaves of her rocky tablet, we find, instead of her having sprung into being in connection with man, that those tablets contain the revelation of her evolution from the primordial chaos of distant eternity, and, during all these intervening ages, has God been evolving the form of the universe we now see.

My fifth proposition is: That all the preceding facts and principles find their culmination and illustration in the grand fact or law of progress, which is the method of divine procedure in all times and departments of the universe.

The fact of progress in the lower departments of existence is generally admitted. That this earth, from an original chaotic mass, has sprung into its present form, is admitted to be true. Also, that by uncounted changes matter was combined, disintegrated, and recombined; that change followed change, each one of which refined the constituents of matter, elevated it to a higher plane of use, until it was possible for vegetable and then animal life to exist on the globe.

But, progress has been by successive steps of race — creations. The lowest form of animal life appeared first, then another, and another still higher, until

man has crowned the whole. This idea is indicated by verbal revelation, for, essentially the order of creation, as stated in Genesis and the other sacred cosmogonies, is the one which science confirms.

Man, I say, crowns the whole, by including in himself the law or principle of progress. There is no higher principle in this lower creation than in him, for all earthly forces and principles find in man their culmination. Hence, there is no necessity and perhaps we might say, no possibility, for any further creation. Possessing in himself the capacity for eternally outworking new forms of use in his own nature, he is, so to speak, a *perpetual creation*, for no being could be more perfect than man, and be below the Infinite. These continual blossomings of his nature, in the path of change, are the revelations which his nature makes to itself, and they not only intimate his distinction in the scale of existence, but also his possible destiny.

I have termed these propositions *basic* ones, not as being arguments themselves, but as furnishing a foundation on which to construct an argument in favor of man's immortality.

I have not time now to apply these propositions in argument, and will only indicate, that if they shall be admitted by the brother who is to follow me on the negative side of this question, that man has a dual nature, as he must, that the distinction between soul and body is reasonable in theory, revealed by language in connection with the various religions, and indicated by science and philosophy; we shall then contend that the universe is one of means and ends, man being an integral part and the culmination of this portion of the progressiveness of his spiritual constitution capable of continued joy; their outworkings are the symbols of divine revelation to him that he will live on in the coming future, discerning more and more clearly, the *necessity* for the rendering of justice in the future for the inequalities of this present life. All events, all acts and changes, will be seen to be embraced in one grand whole of means and ends, and in man they will culminate in the brightenings and glory of his immortal existence, —

(The speaker's time here expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — The subject before us this evening is one of deep interest. Perhaps no one is agitating the theological world more than the one now under examination. Great and important results are attached to this question, and, if my friend upon the opposite side sustains his position from philosophy, science, and the Bible, *we* think he is sustaining the doctrines of hero worship, prayers to saints, purgatory; the doctrine of eternal misery, as held by many, and the doctrine of *spiritualism* — *all* of which, we think, are sustained by him who said to our first parents, "Thou shalt *not* surely die."

We are aware that the sympathy of the public is not in harmony with our position; we are aware that popular theology is against us, and, also, the

majority of the Christians of the present day; we are aware of this; and yet, we feel that we *are* sustained by many uninspired men. For instance: John Milton, the author of "Paradise Lost;" William Tindall, who presented the world with the first printed copy of the Bible printed in English; Martin Luther; the apostolic fathers; and, we feel that we are sustained by the apostles; by Moses and the prophets; by Christ and His Father; — *this* is the way *we* feel. We are just as honest in our position as our friend on the opposite side is; we give him the credit of being honest; we honestly differ, and we shall endeavor throughout this discussion to speak only what we *heartily believe*. We are here to discuss, with Christian feelings, the subject in question.

My friend on the opposite side has made many assertions. If they can be sustained, perhaps *we* might as well yield the ground. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a wide difference between *assertion* and *proof;* and *we* shall call for proof — of some of the assertions, certainly.

The *first* was, "that Jesus taught immortality in opposition to the Sadducees." In one sense He *did*. But, Mr. Chairman, we remark, He *never* taught that we are immortal *in this life*, or, that we have *human* immortality (as my opponent and myself agreed that the word *human* should refer to *this* life — this was agreed between us); hence we remark that Jesus never taught *human* immortality. The Sadducees denied a resurrection of the dead. Christ *taught* it, and by this means we are to *obtain* immortality.

We believe in the resurrection of the dead — that they are to be raised. We think as Paul did when he said, "If the dead rise not then is not Christ raised, and if he is not raised they that sleep in Christ are *perished*."

Our friend thinks that the doctrine of human immortality is taught us by intuition. Mr. Chairman, it is not so taught to *me;* I do not so understand it; no intuition teaches *me* such a doctrine. He also says it is the base of *all* religions, both Jewish and Christian; but, we ask, Mr. Chairman, if it *is* the base of all religions, why do we not find it given so in the Bible, the recognized record of God's word? Why does God leave it to the simple wisdom of man? If it is the base of all religions, Mr. Chairman, why did not Christ himself teach it? Why do we have to wait until the teachings of the Platonists were introduced into the church in the second century? Call that proof and argument? Is it not contrary to the belief of Christians? Do we not read in Genesis "that God created man of the *dust of the earth* and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (or *lives*) and man became a living soul"? We would like that our opponent should define man, so that we shall know his position, and then we will compare it with facts, science, and philosophy. But referring to the Scriptures we find the record reads "that God formed man of the *dust of the earth;*" and, we have yet to learn, Mr. Chairman, that man originated in any *other* way than by the direct formation of his Creator at that time. He is made of the dust of the ground, and when analyzed chemically, is shown to be composed of carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen, iron, sulphur, phosphorus,

and lime; these are all earthly substances, and when the breath of life (or *lives*) was breathed into his nostrils, he became the living, thinking man. Therefore, as man is composed of the dust merely, and of the breath of life, we are yet to learn, Mr. Chairman, that any thing but the breath of life leaves man at death, or that the body goes anywhere but to the dust from whence it *came*. We read the following interesting question in the 14th chapter of Job: "If a man *die* shall he live *again?*" Not, if he die is he alive at the same *time?* But, "shall he live *again?*" We gain the answer from our Saviour: "He that believeth in me, though he were *dead* yet *shall* he live." Not, "he is *still* alive," but, "Jesus *will* raise *him* at the last day." We are asked, do we believe there is a difference between body and spirit? Certainly, sir. We are not here to dispute it at all; we believe God formed the spirit or breath within man; but when did he create that spirit? Before the creation of man, before he breathed the breath of life into him? The word here rendered *spirit* occurs four hundred times in the Old Testament, and three hundred and eighty-five times in the New, and in not *one* place do we find it rendered *soul*. We have the same word in Amos 4: 13: "For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the *winds*, . . . the Lord, the God of hosts, is his name." We have the same word where we read, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the *spirit* shall return to God who gave it." Observe that this word is never used in either the masculine or the feminine gender, but always in the *neuter*. We have the same word in Psalms 104: 29: "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their *breath;* they die and return to their dust." Here it is used, as you see, as the *breath* that God breathed into the nostrils of man. It does not *always* read "breath of life," or "wind," but it *is* rendered *wind ninety-five* times in the Old Testament, and *then* it refers to "the *breath of lives;*" hence, we all have but one breath, we are all made of dust, and all must turn to dust again. We are referred to Job 32: 8, for an example of the use of spirit: "But there is a *spirit* within man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Here is the *same* word again, rendered *spirit*. We *deny* that this spirit lives on when the breath is taken away, but believe that this very breath of life is the *spirit* in man. He is formed of the dust of the ground, then is the breath of life (or lives) breathed into him, and he *lives;* it is taken away, and they *die*. Hence the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding. When they *have* understanding this spirit or breath of life is *within* them; when taken from them, they *die;* and, Mr. Chairman, we shall call upon our opponent to show from the *Bible*, from facts, from philosophy, from science, or *any* reliable source, that any thing *else* leaves man at death *but* the breath of life which God breathed into his nostrils! Says Job, 27: 3: "The spirit of God is in my *nostrils*." In Matthew 10: 28, we read that God "is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." The word here rendered *soul*, mark, is *not* that rendered spirit. They are never used interchangeably in the Bible. This word is used in the Old Testament seven hundred and

fifty-two times, but it is not rendered spirit *once;* they should not be confounded. Our opponent says that science confirms spiritual existence, especially medical science. Mr. Chairman, we have yet to *learn* that fact; we call for the proof of that assertion; let our opponent state it. It is directly the *opposite*, Mr. Chairman, so far as our experience goes. He says that human immortality is the *base* of all philosophy. It is the base of *his* philosophy, I know, but Herodotus says the Egyptians first taught the immortality of the soul. He wrote some four hundred years *before* Christ. Does it look *reasonable*, Mr. Chairman, that when a man is alive, and all his faculties, moral, physical, and intellectual, are in healthy operation, and he can astonish the world by his eloquence; that when he is *dead*, when his organism has all returned to dust, that he knows more than ever? Does it look *reasonable*, sir? Has it a sensible look about it? We say, No! And we shall bring the Bible to sustain our position and decide the question.

It was remarked by our opponent "that the whole universe is a system of means and ends," — we grant that proposition — "of causes and effects; man is the end of this life, the culmination point." We understand our opponent by this to mean, that there is nothing higher than *man*. If this is *so*, then there is nothing, of course, *above* him. *We* think God is higher; Christ is higher. But if his position is that man is God, and God is man — if this is the meaning of the proposition, we shall deny it.

He remarks "that the universe is one of justice." We admit it, not stopping to argue it.

He says "all revelation is mediate or immediate, direct or indirect." We shall not now argue this point, but will wait until it is more fully developed. He remarks "that verbal revelations are amenable to, and agree with, science." Not prepared to admit it. The remark was made in reference to science, "that it has not one point upon our side;" spoke of "the changes that might have taken place within the many thousand years from the beginning of the universe," etc. As this is not the point in discussion, we pass it. He gave us to understand "that the Bible teaches that earth is the centre of the universe." I should like the chapter and verse that shows it; we shall want *proof* — substantial proof.

His fifth proposition is, "that man is a being of progress." We look upon it otherwise. Why doesn't he prove it? Why, if this is so, does not man show it in himself? Is it in physical form, moral capacities, intellect — how and where? We think man is retrograding instead of progressing, in *many* respects. It *is* progression, but its progression *backward* instead of *onward!* Records show it to be so, at any rate.

We ask him to sustain his position; we doubt it.

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — I am happy that very many of my propositions have been admitted. Very briefly I will notice a few of the leading views of my brother who last spoke.

First, in relation to Jesus teaching immortality in opposition to the Sadducees. I admit that Jesus taught the resurrection; but in that form that taught immortality or a future life. The Sadducees came to Him and questioned Him respecting the resurrection. After explaining to Him part of their position, He says, "And that the dead are raised have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke to him, saying I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?" "God," said Jesus, "is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for *all* live unto Him." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who had been dead as to the body for very many years, yet lived in the spiritual world, which was denied by the Sadducees. When my brother says "that human immortality refers only to this life," by human immortality I mean the immortality of *men*, not of beasts or the entire animal creation. Again, he wishes me to define *man*. I will do that presently. When the Sadducees came to Jesus and spoke of the woman who had seven husbands, and asked, "at the resurrection *whose* wife she shall *be?*" Jesus answered and said, "Ye do err, for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the *angels* of God in heaven." Possibly there is no significancy in *that*. I leave that with my brother to determine, as it is the angels and the Almighty that are concerned. Here is the idea of Job 32: 8: there is a spirit of man; the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding; i. e., the spirits or souls of men; it also gave *them* existence. It is the spirit *within* them which causes them to *will* and *act*. What *is* this spirit? Let us have *that* as clear as my brother wishes me to define some of *my* positions.

I did *not* say "that medical science and medical men more and more tended to prove the immortality of man's nature;" but I *did* say, "that medical science and medical men more and more recognized the duality of man's nature, in the influence which mind or spirit has over physical disease, and that that affords evidence of something in man which is distinct from the body, and which we call soul or spirit." This is not a direct argument. I did not offer it as such. The assumption is made by my brother that I said "that man was the highest of all nature's creations in the universe." I did *not* say so (VOICE. No!), but I said "that man was the highest being upon this *earth* — *this* world — not *all* worlds. I said nothing of *other* worlds or other universes. I was surprised at one remark my brother made: that if my position is true, the Bible is *false;*" but, with this remark, I shall pass to my direct argument, and apply the propositions I have submitted by first remarking that man is *to* man a more perfect revelation than any that can be made to him by words. Ideas are older than words, desires are back of ideas, and *feelings* lie back of *them*. Words, it is said, are signs of ideas; hence, the thing signified must exist before that which signifies it has an

existence. A desire must have a feeling which is prior to it, which prompts it, which exists before it. This is the order of the means and ends, the causes and effects of the human mind. Hence, I say, that man is *to* man, and *of* himself, a more perfect revelation than can be made to him by mere words. For, if revelation be made to him by words, then words must signify ideas, which ideas must have originated in the mind of man; hence, as they are in this sense a revelation to man, man could make it better by comprehending himself.

Man is revealed to himself through his power and susceptibilities. These I might classify as intellect, imagination, love of the beautiful, æsthetical, etc.; and they are primary means in the constitution of man, having reference to some use which is germain or homogeneous to the nature of man himself. They do not exist as entities in man's nature, but as powers. Man generically possesses intellect; man is prior to the thoughts of his nature; man is the end of the means used by his Creator in his creation. My brother has admitted that the universe is one of means and ends, and that man in himself manifests means and ends. That he is a revelation to himself of what constitutes that nature, and what is its destiny. He learns this from himself, and, if a verbal revelation can reveal that to him which will lead him to comprehend himself, then we will admit that verbal revelation is superior to the primal revelation of God. The existence of aspiration or desire in man's nature, we here remark, signifies a capacity within that nature to enjoy and realize that desire if attained; and unless there *is* a capacity in the nature of man for the enjoyment of immortality, or any thing else, he *could not desire it*; — it would be *impossible*. Man desires immortality because he has an innate capacity for its enjoyment when attained, and he could not desire it unless he *possessed* that internal capacity. The very *fact* of his desiring it shows he can enjoy it. The desire and capacity is the means; the possession, the *end* to be subserved by the use of these faculties. The strongest desire in man is that he shall eternally live; man desires this more than any other one thing; and the *fact* of his desiring it shows that he is capacitated to enjoy it; that unless he *was* so capacitated he would not desire it. Why is it that men desire — not so much to live here — but they desire eternal life — immortality? This is the question. Why do they desire it so much? Is it not that they feel there is a craving, a longing *after* this eternal life or immortality? I do not *say* that man *is* immortal *because* he *desires* it, but that he desires it *because* he has the natural capacities with which to enjoy it. My position, clearly stated, is this: there is, there cannot *be*, any *desire*, unless the person desiring it is *fitted* to receive it, and has a provision in his nature fitted for its reception. Let this argument be met if it *can* be.

My opponent says, "that man, instead of progressing, is *retrograding*; he is progressing, but it is backward instead of forward." This is somewhat singular; it's a strange position for a man to assume who pretends to understand these matters as well as my opponent. I have only to say in answer to this, that it

is generally admitted, by philosophy, by science, by religion also, and it stands out as one of the primeval facts on the face of nature *herself*, that man *is* a being of progression, not of retrogression. Progress is visible everywhere! Nature reveals it; man shows it; one change after another proves it. Let my opponent *substantiate* the assertion he has made; let him *prove* it. It is *so*. None dispute it; it is no manufactured idea; it is no assertion. It is *fact*.

My brother speaks of the resurrection, as being of the *literal body*, etc. He says if it is literal in one case it is in another; if it be true in one instance it is true in all instances, etc. If his nature is so constituted that he may live in the future it will reveal itself. If man was *created in the image of God* and is *not* immortal, then is not *God* immortal. Again, my brother speaks of man as being made *only of the dust of the earth*, and yet says, almost in the same breath, he is composed of oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and some other substances! How is this? We leave *him* to reconcile these discrepancies with himself and the Bible.

We affirm that man's immortality is revealed in the intellectual powers which he possesses, in those aspirations which are never satisfied with this life, but long for eternal life; that immortality reveals itself in the inherent qualities of man. Man cannot be satisfied here: he is intuitively taught to feel that there is something more; and he lives, as it were, hoping and longing for the life to come. ("Time.")

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — The remark is made, "He is not the God of the dead but of the living, for *all* live unto Him." It is here, our friend remarks, that we are taught the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of the soul. Let us look at the subject a little more. In Luke 20: 27, you find the account. There was a woman who had seven husbands. "In the resurrection whose *wife* shall she be? For they all had her." The Saviour says, "they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more," — implying that they die *once*, — "for they are equal unto the angels, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised" — our friend dwells on the word *are*, as if the resurrection had already taken place. The Syriac reads: "But that the dead will rise, even Moses showed; for, at the bush he maketh mention while he saith, The Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." There is also reference made to the same account, our friend remarks, in Mark 12: 25, 26, 27; "For when they shall arise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage," etc. "And as touching the dead, that they rise" — or shall *be* raised — "Have ye not read in the book of Moses how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead but of the living." What is our Saviour here en-

deavoring to prove? Is it not the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead? Admitting, even, that they *are* alive, does *this* prove the resurrection? But it is easily *enough* understood if you admit they were *dead.* Does not Paul himself say, Rom. 4: 17 ("As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations), before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were"? Now comes the point. We read here, "as touching the resurrection of the dead, I *am* the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." But, if they are *alive*, then there is no *need* of a resurrection of the *dead.* We claim this argument of the other side, Mr. Chairman. "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob"—*they* are *dead*—*when* dead he declares "he is *not* their God when dead"—they *need* no God to prove that they are *alive.* They can live again, and "Christ died that he might raise man from the dead, and be the Lord *both* of the dead and the living!"

My friend says, Jesus did *not* preach a literal resurrection of the dead. We are rather surprised at this assertion after his remark on spirits and demons. Jesus is the type of the resurrection, yet my friend claims that "he has *not* risen from the dead. "If the *dead* be not raised, then is Christ not raised." Yet he claims that the *spirit never dies!*

We remarked before that the *spirit* does not *mean* life, but the breath of life, or lives. The word rendered spirit does not always *mean* a *being.* It means also a *state* of being. Thus we read of the "contrite in *spirit,*" the "humble in spirit," the "meek in spirit." It denotes an influence proceeding *from* the being —not a being in itself!

Our friend remarks, in speaking of man as being a progressive being, that *we* claimed that if progress *is* true, the Bible is false. We did not say that if progress *was* true the Bible was false; but, if *man* is growing *better* the Bible is false. These are the words we used. The Bible account says, "man shall wax worse and worse." Now if he can understand the words of Revelation we ask, *is* man growing better or worse? *Is* the Bible true or false? The records of crime, all over the earth, show man to be retrograding instead of advancing.

Again, my opponent says, "man reveals himself *to* himself." *I* do not *wish* any other revelation than the *Bible.* I read in this good book (holding the Bible up before the audience) "that life and immortality are brought to light *through the Gospel.*" Not all the philosophy that man ever had, does now, or ever *will* possess, could ever convince *me* of a resurrection of the dead without the aid of this blessed book!

We pass now to the consideration of our friend's remarks on the word *desire.* He says, "the desire of immortality is proof of the future, and that man couldn't *desire* it unless he was adapted and capacitated to enjoy it." Very well; we admit that point. He asks, "what is the universal desire of man?" We assume *future eternal life!* And that *desire* for it, Mr. Chairman, *proves we havn't* GOT *it!* (Loud applause from the friends of Mr. Grant.)

CHAIRMAN. I hope we shall have no more demonstrations of this kind.

MR. GRANT. The Chairman is right. You have applauded my friend once; call it even now. We wish no cheering; it is not pleasant to *us* at all.

MR. GRANT then proceeded. We were speaking about man's desire for immortality; and, I repeat it, Mr. Chairman, the very *fact* of man's desiring it proves he hasn't *got* it! A man would be foolish to desire a thing he *has already!* He asks the question, "can mortals desire immortality?" Not if he *has* it — he can't. When I *have* my book (holding a book in his hand), I do not *desire* it! When I am sick I *desire* to be well — does that *make* me so? When a man *desires* to be rich, does that prove he *is* rich? Not at all, sir; it proves he wants to *be* so, and *that* in itself implies that he is *not!* Perhaps our friend will clear this up in *some* way.

He says, it is just as possible for a *clam* to desire to be a *man*, as for a mortal to desire immortality? The clam might desire to be a man, but, can a clam desire to *be* a clam? No; *because it is one already.* Yet, he says man "desires to *be* immortal, because he *is* immortal." There is no mistake that he said so. We noted it down. Man, by the law of progress, is susceptible of *receiving* immortality; and yet he has *got* it! Perhaps my friend is a little confused in his mind; he makes such strange remarks.

He refers again to *progress.* Look back to Adam and Eve in their innocence, when the earth was full of love and harmony. Where is the *progress?* Are we better, so far, than our first parents? Is man better now than when first created? He says, "man is so constituted as to *receive* immortality." We admit *that*, but we deny that it *proves* universal immortality, because humanity possesses the capacities *for* that immortality. Where is the use of putting forth any effort to obtain immortality if we are all to have it *without* any effort whatever?

Now we come to an interesting point in our opponent's remarks. He says, "man is created in the image of God," — this we admit, of course — "which proves he is immortal, or else he is *not* created in God's image, or else God Himself is *not* immortal." He might as well say, man is omnipotent, *because* God is so. We are not here to argue the immortality of *God*, but of *man.* Perhaps he believes that *man* is *God* — and that we have none other, as *many do!* We admit that God is immortal; we are not disputing that point at all.

He says," man's faculties are adapted for something more than this life" — that's it — that's it — that's the point we believe, exactly.

We believe we have answered all our opponent's arguments; we have nothing more to say, as we see. It is not our place, upon the negative, to bring forth any arguments, but only to answer those put forth by the affirmative; and, as I have done this, I will cheerfully give my opponent the balance of my time, and sit down.

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen : — Either my brother is a very poor reporter, or else I have said a great many things I never thought of, or *meant* to say, or else I have a strange habit of *thinking* one thing and *saying* another! My brother uses phrases like these: "we *have* immortality," as though it were a thing to *have* — a thing to *possess!* As though, when I used the word *spiritual*, I meant something *distinct* from man, something which comes into his *possession!* I meant nothing of the kind; I meant the inner state or the *soul* of man, the very constitution of the human spirit itself; that it is naturally and necessarily immortal; that it naturally desires future life, and, that that desire for future existence, which almost every, nay *all human* beings possess, *is* the interior soul of his constitutional organism, because, mark you, that *in* this desire for future existence is blended not *only* the desire or idea of the life *itself*, but also of the everlasting joys which are anticipated in connection *with* that state of existence. This is what I meant; hence, I did *not* say that we *have* immortality *because* we *desire* it. Nor have I made the remark, "that unless he *can* have immortality," unless I made a remark I never *intended* to make. I *did* say, that unless man's inherent constitution, or his spiritual nature, *be* immortal, unless he had capacities for the enjoyment of immortality, he could *not have the desire for it!* That is what I said, exactly.

Man now possesses all the faculties originally created in him, and they, so far as this life is concerned, exert a happifying influence; they show themselves in his constitution, for they are natural, and will naturally do so. If they exist here only that they might subserve the mere necessity of an earthly existence, how they could meet the wants of the spiritual nature, is very poorly shown. The necessities of this existence seem perfectly fitted to perfectly answer the ends to which that nature is adapted, for then do all these high and noble faculties of man explain the fact that only his *earthly* existence would perish. But, if the faculties that man possesses can be used for the perfection of *spiritual* existence — if they can *here* — for a spiritual existence — that existence in which man shall be ever unfolding more and more in the perfection which we see him striving for now, then these unfoldings must be germane to that existence, to which a more earthly existence does not correspond as the end of life.

This, I claim, *was* taught by Jesus, and as man is *now* what he was *then*, and the world exists now as it did then, and if there be a future life admitted for man, then we see a use, an end for him, which corresponds with his nature, in its adaptation of means and uses.

If you give eternity to man, if you give him a future, if you allow him the gift of eternal life, to all men, you have laid the basis for that charity inculcated by Jesus when he taught us "to love one another." You have also laid the

basis for that satisfying faith which gilds the whole of life with smiles; and with *that* belief you may feel much higher joy, and such joy as corresponds with the wants of man's nature. And, with this end in view, each succeeding throb in the heart of man's conscious nature, shall cause him to grow more and more happy in the contemplation of his future being. All these glorious thoughts will tend more and more to spiritualize mankind; will cause the true nature of man to shine in this light; we can glory and rejoice in all the bright anticipations of the future. The bright sun of glory will never set upon the nature of man. When we shall have sprung into this new sphere of being each subsequent joy shall work out the true end of life.

That this desire is in the heart of man, we think our brother admits, and we think all Christian religionists admit the same fact. Does any Christian, in his sober senses, believe that there is no higher destiny for man except to return to the dust from which they, in the persons of our first parents, as to their outer nature, were taken? Were *they* but dust of the earth? Were they not *more,* that is — spiritual? *Are* we then to be consigned again to the dust from whence we came? Are all these higher faculties of man created to perish forever? *Is* there to be *no redemption?* We fain would *hope* so; for, it has been said,

"'Twas *great* to speak a world from *naught;*
'Twas *greater* to *redeem.*"

And would this higher life, which is the *animus* of the Christian's hope, be so greatly prized were they formed *only* of the dust? Does not this indicate the means and ends of which we have spoken? Does it not show *why* man is so anxious to live an earnest life and improve himself by knowledge? Does it — ("Time expired.")

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We read in the Bible, "when this mortal shall *put on* immortality." This shows we havn't *got* it. This has already been shown, we think, satisfactorily. My opponent remarks, "the present life is not sufficient to satisfy the demands of man's nature." Certainly not. There is the life to come; we have admitted that. We believe it, and we believe it because the Bible says so! (Applause.) He remarks, "we *are* better than our first parents, if the Bible is true." Please show us where the Bible says so. Does it not say, "Sin brought death into the world," and that "God sent Christ to redeem the world"? If it is better, Mr. Chairman, what is the use of a redemption?

I read, Mr. Chairman, of Adam: "*lest* he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and live forever." *That* doesn't mean he *should* live forever, *any way?* Does it? We think not. It is true, it was a great work to redeem the world; but you must also bear in mind that it involved a great sacrifice — more than you know for. How much better would it have been for the human race

if Christ could have been spared the many scenes of anguish through which he passed. Does my friend say that man is happier in his toil than he would be in the calmness of his own conscious innocence? God said, "Adam *should* surely die;" the devil said, "thou shalt *not* surely die." Let our friend now tell us *who* told the truth?

SECOND EVENING.

Opened by prayer by Rev. Mr. Loveland.

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In resuming the discussion, I wish to call your attention to a fact which must have been patent to your observation, last evening. I refer to the marvellous ease with which my brother on the negative disposed of my arguments; and, his real or seeming obliviousness to the fact that I had presented *any thing* demanding the slightest notice, was *very* refreshing, while his construction of men of straw with which to amuse himself, instead of meeting the real positions adduced, was simply *ridiculous*; and I must assure him that no *such* attempts to wink down my arguments will answer the purpose. I promise *him* attention to all his real positions, when *he* shall lead in debate. I will not set aside the points he makes when he takes the affirmative, neither must he, now, or else he must yield us the affirmative of *this* question.

My *first* position was, that man possesses a *dual* nature — soul or spirit, and body. This he partly admits, but seeks to avoid its force by assuming that spirit is simply breath — air! Very well; it is the breath of GOD; "for *he breathed,*" it is said, "into man the breath of life (or *lives*), and he became a living soul." But he has admitted too *much*, by allowing that angels are spirits — organized, personal beings! I recollect a passage which says, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire," or, as I might say, more properly, "who maketh his spirits *angels*" — angel being *not* a title of a *being*, but indicating an *office*. Angels are men, natural men, who have laid off the physical body, but who live in a spiritual existence. I here affirm, that there is not a *hint*, much less a precise declaration, in the whole Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, affirming angels to be a *distinct* order of beings *from men*, or, that they have a *nature* distinct *from* that of *man!* On the contrary, it will occur to you — all who have read, as you all have, the Bible — that *angels are called men*, that they have appeared as *men*, talked as men, that they eat and drink as men, or are said to have so done. But my opponent declares that the spirit in man is nothing but his breath? But "*is* the Holy Spirit a *breath*"? Were the demons of the New Testament breaths? But these *demons* are *called spirits* — unclean spirits; were they *breaths?* *Demons* are also called *men.* According to the theory of the Greeks *they were the spirits of men*, and *the spirits of men who had lived on the earth!* Was the spirit which stood before Job's friend, a simple *breath*, or a real, personal entity? Personal qualities are attributed to *spirit*, and spirits. But our opponent says also, that "the spirit of man is the *influence; that* is, the spirit which is within him." Was man only

the *influence* of God? Paul's spirit is said to have been "stirred *within* him." We read also of a *wounded* spirit. So when the term *soul* is used, is the *soul* a breath, or something else? Is it any thing else than this actual, personal, conscious, thinking being, which is *converted* by the laws of the Lord? Is it a *breath*, or is it something else which filleth us with life? These various examples fortify the position of man's immortality—not directly, mark you; nor do I assume that the immortality of man is demonstrated in the fact that he *has* a dual nature, but that spirit and soul are terms we use interchangeably, when we refer to the thinking, conscious, personal part of man; that they are something *distinct* from man's *outer* form, or body. The evidence afforded by the trance is also strictly applicable here. *Paul* implies that the thinking, knowing part of man *may* be absent from the body, when he says he knew a man fourteen years since, whether *in* the body or *out*, he didn't know; God knew; such an one caught up into paradise, hearing unspeakable things not allowable to be uttered. Now, I ask, what *was* this which Paul says may have been caught up into paradise? Was it a *breath*, or what *was* it? Or, was it that which acted, thought, and knew, of which he is speaking? "Whether *in* the body or *out*, God *knoweth*." There *is* something, then, which *can* be caught up into the third heaven, and yet *may* be out of the body, Paul being authority therefor!

Many will recall the instance of the gifted Tennent, a preacher in New Jersey during the last century, who was supposed for some days to be dead, but who was finally revived, and related his wonderful experience while in his, to all appearance, unconscious state. The body was kept, contrary to the wishes of his family and friends, from burial, by the physician; and, after recovering from this trance, he affirmed that, notwithstanding his body had been to all appearance dead, that *he* was, notwithstanding, *conscious*, and like the one Paul speaks of, was enabled to look upon spiritual things "that were not allowable to be uttered." So great was the glory revealed to him that it remained with him for years, and eclipsed all the glories of this mundane sphere of existence!

I remember, years since, at a Methodist camp meeting, we had taken along a little orphan girl, some nine years of age. One day she had been missing. We looked around after her, and after a long search found her in the back side of a tent, *in a trance!* *She* had never seen any thing of the kind in her life; did not know what it *was*. She came out of it after a while (and here please remember that my brother last evening appealed to your perception of the ridiculous, about a man's being "knocked in the head," having his brains scattered about upon the ground, and then knowing more than he knew when he was alive, and "all together"). She said she saw the spirit of her mother; that angels and spirits came and talked with her. She had never *learned* this. It was a new thing. She had never *heard* of it. But there, in the innocency of her childhood—and she was one of the most perfectly innocent little beings I ever saw,—she had passed into that unconscious state, outwardly. But there

was something still alive — a consciousness of spiritual presences manifesting all their love toward her! Is there no evidence *here* of a spirit in man?

Another instance occurred some years since, in the town of Danville, Vermont. A man by the name of Weeks, a member of the Free-Will Baptist Church, was supposed to be dead, and laid in that condition some days. The best physicians in the country said he had died of mortification of the bowels — a fatal disease, as every physician knows; but after some days there were signs of reviving animation in that form, and he was able to whisper to them what would restore the body again to life. This being done, and life in a measure regained, the man detailed the experience of his thinking, conscious, personal self, during which the body showed all the appearances of *death!* During that unconscious state there was a *something* in him which allowed him to hold communion with spiritual beings. What was it? I leave our brother to answer, while I pass this point, for I might multiply instances of the same description sufficient to occupy all my time.

My brother must show, in opposition to this array of testimony, that the soul or spirit is *not*, as here affirmed, the thinking, feeling, conscious, personality of man, or else admit our first position to be triumphantly sustained. And as he admits the spirit *to be the source of life*, we are prepared to infer, from this admission, it to be essential life itself.

Our second proposition was that "the universe was a scheme of means and ends." This was admitted. I observed, on this proposition, *first*, that there can be no superfluous ends; *second*, that man is the end, culmination, or head of this earth, a crown set over the works of God's hands; *third*, that the universe is one of even and exact justice, was *fully* admitted; *fourth*, that all revelation is either mediate or immediate, direct or indirect — partly admitted, partly denied. I showed that mediate revelation was by symbols, words, and things. Verbal revelations must agree with the primary ones in nature; and science *corrects* the verbal. *This* was denied. In proof, I referred you to the fact that the Jewish church and the christian church, down to the days of Copernicus, without a single exception, so far as history furnishes any proof whatever, believed this earth to be the centre of the universe, and, believed it from the verbal declarations of the scriptures, and that *science* corrected the mistakes of *verbal revelation*, by proving that the earth, instead of being itself the centre of the universe, was only one of many similar bodies which *all* revolve around *one* great centre. *This* can *not* be *denied;* it is *fact!* And it will not do, in defence, to say that the Bible doesn't *mean* that the earth is the centre, because we know that such *was* the belief until science forced the christain world everywhere to receive *its* evidence, instead of believing the verbal revelation, they had before them.

My fifth proposition was the affirmation of the law of progress, as demonstrated in the formation of the universe, from original chaos, which, after change upon change took place, was in a condition for the reception of man, etc. This was denied, as a universal law, though perhaps *partially* applicable. If I understood

my brother rightly he said "that the principles of geology and all its followers asserted that six of our days were sufficient for the creation of this sphere." I may be wrong; if I am, I wait to be corrected.

Mr. Grant. — I remarked that some, not all, geologists held these views — some of the most able writers on these subjects.

Mr. Loveland. — I say then, in reply to this, that all the *principal* geologists, and, so far as *I* know, *every* geologist who is recognized as a scientific man, affirms *just the contrary*, beginning with Professor Hitchcock, of our own country; Hugh Miller, John Pye Smith, Lyell, and all the other acknowledged able writers upon geology, admit the mistake of supposing it to be in the space of six of our *days*, and affirm that it would occupy many thousands of *years* for the formation of such a sphere as this.

Man, as an integral portion of the great whole of creation, must embrace within himself, in his powers and susceptibilities, means and ends. Then I brought the argument to the point; man desires immortality, with the accessory idea of happiness; this desire is, with other faculties, a means pointing to the future as a prophecy, and back to the soul's essence as a basis, or source; is a product of soul life or essence. There *is*, there *must* be, a corrrespondence between cause and effect; the bramble cannot produce figs, nor the fig-tree bring forth brambles. The idea of, and the faith in, man's immortality, spring from this desire, or else are matter of revelation; in either case true.

Man is constitutionally progressive; that is, God progressively unfolds or reveals himself in His universe; so man progresses in the comprehenson and enjoyment of these revelations; that God incarnates in the parental *germ* of all forms of existence that power which outworks all their future destiny. This, in man, is the image of God, or, man's spiritual nature, for God is a *spirit*. "Hence, if *one* human being ever reaps the golden harvests of immortality, *all* will."

What is my brother's answer to this concatenation of argument? He retorts by a play upon words, — he seeks to reduce my argument to an absurdity, — upon the word immortality, meaning, as applied to the soul, capacities for eternal joy, and as applied to the future desire therefore. This he seeks to avoid by a play upon words, and all he does with that argument is to say that "it amounts to this: man *desires* immortality *because* he *has* it, and *has* it *because* he *desires it!*" Let us see.

For instance, the desire for music indicates a passion for music; a man has the desire, the germ, the longing after it within him. What do we mean by this? Do we mean to say that *because* he has the desire for music, *therefore* he is a proficient in the execution of music? No. But we *do* mean to say that the music is *in* the *man*, in that he has the musical *capacity;* that he *could* not desire the music unless the musical capacities were *there*. We mean that man desires immortality in the future, *because he has the capacities or inherent essence of immortality within him. This* point, mark you, has not been *touched;* it has

not been *looked* at in the *attempted answer!* Understand this; apply it to food. A man could not desire food if he had not the digestive apparatus, any more than he could desire music if he had not the musical *capacity*. So in *all* branches of learning and education. There *can* be no desire where there is no capacity corresponding to the enjoyment of the things desired in the person who desires them. This argument has *not* been met, and, we repeat, it can *not be met*, without denying the propositions which have been already admitted. (Time expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I have listened with a great deal of interest to my opponent. I am pleased with him, and presume you *all* are. He is so kind and gentlemanly; I love to talk with such a man.

We will briefly run over the points presented to us. First, "man has a dual nature; soul or spirit, and body." If by dual *nature* he means two distinct *men*, we disagree. If he means by nature that he thinks and acts, we coincide. Nature is not a being. Nature doesn't act, doesn't think, doesn't reason. It is not an entity. When he says, "two distinct natures where there is but one being," that one being must have both the natures! Is this his meaning?

Then comes the interesting point of angels. The assertion is made that *angels are the spirits of men.* We read, in Hebrews 1: 14, that they are "ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." We believe in angel maifestation, because the Bible teaches it. We have records of such manifestations. My opponent refers to them, and says of these angels that they are *tangible organizations;* that they did eat when they visited the earth; that Lot waited on them, washed their feet, and made preparations for them to remain over night. And, we learn, "that we should not be forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." Now, Mr. Chairman, we make the remark boldly that these angels are *not* the spirits of men in a *single instance;* that no departed human spirit ever *did* or ever *will* come again to earth; that the thing is impossible, absurd, and contrary to sense.

(Mingled applause and hisses, during which the Chairman called the meeting to order.)

MR. GRANT then proceeded. We admit that angels are tangible organisms, like ourselves; but they are *not* made of flesh and bones and earthy matter, as *we* are. Christ says, "a spirit *hath not flesh and bones*, as ye see *me* have." But we *do* read, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the creation of man, the work of our Creator, "let us make man in *our image.*" Then we read, "man was made a little lower than the *angels.*" Was he made a little lower than *himself*, to begin with? That hardly looks sensible to *me.* We read it. The Bible confirms it. "Man was made a little *lower* than the *angels.*" Then I read again, "when man is raised from the dead, he will be made *equal* to

the *angels.*" Equal to *himself*, sir? We read of angels manifesting themselves to Adam and his companion before there was any *death* in the world or anywhere else. Now, if angels are departed men's *spirits*, where did *these* come from? Who were instructed to guard the tree of life before the first man died — the noblest of the human race· Who were these? We shall want *this* point met, too! Angels resemble men — have been mistaken for men; their outward appearance is very similar, otherwise they would not have *been mistaken for men*, as they frequently have. Daniel says, "an angel appeared to me as the *appearance of a man.*" Looked *like* a *man!* We should like our brother to show that man has something *in* him that goes *out* of him which is immortal, which has the "*appearance* of a *man*," and is *like* a man. Something that has *strength* and power; something that can roll away the stone from the door of the sepulchre. Mr. Chairman, when angels have made themselves manifest *they have always come in their own persons, never* through a "*medium*," in a single instance — bible proof to the contrary! There is not one example to be found. These angels have power to render themselves visible or invisible, at pleasure, as Jesus did after He arose from the dead. Angels, as we have before remarked, are *tangible organisms*, so that they can "let men wash their feet," and they can "eat bread." Is there *such* a being goes out of men after death? One that comes back with his *feet?* One that sits down and eats *bread?* Let there be *proof — proof*, Mr. Chairman, that *any thing* but the *breath of life* leaves man at *death!*

My opponent sticks to it still, that angels are an order of beings higher than men, instituted before men. Then it follows that they are *not* men. They have been mistaken for men.

He asks, "are the demons *breaths?*" No, sir. We remarked, last evening, that the word *spirit* has four uses in the Bible.

First: "For praising and being as God, which is a spirit." Angels are spirits; *demons* are spirits — *unclean* spirits, etc.

Second: Spirit is used to denote an influence proceeding from a being, as in the case of mesmerism, a psychological influence — spiritual influence cast from one man to the other.

It also represents the Holy Spirit which proceedeth from God; not breath or wind. Certainly not. He asks, "was that a *breath* that passed before Job?" No, sir. It was a spirit, an angel. "Is the soul a *breath?*" No, sir. The word rendered soul is *never* rendered *spirit*, as we remarked last evening. It occurs *seven hundred and fifty-two times* in the Old Testament, and *one hundred and five* times in the New, and is not rendered spirit once; therefore they should not be confounded, I remark again. "Is any thing else lost but this living, thinking being?" No, sir. The whole man is dead, with all his passions and appetites.

My opponent then refers to strong constitutions as proof of the immortality of the spirit. We can't see how this proves it, because —

MR. LOVELAND. I did not offer it as proof, sir.

MR. GRANT. Then it should not be brought, if it is no proof. Paul says, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth — such a one caught up to the third heaven." We have several such examples in the Bible, of persons being caught up into the air, sometimes personally, sometimes mentally; as we see things in dreams, for instance. I see my friend, talk with him, we have a pleasant conversation together, but

"Awake to find it's all a dream."

So in the trance, and other states, when they think they are taken away bodily. See Ezekiel 8: 3: "And he put forth the form of a hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heavens," etc. Revelations 21: 10: "And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain," etc. Ezekiel 11: 24: "Afterwards the spirit took me up and brought me in a vision by the spirit of God into Chaldea, to them of the captivity." We believe angels have the power to take a man up and carry him; we believe demons can do as much (faint attempts at applause); but we are *not* prepared to admit that the "breath of life" — which we have shown to be the only thing that leaves the body at death — *can* take a man up and carrry him off! Paul did not know whether the man was *in* the body or out. "God knoweth;" so there is as much proof in *that* passage for my side, as there is for my opponent's.

He asks me, "is life a *being*, or an attribute of a being?" We might question his definition of life. Then if this spirit is essential life itself, it is no essential being. "The Christians believed the earth was the centre of the universe, because the Bible taught it; and this error was not corrected till science showed the mistake." The Bible does not pretend to teach astronomy or geology, but the way of life and how to obtain immortality. He says his argument in favor of desire is "one that can't *be* met, and there's no use in trying." It's one thing to *say* it, Mr. Chairman, but quite *another* thing to *do* it. If I heard my friend right, I understood him to say, "the fact of man's *desiring* immortality was *proof* that he *had* it." It's either proof that he *has got* it, or that he *hasn't* got it; we don't care *which* "horn of this dilemma" he takes. "Desire is a longing after something we have not got," — so all our lexicons tell us. Now, is it proof we *have* got it, or proof we *haven't* got it? Which *is* it? If the desire is what my friend claims it is, any thing can have immortality. But we claim that nobody can desire it if they *have* it; and the desire for it proves they haven't *got* it, Mr. Chairman. So, taking either side of it, we will be willing to rest our whole argument on this point, if he will prove that the soul has immortality because it desires it, or else desires it because it hasn't it. Will he admit that?

MR. LOVELAND. — Yes!

MR. GRANT. — Then it hasn't *got* it yet. We wish to bring forward some positive Scriptures on the subject before us. We shall bring the testimony of inspired men, of angels, and of God, to prove that men, or *all* men, are dead between death and the resurrection; and if there is no resurrection of the dead, as Paul declares, "they that are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." We will now give the testimony of inspired men. "When the Lord saw her who was weeping he said unto her, Why weepest thou? And he came up to the bier, and they that beheld him stood aside; and he said unto him that lay upon the bier, Young man, I say unto thee, arise." Before this it has been said, "and there was a dead man carried out." "Young man, I say unto thee, arise; and straightway he that was dead sat up and began to speak." Was that the man on the bier? We showed, last evening, that God formed man of the dust of the ground, and it remains yet to be shown that any thing else is *called* man or associated with man in his creation, except "*organized dust!*" — what is formed of the "dust of the ground." Christ says, in John 6: 49: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are *dead*." Is this proof, sir? Shall we believe the testimony of Jesus? God says to Moses, in Exodus 4: 19: "Go, return into Egypt, for all the men are *dead* which sought thy life." In John 11: 14: "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, *Lazarus is* DEAD." And Jesus said unto the woman, "though he were dead yet shall he *live*." When the stone was taken away from the mouth of the grave, Jesus cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth." Thus we have the testimony of inspired men, the testimony of our Saviour, the testimony of God, and of angels. (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I do not propose to enter very lengthily, *now*, into this argument respecting *angels*. I have only to say that they *are* called *men*. That the *word* angel means messenger — one sent. Either Daniel or Ezekiel calls them *men:* "I heard a certain *man* on one side of the river," etc. The angels of the Apocalyptic churches, I take it, were *men*, notwithstanding they are *called* angels; and I think it would be a very unsound conclusion to say the city messenger of Charlestown was *not* a man, because, literally, the term applied to him signifies that he is the *angel* of the city — the messenger. The word signifies an *office*, a *work*. If I should say I saw a company of *soldiers*, and should say that *because* they were *soldiers* they were *not men*, I should certainly make a great mistake, because *man* is the *fundamental term*.

I am surprised at the assertion made by my brother, "that angels manifested themselves unto Adam." This assertion amounts to nothing, unless it can be proved that *cherubim* are *angels*, — which it cannot, — and they were *guarding the tree of life*, instead of making any manifestations or coming to Adam. It

is not certain that the spirit that passed before Job's friend *was* an angel; therefore it will help the assertion of my brother none whatever.

I am hopeless of making my brother comprehend the argument about *desire;* therefore I will *pass* it, and leave it with the audience. There is an incapacity *somewhere.* I do not say *where* it *is!* (Applause.)

As to the meaning of the word *man*, my brother argues thus: "That nothing is included in the term man, but dust of the earth in an organized form." And then I am told, after this, that "man was created in the *image* of God;" *in the* IMAGE OF GOD. Then the image of GOD means organized dust!!! God, then, is organized dust; is he? Man made in his image, was made of dust; there is nothing else enters into the composition of man; man is nothing more than this dust organized. My brother argued, last evening, that man is mortal, and still says he is created in the image of God! Why not call God mortal, too, and done with it? We do not mean to assert that image or likeness implies equality, by any means; but man is in the image of God, has all the qualities which constitute his natural image, and manifests them. He has power, wisdom, etc.; but they are finite in him, infinite in God. The same in *kind*, differing in degree; especially is it so in the essence of his nature, his spirit. God is an immortal being, is the "Father of the spirits of all flesh; we are His offspring." If so, then we, "His offspring," "made in his image," are created, as one has said, "to be a picture of His own *eternity;*" that is, if the human soul can die, then can perish the Divinity! And every argument which trenches upon the immortal individuality of man as a spirit, trenches upon the immortality of God — which God is declared to be a *spirit* — is striking a blow equally destructive to the immortality of God himself!

What does my brother do with the argument, that the soul's capacities transcending nature, and especially in their power of endless unfolding the *necessity* of mere earthly life, of necessity require an endless future as their only legitimate sphere of exercise and unfolding? Capacities which fit man to ever learn in the boundless school of the universe, to ever drink from the flowing stream of bliss, in short, to endlessly glorify in wise and holy action, in pure and earnest loving God from whom he sprang? If man is to die the death of annihilation, if this candle of Jehovah which guides the feet of man in this life, is to be blown out in eternal night, have we not superfluous *means* — faculties and powers for which there is no legitimate use unfolded in the universe in which they are placed? Certainly.

My brother partly admitted this argument, by admitting that the "life we here enjoy, cannot alone satisfy the mind"!

But man, by virtue of his nature, is necessarily progressive. This was also denied, and some attempts were made to put in the plea of man's fall through Adam going to show that he was *not* a progressive being. Because *one* man falls, does that prove that *all* men follow? In the account which is given of the eating of the fruit in the garden of Eden — and here please bear in mind there

was a *something* which is said to have exclaimed, "thou shalt *not* surely die" — I wish to ask the question, who told the *truth* — the one making the assertion, or the one giving the command? (Applause.) And in connection with this, let me say this: some being said to the woman, "for God doth know that in the day thou eatest thereof ye shall become as gods, knowing good and evil." Now I ask, *who told the truth?* Didn't he say in "the *day* you eat thereof you *shall not surely die?* And did not God affirm the truth of this assertion? *Did* he die in that day? No, sir. Unless my brother has some mode of calculation *I* am not aware of; for the *history* declares he lived some *nine hundred years* after that, instead of dying that very day!

Man is, by virtue of his nature, *necessarily* progressive. Forever stimulated by desire, his perceptions or intuitive powers supply material for the comparing and forming intellect. And here is the broad line of difference between man and the *animal.* Animals cannot reason — man *does;* and *by* and *through* reason he is indisputably and necessarily progressive.

I have hinted that justice is the inexorable sequence between cause and effect. When man sins, retribution must follow; he cannot set it aside or escape it by any possible means; but retribution is *not* an *end*, but a *means*, in this universe; and a means *to* an end; for, if retribution were in *itself* an *end*, suffering or extinction of existence, if that were possible, would be an end in God's universe.

But this would make retribution an end instead of being a means. But this is *not* the case. But look at man! The majority stand, as it were, on the very brink of destruction, but He is not able to save them from it! He has brought man into existence, created in his own image; he has strayed, to some extent, from the path which He has marked out for him, and He is not able, by any possible means, to bring them back into that pathway. Foiled in His purposes, disappointed in His expectations, He raises the mace of His power, and by one single blow sweeps into utter annihilation the millions of those whom He is unable, by retribution or any *other* means, to recall to the path of life and duty! Is *this* the *end* to which the Diety is compelled to consign the life He has given, forever? To blot out the lives He is unable to save from sin — *eternally?* The spirit he has created in man, "after his own *image*," — is he to forever blot *that* out? Can we not be recovered? Are we to go back to original nothingness, and sleep together there the unending sleep. The true ends of justice would in either case be subverted. Justice would not be paramount, but simple vengeance, *not* justice. Neither one of these would serve the ends of justice; and I pass them now to notice that the guilty fears of man are no mockery; on the contrary, they will be fully realized in the appropriate retribution, and furnish proof as positive of man's future existence as is his desire. If a man commits a wrong upon a fellow mortal, the terror of a future retribution hangs heavily upon him. Like a phantom it haunts his dreams and follows his footsteps, by night, by day; it is ever upon his track; he cannot escape it. These

fears are no imagery merely, but they are the warning which inevitable justice suspends over the head of the culprit, haunting his every step, looking at him at the turn of every corner, staring him in the face wherever he may go. If a man dies, and is dead *forever*, in this state, the ends of justice are overthrown; no punishment is awarded. But all this speaks of a retribution beyond. Man fears something *more*. Then there *must* be the future. (Loud applause.)

(Time expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We admit the term "angel" signifies messenger, or the term *rendered* angel. But my friend has not endeavored to meet the point brought forward before, which proves that "men are made a little *lower* than the angels." The angels have strength superior to men. The angel that came down to the prison where Peter was confined, and led him forth, was alive — a real tangible being. There is no proof that the spirit that passed before Job was an angel. A spirit *did* pass before Job; but it remains to be proved that angels exist without tangible shape. My opponent demands *proof*, and we shall have to ask him for a little more of it ourselves, on *that* question.

He referred again to the "creation of man in the image of God," and then asks, was God "organized dust?" No, sir. There is an image of Franklin standing over yonder (pointing towards the statue of Franklin, in School street), made of metal. Do we suppose that Franklin was made of the same material? Certainly not. There is a image of Webster made of plaster of Paris. Does it follow that Mr. Webster himself was composed of plaster of Paris? No, sir. The Bible affirms, most plainly, that "man is made in the *image* of God." Let it be proved that he was *not*, when he was "made of the dust of the ground!" God is a spirit; angels are spirits. But, God can make man of the dust of the earth, or any thing else, just as he likes, as the Smiths did the statue of Franklin in front of the Court House, of metal. He has declared he has done it; we know that man is composed of this earthy material. *Image* doesn't imply *equality*, Mr. Chairman, does it?

He says if man's soul can die, then God can die. Take Adam's fall, for instance. He sinned — then God sinned! He fell — then God fell! We utterly repudiate such sentiments as these; that the soul of man is a part of God! Might as well say there *is* no God but man!

MR. LOVELAND. You had better wait till I *take* that position.

MR. GRANT. I understood it so. If I am wrong I like to be corrected. "Man is progressive." *This* point came up again. We showed that man *was* a progressive being, but it is progression *backward*, Mr. Chairman. Any amount of facts can be brought to prove this point. Reference to the earlier history of men, as contained in the Bible and elsewhere, and comparison with

man's present condition, clearly establishes this "retrograding progression," if I may be allowed the use of such a word.

He asks, "which told the truth — the Lord or the Devil?" The Bible says the Devil was a liar from the beginning. What did he say, talking to the person in the house? "Thou shalt *not* surely die." God said, talking to the woman in the house, "Thou *shalt* surely die." And, as I understand the conclusion of my friend on the other side, the "Devil" had the truth on his side, because Adam did *not* die that day! The phrase here rendered "*in that day*," in this passage, may be rendered one of *fifteen* different ways. We have the same words rendered different ways in the same passage of Scripture. In Numbers 28: 26: And *in* the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto the Lord, *after* your weeks be out," etc. There is the same phrase, rendered "*in*" and "*after*" in the same verse. When our translators translated it last they understood that was a *spiritual death*, when God told Eve, "thou shalt surely die." The spiritual body and the natural cannot be both alike. Only one death is named, and only one death is suffered. "Nine hundred and thirty years after he died." It is certain, God did not mean to imply that he should *die that day*. Hence, Adam became a sinner in consequence of that sin; was on probation; eternal life or dying; though he coveted that life, when it is said he should die. Now, if there is no resurrection of the dead, and they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished, all the hope hangs *there*. Had this phrase been rendered "*after*," it would have been in harmony with the Bible. We can take which we please of the fifteen ways of rendering that phrase. Here then we find the whole story. Either Satan or God told the truth. Let my friend prove Adam is not dead, but that he is now alive — then, Mr. Chairman, Satan is cleared from the charge and it falls back upon our Creator.

My opponent uses the following language: "if *all* cannot be saved, let *me* sleep eternally," etc. We will consider this point at a subsequent time. We see nothing further to reply to, and we will give here the popular definition of the "soul" or "spirit." Kitto says, in his Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, Gen. 2: 7, reads as follows: "And Jehovah God formed the man (Heb. the Adam) dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and *the man* became a *living animal*." Let my friend *prove* that any thing but the "breath of life" leaves man at death. I have asked, a number of times, to have this question answered; but it has not been *attempted* yet.

I have before me the remarks of Mr. Childs, made at the Bromfield street conference, on this word soul. I will read them. "The immortality of no soul can be proved by any philosophy that belongs to earth." Our friend will probably endeavor to prove it on the ground of *desire*. (Applause — rather faint.) Suppose a man, or suppose rather this book I hold in my hand (taking one from the table before him), represents a coffin, and suppose a man be put in it alive, that this coffin is hermetically sealed, that another is put around that and sealed in the same way, then another still. Where is the man? Is he gone out of the

coffin? What will philosophy, common sense, and the *Bible* say? "That he is *dead—knowing nothing!*" This looks reasonable to *me*. He was alive when he was put *in*, he is *dead* now, and "the dead know *nothing*." Now, if my opponent will prove that the dead *do* know something, then we will confess that facts, philosophy, science, common sense, and the *Bible are at fault*—not before.

When Dr. Barclay was travelling in Palestine, he went into the cave of Pelagius, where, in the age of persecutions, some of the Christians had sought refuge in seclusion, and there saw engraved upon the rocky walls of the dungeon, in the Greek language, the following motto: "Put thy faith in God, Domitela, no *human creature* is immortal."

This reminds me of what Job says: "Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were printed in a book—that they were graven *with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever!*" This same Job said, "yet in my *flesh* shall I see God." He then tells us, "the wicked shall be *no more;* that they shall not awake nor be *raised out of their sleep.*" Is this *truth*, Mr. Chairman? And *then* he asks the interesting question, "If a man *die* shall he *live again?*" Jesus answered this, and said, "though a man die yet shall he live *again.*" But the idea that "*something*" leaves man at death and goes off "*somewhere*," is strange and rather foolish. There's no philosophy about it, no common sense; and as we think the whole Bible is against it, we cannot receive it!

As we have but one more point to speak of on this question, we will now do so. It is in reference to "Jesus teaching immortality in opposition to the Sadducees," as my opponent contends he did. We admit Jesus *did* teach immortality, but he *never* taught *that man was immortal in this life.* My opponent has not brought forward *one single passage* from the Scriptures, teaching immortality in *this* life. The Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead. Christ taught it. My friend says, "our intuition teaches it to us." Then why does not *my* intuition teach it to *me.* It does *not.* Why did not the intuition of *all* men teach it to them from the three thousand years before the Christian era, sir? Why did not the Bible historians find it out, if it had been taught for three thousand years? There is nothing said about immortality being possessed *here.* The apostolic Fathers taught nothing of the kind that can be found in their writings. This point is one that needs proof. We call for the proof, the evidence, the philosophy, the *facts* that substantiate this assertion. It looks to *us* like the philosophy that Paul told us to "beware of!"

It is remarked "that there are none higher than *man*," thus implying that the angels are not higher than men. But the Bible affirms that they are. Let it be proved that they are *not.*

"Man is a progressive being." This point has been brought out again this evening, but as my friend has not yet afforded us the proof of it, we pass it. Look from the creation of the earth. We *do* see progress, *alarming* progress, too!

He then remarks, "man is the crown of the universe." Proof wanting, Mr. Chairman. If so, there is no God but *man*. This is our friend's position.

MR. LOVELAND. — I corrected that, sir, last evening.

MR. GRANT. — Then let our friend speak boldly, and say man is *not* God, God is *not* man; then we will understand him —

MR. LOVELAND. — You have no *right* to *assume* positions *I* do not advance, sir!

MR. GRANT. — And not leave us in the dark upon the views — (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am inquired of again, "what goes out of the body at death, but the "breath of life?" I answer—the spirit body, which is raised from the natural body.

I did not reply to my brother's argument, about man being created a little lower than the angels, because I wished to examine into it a little; and I found a passage in Hebrews, where it is said of Jesus, "He was created a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death." There is a similar passage in the Old Testament. But perhaps *I* might quote a little Greek or Hebrew, to show that this phrase translated "a little lower," has a very different signification in some places in the New Testament, and this would entirely dispel the idea he has advanced, in reply to my argument.

We know of no contest between the "Devil" and the Deity in the garden of Eden; and I will not allow my opponent to change a "snake" into a "devil," by any means. He must take the account as it is. We cannot allow any such transposition. He may attempt to make the spirits of men into devils as he likes; but we will not allow "snakes" to undergo any such transfiguration. Nor do I intend my opponent shall continue to alter my propositions. I simply say again, that verbal revelation is mediate, indirect, and is inferior to the primal revelation, and must be corrected by it; and, as he admits that no two truths can clash with each other, then all the verbal histories of man are of no account at all, when they are found clashing with science.

As to the progress backward, I don't remember that he proved his assertion, that men are going backward instead of forward! He says they do not live as long, are not as strong, etc. It is not true. The average of men now living are larger and stronger than they were centuries ago. This can be substantiated by facts, to any extent. Everybody who knows any thing at all, knows it to be so. The armors hanging up in the old castles of England, that fitted the forms of men one or two centuries ago, are not large enough for the average of men now. These are facts, and facts constitute proofs. Instead of being worse than they were, men are becoming better, every way, instead of worse. One assertion is as good as another, I suppose. (Laughter and applause.)

I admit one thing very freely, which my brother has just said; that is, "that the spirit of man is dependent upon an organism for manifestation." That is the very use of the body. It is the very use of all universal material, known to the Deity; for Deity can manifest himself only through and by means of the physical universe. So the spirit of man, "made in His image," can only manifest itself and have existence through the organism of the body; and when it leaves the natural body a spiritual body also goes forth, and thus the spirit, taking possession of a natural organism, manifests itself, and thus accomplishes the things we claim have been done.

I will now present some positive declarations of scripture bearing upon the question before us. It is said of Jesus, "that being put to death in the flesh, quickened by the spirit, he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Here then, Jesus, after He was "put to death in the flesh," and "quickened by the spirit," went and preached to the spirits that were said to be in prison," which spirits were sometimes disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." In the chapter following, it is said, in referring to the same thing, "for this cause also was the gospel preached to them that are dead." If dead, in the sense of my brother, I am at a loss to know how the gospel could be "preached to them," and what good it would do if it was? They were preached to, and talked to, in the same manner as men in the flesh. Another clause of the passage reads, "that they may be judged according to men in the flesh but live according to God in the spirit. Paul says, "If this earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." And in the context I find the following verse: "We are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body." How could he say at home in the body if the body was all? He continues: "we are absent from the Lord; and are willing rather to be absent from the body and be present with the Lord." The same idea is conveyed in the following passage: "I have a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." Then again, John says, "I saw the souls of them that were slain, for the word of God and the testimony which they held, saying, how long dost thou not judge and avenge our blood upon those that dwell on the earth. And white robes were given to every one of them. And it was commanded them that they should rest a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Here, as it seems to me, in this passage, we have the idea very clearly stated, that men who are dead live a life of inspired spiritual activity in the spiritual world, being present with the Lord, which is far better than being from him. I would also refer to the coming to "the spirits of just men made perfect." Paul asserts, Heb. 12: 23, that we "are come to the general assembly and church of the first born, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." He alludes, in the first of the chapter, to the same persons, where he assures his fellow-christians that while they are running

the toilsome race before them, an innumerable company, "a great cloud of witnesses" surrounded or compassed them about. While the jealous eyes of their foes waited for their halting, other eyes of sympathizing witnesses watched over them with deepest love and earnest solicitude.

Who were these witnesses? Were they breaths floating on the mists of the morning? Nothings? Nonentities? Did they know nothing? Or were Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and this "cloud of witnessess," the holy ones of earth in the spiritual form, ever hovering around those running in the race that was set before them? Who was it that came to the troubled Saul, and said, "to-morrow, "thou and thy sons shall be with me"? Who was it that came to the Revelator, and said, "I am of thy fellow-servants, they who keep the sayings of this book"? Who were Abraham and Lazarus? Who was the rich man who was in torment, and besought Lazarus to return to the earth and warn his friends, that they might not come to the place in which he was? Possibly my brother upon the opposite side may seek to escape from all these proofs by attempting to make them out as mere parables — simple fancy. But we warn him against such a course, as we shall insist on his literalizing these texts as much as the ones he will probably offer, when he assumes the affirmative to-morrow evening. These spirits spoken of in the instances I have quoted, and many others that are spoken of in the Bible, are said to possess the same characteristics that men in the form possess. They are occupied differently. Some in giving praise, some in telling of their joy — things corresponding to the characters they possessed while on this earth. They have language, can talk, can eat, can suffer, can enjoy, and do all these things which appeal to our outer senses. And if to these should be added the multitudes of similar cases which have been given to man (many of which have been witnessed by many now present as well as myself)— if, we say, it then shall be questioned whether there are such existences as spirits, and whether they can return and communicate to those in the form, we doubt whether proof of any kind would be admitted by those who deny such existences and manifestations. Is this all a myth? No, sir. It is fact. It is certainty. It comes to the heart of man; it appeals to his affection — to his senses. Is this all a myth? Am I to believe that all the noblest of the sons and daughters of earth, the gems of God's own universe, the brightest stars of His almighty creation, as soon as the breath of their natural life leaves the body, sink into a state of utter unconsciousness, that the darkened pall of a never-ending silence is thrown over them, and the lips of eloquence forever hushed in the darkness and silence of nonentity? No, never! Never! so long as this declaration exists (taking the Bible in his hands from the table before him), so long as the proofs of immortality shine out as strongly as they now do from its every page, so long shall we cling to the doctrine of the ultimate happiness and never-ending joy of all our brethren, of all God's creatures. I believe in the communion of saints, and so in the faith of Wesley, that the "church militant and the church triumphant are but one," though "part have passed the flood," and part

are crossing now ; while some remain, "divided only by the stream, the narrow stream of death." I base my faith on the declarations of universal inspiration, faith, hope, feeling, and revelations, and I shall not give it up to any mere dogmatisms which may be brought against it. (Time expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — My friend says he builds his faith, in part, on the declarations of universal inspiration, and the rest on faith. We shall go back of there — to the Bible.

MR. LOVELAND. — So do I.

MR. GRANT. — And believe according to the testimony of the Bible. My friend has brought forward considerable Scriptural argument, which he claims proves the immortality of the soul ; but not in any one of these is any thing — not a word — said about immortality ! He says "the spiritual body goes out of man at death." Paul tells us that "the spiritual body is the one that comes up from the grave ; " and we think it best to believe it, as an account coming from God.

The Bible does not profess to give us an account of angels in their earliest history, but only the history of this world and their connection with it.

He says he "shan't allow us to make a snake into a devil." We have no disposition to do so, Mr. Chairman. We didn't come here for that purpose. But we do contend that that animal was employed as the first medium of the "devil ; " for the Bible tells us so. (Applause.) He still says, "men are growing better ; that one assertion is as good as another," etc. According to the records of crime — statistics taken on the subject — we learn that crime has increased from forty to four hundred per cent faster than the population. We are prepared to back up our "assertions" on this point with any amount of facts. If our friend shows that the world is growing better, he has overthrown the word of the Lord, which declares directly the opposite. (Applause, during which the Chairman smiled the audience into comparative calmness.)

He then refers to the "spirits in prison." These are offered as proofs of the existence of spirits after death. We read, in 1 Peter 3 : 18, 20, "For Christ who hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit : By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prisons, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." We read, "God raised Him from the dead," being quickened by the spirit, "by which" — "what does that word "which" stand for ? For Christ ? No. The spirit that brought Him from the dead "by which He also went and preached." When was the preaching done ? Was it while Christ was in Hades ? No. It was "while the ark was preparing." Who did the preaching then ? Noah, by that spirit that brought Christ from the dead.

He then refers to another one, somewhat similar to this, in 1 Pet. 4: 6. "For this cause the gospel was preached to them that are dead," etc. This proves that they were dead any how, that they were to be judged in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." McKnight thus renders this passage: "For this purpose the gospel hath been preached even to the dead, that although they might be condemned indeed by men in the flesh, yet they might live eternally by God in the spirit."

Wakefield renders this: "For this indeed was the effect of the preaching of the gospel to the dead, that some will be punished as carnal men, but others lead a spiritual life unto God." Tyndall, who gave the first printed copy of the Bible in English, renders it thus: "For unto this purpose verily was the gospel preached unto the dead, that they should be judged after the manner of men in the flesh, but should live godly in the spirit."

We will now refer to 2nd Corinthians, 5th chapter. My friend claims that this shows that after death we put on another body — a spiritual one. The Bible account affirms that God shall raise the dead. If we look a little further we find that John saw "the Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a voice from heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men." David asks the question, "who shall abide in thy tabernacle?" Paul says, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" but not a word does he say about our "spirits" going to the Lord. He also says, while we are here, we are "absent from the Lord;" but he mentions nothing of the "spirit" going to the Lord, or that we shall go into a spiritual body when we go out of this one.

When he says "to be with Christ was far better" — what does he mean? Far better than what? "To live, is Christ; and to die, is gain." Wakefield renders the passage under consideration thus: "For we know that if this tent wherein we dwell, which is fixed on the ground, be taken to pieces, we have a divine building, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For, indeed, in this tent we sigh with an earnest desire of clothing ourselves with that heavenly habitation," of which David speaks, and in which he says, "he shall dwell." The word rendered depart, in Phil. 1: 23, occurs in only one other passage, which is in Luke 12: 36, and reads, "And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord when he will return from the wedding."

Now, as to the "souls under the altar," where was the altar? "On earth," as Dr. Clark remarks: Then they are not in heaven. The term "spirit" is not used in this account once.

The spirits of just men made perfect. "When we appear perfect, then we are to be raised, and this mortal will put on immortality?" Thus McKnight renders it.

Now as to Samuel. The inquiry is made, "whom shall I bring up?" — the

reply, "Samuel." Not a word about Samuel's spirit in the whole of it. "Now Samuel was dead," and they buried him sixty miles away from the spot on which this conversation occurred. How did the woman of Endor manage it? Was Samuel's body brought along sixty miles under ground to the spot were they were? And he told Saul he would be with him the next day, and yet it was three days. About as true as some of the modern manifestations and stories.

One more passage. Rev. 22 : 9 : "I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel." Fell down at his feet! Do they take their feet off with them, or are they buried? They must do one of the two; let us know which it is. We have asked him this a number of times, but he hasn't answered it.

But we must hasten. Our opponent has failed to bring one single passage of scripture that proves the spirit of man to be immortal. On the other hand, we have shown, from scripture testimony, that man was created from the dust of the ground; that nothing was added to him after his creation, but the "breath of life," and that when this leaves him, he dies — is dead! "Return to their dust." Job says, "there is a spirit in man;" and again says, "the spirit of God is in my nostrils" — the same "spirit" in both cases. As we have proved that nothing but this "breath of life" leaves man at death, we have triumphantly sustained our position that man is not inherently immortal, and has not immortality in this state. We have proved that the "spirits" of my brother, and the "spiritual manifestations" he advocates, are opposed by the Bible, science, philosophy, and common sense, and consequently, the "communications" he advocates proceed from "demons" — of the same kind who lied to our first parents when he said, "thou shalt not surely die." The Lord, then, told the truth, and the lie falls back upon Satan. But, if man is immortal and never dies, then Satan told the truth, and the lie falls back upon the Lord. But, as it has not been proved that Satan told the truth, therefore, we come to the conclusion that human immortality is not taught by the Bible, science or philosophy, or proved by spiritualism, and that the affirmative of this question has not been sustained. This point will come out more fully in the future consideration of the subject. We see our time has expired, and with many thanks to the audience for their kind attention, we submit the remarks for the evening.

THIRD EVENING.

Opened by prayer, by Rev. J. V. Himes.

QUESTION. — *Is immortality a gift of God, dependent upon the character of the receiver? Elder Grant affirms — Rev. J. S. Loveland denies.*

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — The question before us is one of deep interest, one in which we are all interested. We think we need not have fears of overrating its importance. If the affirmative of this question is sustained, the foundations of the doctrines of "hero worship," "prayers to saints," "purgatory," "eternal misery," "Swedenborgianism," "Shakerism," and "Spiritualism," are removed. If the negative is sustained, then there is a strong argument in favor of these different systems. We think, if the affirmative is sustained, the Bible is shown to be in harmony with itself, with justice, with love, with mercy, with science, with philosophy, and with common sense. You will perceive, sir, there is a wide difference between our positions — that of myself and my friend upon the other side; and, as we differ, one or both of us must be wrong; both cannot be right.

As we have before remarked — and this our friend cheerfully admits — no two truths clash with each other. Every truth in revelation is in harmony with every truth in science.

We would remark, first, the natural immortality of all men is denominated by my opponent the fundamental article of the faith he advocates.

At the Conference in Illinois, held in 1857, the following resolution was passed: —

Resolved, That spiritualism, according to the modern acceptation of the term, embraces all those who believe in the "immortality of the soul." Beyond this common faith, there is no doctrine or creed necessarily belonging to spiritualism."

Says one, who purports to be the spirit of John C. Calhoun, "the object of these communications coming from spirits, is to draw mankind together in harmony, and to convince sceptics of the immortality of the soul." So, then, when we remark that this doctrine is the fundamental one of the Spiritualists' creed, our remark is sustained by their own writings. We might bring many statements from different writers on this subject, if necessary, confirming the remarks we have already made. Bishop Tillotson remarks: "the immortality of the soul is rather supposed or taken for granted than expressly revealed in the Bible;" and if every thing were taken out of the Bible relating to the immortality of the soul, no passage would be removed with the exception of what

a certain character said to Eve — "Thou shalt not surely die." Says Olshausen, "The doctrine of the immortality of the soul and the name are alike unknown to the entire Bible."

We wish to ascertain, this evening, whether we are all to have immortality, or, whether we are to have it upon certain conditions, and if so, upon what conditions.

We think we have shown, by previous remarks, that our desiring immortality is proof that we haven't got it. Desire is a longing after something not yet possessed. I never desire a thing if I have it in possession.

We will now lay down a proposition: The affirmative of this question is sustained from the fact that a portion of our race, denominated the wicked, are to be destroyed; consequently, all men are not to receive immortality. If the "rich man and Lazarus" be brought up as an objection here, allowing all that some claim for it, it represents what took place before the final judgment, and hence proves nothing in relation to the subject of future punishment. It is said of the rich man, "he died;" of the poor man, "he died." If it is a matter of fact, then they both died. "The beggar died and was carried" — that which died was that which was carried — "by the angels into Abraham's bosom." It is not contended that he was literally carried. And the place where the rich man was carried, was *hades* — the word that is rendered "grave" — never referring to a place of future punishment. The corresponding word (*sheol*) occurs in the Old Testament sixty-five times. Job says, "O, that thou wouldst hide me in sheol." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were laid there. Jacob said, "Shall bring down my gray hairs in sorrow to sheol." We have a scripture definition of this word, as follows: "For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in shoel, whither thou goest." There is no knowledge there, no wisdom there, no device there; all that are there are dead. See Revelation 20: 13: "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hades delivered up the DEAD which were in them." This one passage in Luke is the only instance we find in the whole scriptures where men are said to be conscious between death and the resurrection; and then only on the ground that this is a matter of history. An old version of the seventh century, reads — "Then spake Jesus this parable unto them: There was a certain rich man," &c. If it is a parable, then, the death spoken of is not a literal death; if not, then it is a matter of reality. What then is it, if not literal? Symbolical, or, representing a political grave. The rich man referring to the Jews, and Lazarus to the Gentiles. It has nothing whatever to do with the subject of punishment, or to the destruction of the wicked, to which we refer as proof that all men are not immortal. We read, "fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in *gehenna*." Destroy both. Again, we read that "He will consume both body and soul," in Isaiah 10: 18. Again, in Ezekiel 18: 4, "the soul that sinneth it shall die." Then it must be mortal, or else it cannot die.

We pass now to positive Scripture bearing upon our position — that a portion

of mankind will be destroyed, and that man's immortality is not natural, inherent, but something to be received upon the performance of certain conditions. Psalms 145 : 20 : "The Lord preserveth all them that love him, but all the wicked will He destroy." What is destruction? Mr. Webster defines it to be, "the annihilation of the form of any thing; that form of parts which constitutes it what it is." If this building were destroyed by fire, the form constituting it what it is, no longer exists; the matter exists in another form, but the building is not in existence. The word rendered "destroy," in the passage just read, is defined "to annihilate." This is the only definition given of it by Mr. Pick. Gesenius defines it, "to destroy, to lay waste;" for example, "cities, altars," etc. "I will destroy your high places." There the same word occurs. "Then you shall drive out all inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all the pictures, and destroy all their molten images." Numbers 33 : 52. When these pictures were destroyed, they were not preserved or carried off to some other place to be set up. Hence, when the wicked are destroyed, they cease to exist, or else they are not destroyed. Again, in Psalm 37 : 38 : "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off."

As we have no other means of knowing about a future existence but from the revelations of God to man, we shall appeal to that entirely.

Psalms 92 : 7 : "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed forever." The word here rendered "forever," is defined by Gesenius to mean, "perpetual time, eternity." Parkhurst defines it, "time onward, futurity, eternity to come." We have examples of it in Isaiah, 9 : 6. There it is rendered everlasting. Psalm 45 : 6 : "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Isaiah 57 : 15 : "For thus said the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity." That is the only passage where the word "eternity" occurs, in the whole Bible.

We then must reject the Bible or admit these statements; and we shall endeavor to show, before we get through, that this is in harmony with justice, with mercy, and with love.

Hengstenberge remarks on this verse, "The annihilation of the wicked comes into notice as the basis of the deliverance of the righteous, which is the proper theme of this psalm."

Again, Proverbs 13 : 13 : "Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed, but he that feareth the commandments shall be rewarded." We would here remark, the words rendered "destroy" and "destroyed" occur in the Old Testament, or there are, rather, some thirty-eight different words which are thus rendered, none of which is defined to mean suffering — not one of them. We make that remark for the benefit of those who believe the doctrine of eternal misery. These words occur in the Old Testament three hundred and twenty-six times; in the New Testament fifty-three times. Words used so often must have some definite meaning; and when applied to an age or dispensation, they always signify the demolition

of that age — never, in a single instance, to preserve them. This is in harmony with the declaration, "fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body."

Jeremiah 17 : 18 : "Bring upon them the day of evil, and destroy them with double destruction." There isn't much preservation about double destruction; is there? Proverbs 29 : 1 : "He that, being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy." If they were to be returned after that destruction it would be a remedy; hence, there is no life after that destruction to which we are referred in Matthew 7 : 13, 14. If we receive the instructions of the Saviour, then we must admit there is a road to destruction as well as a road to life, and when destroyed they are not preserved or saved. (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — I have promised attention to all the positions assumed by the affirmative; but I must not be expected to wade through all the interminable wilderness of texts that may be quoted. Nor need I; for, if I shall be able to determine the signification of a single one, I shall have determined the significance of all the class to which it belongs.

To the positions which have been assumed I have certain counter positions, which I will now repeat.

First, Man is inherently, naturally, immortal, as proved by the arguments we have adduced during the two past evenings, which have none of them been met — several of them not even noticed at all!

Second, The resurrection is not of the physical body, but of the spiritual; and is progressive.

Third, Immortality is not a gift, in any sense. It is nowhere in the Bible spoken of as a gift. My brother, the last evening, said, "the texts which we quoted, none of them, spoke of immortality." He has not yet shown us one text which speaks of immortality as a gift!

Fourth, The spiritual body, which, as Paul affirms, "is raised from the natural body," becomes immortal by virtue of that resurrection.

Fifth, Eternal life is not a synonyme for immortality.

Sixth, There is no proof whatever of the existence of an order of "superhuman devils," anywhere in the Bible, or anywhere else.

Seventh, If I prove the existence of one single human being, in the sphere of immortal existence or life, all the arguments and all the positions of my brother fall to the ground, and are good for nothing; he having admitted that "if a man lives after the body dies, then our position is sustained."

Reference was made to the "rich man and Lazarus," in connection "with the interpretation of the Greek word Hades, and the corresponding Hebrew word sheol." Perhaps it is no way certain that it is a "corresponding one." That is to be proved — not asserted.

Again, it was asserted that "suffering punishment is nowhere affirmed of

those in Hades." But it is affirmed that the "rich man was in torment." I leave the affirmative to settle this declaration with the explicit teachings of Jesus himself.

In connection with the phrase "destroy both soul and body in hell" — what is the "soul" that is there destroyed, in distinction from the body? Let us know this.

I come now to certain scriptural passages, which I must re-introduce in connection with the remarks I have to make. 2 Corinthians 5: 1-8: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that has wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight.) We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." My brother would have us understand that "tabernacle," in this passage, means the present world, the order of things, which, according to his faith, is soon to be dashed in pieces; and that the dissolution of "this earthly house of our tabernacle" is the dissolution or destruction of this present mundane state of things. This word "tabernacle" (from the Greek *skenos*) signifies a tent. Paul was a tent-maker, and very probably understood the meaning of the phrase he used, and the application. "If this earthly tent," this tabernacle in which we live, "is dissolved, we know we have a building of God" (building used in opposition to the "tent" or "tabernacle" in which we now live), in the spiritual sphere of existence, "eternal in the heavens." Peter uses the same word in his second epistle, 1: 13, 14: "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in the tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing shortly that I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." In this passage tabernacle refers particularly to his body; that he must soon "put it off," etc., because he knew his death was prophesied. It was used particularly in reference to his body. And now, mark you, it is used in the same connection where Paul speaks of being "present in the body," and in the same connection where reference is made to the tabernacle — "but being present with the Lord was being absent from the body," etc., which was more desirable than to wait in this tabernacle, or this body; desired to be absent from it that he might be present with the Lord when thus absent from the body. Will my brother tell us what it is to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord when absent from the body? This he has failed to do, though it has been asked again and again, and pressed upon his attention. Yet he fails to tell us about it. (Applause.)

Let us see what this soul distinct from the body is. Let us find out, if possible; see how this passage proves not only the future life, but the dual nature of man. Something will be absent. What shall be absent from the body? It is something that desires, enjoys, or is capable of enjoying — proving my argument in favor of the resurrection of the spiritual body, instead of the literal one.

Reference was made to the text which speaks of "Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison." He says, "this preaching was done while the ark was preparing, and by Noah." Peter asserts, on the contrary, that it was "after Jesus was put to death in the flesh — quickened by the spirit, that He went and preached to the spirits in prison." He asserts that it was Jesus, and not Noah. Noah was, to be sure, a preacher of righteousness; so also was Jesus; and when the explicit declaration is made, I believe the record that He (Jesus) did go, and that he did not employ Noah as a substitute!

I have had some hints given me, in the discussion thus far, especially in criticisms on "prepositions," and I have taken some pains to look over some few Greek prepositions to-day. It don't require such a great amount of learning to look over the Greek words, and tell "how many times they occur in the Bible." A "Greek Concordance" helps amazingly. I find, from this examination, that a literal translation of the text may be made, and that it will read in this way: Being put to death in the flesh, quickened in the spirit (or by the spirit), according to which, or in conformity with which, He went and preached to the spirits in prison. Another translation would read: by which, being carried, He preached to the spirits in prison. The signification of the words is, He went, was carried, or was translated, by the same spirit that quickened Him, and preached to the spirits in prison, not "in the days of Noah," but to the spirits that were sometimes disobedient. When? mark — when disobedient? "When the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." This intimates that Jesus did go to Hades, the world of spirits, and that He himself did preach to the spirits who were there. Not only do we believe this, but the creed of the ancient church, which says "He descended into Hades" — the invisible world of spirits. Does not this text affirm the fact? Certainly it does. How then shall this testimony be set aside? Not in any way; for here are the affirmations made by the scriptures themselves. I set these records against the assertions of my brother, and leave him to settle with himself and the Bible in reference to his translation of the same.

Again, let me ask, in this connection, what was Jesus' spirit, which He yielded up and commended to his Father? Was it his breath? Simply the "breath of his nostrils" — the air last taken into his lungs? Did He commend that as the most acceptable offering He could make to his Father, after thirty-five years of his existence? And when he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," — let us know what that was. Why such care for his last breath?

My friend again refers to the "souls under the altar," Revelation 6: 9, 10. This, he says, occurred "during the pouring out of the fifth vial." It was be-

fore the resurrection. My opponent says the altar was on earth. According to Revelation 8 : 3, it is declared to be before the throne of God, and an angel stood beside the altar. "But," says my friend, "the word 'souls' means persons." No matter. They were persons who had been killed as to their earthly life, and were, in the somewhat peculiar phraseology of my brother, d-e-a-d! Nevertheless, they were persons who were capable of crying aloud and seeing about them, saying, "Oh Lord, how long dost thou not avenge our blood upon them that dwell upon the earth?" They were still capable of being clothed with white robes, and commanded to rest until their brethren, who shall be killed as they were, should be fulfilled. I suppose they were part of the same company spoken of in Revelations, 7 : 13–17. During the opening of the next vial, said the elder to the Revelator, "what are these arrayed in white robes, and whence came they?" And by the same personage he was told that they hàd come "out of great tribulation, and made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb; therefore, are they before the throne." They were living, conscious persons, in heaven before the resurrection talked of by my brother, according to this record, praising, enjoying, and glorifying God. And a great multitude of them also. They were probably the same as those who, in Revelation 5 : 9, 10, were said to "sing a new song," etc.

I come now to Revelation 22 : 9. The translation my brother puts upon this doesn't help his case in the least. But the translation of this text, in our estimation, is literal. His proposed translation makes the verse read thus: "I am thy fellow-servant, and the fellow-servant of thy brethren, the prophets." What real change does that make in the meaning? How does it help the positions he assumes, "that no human beings who have ceased to live in the body are alive in the spiritual state of existence?" His translation is only of a preposition, to be sure; but it won't do; for, according to his own declaration, there are but two prophets in the heavenly world, Enoch and Elias; and one could not say, "I am thy fellow-servant, and the fellow-servant of thy brethren, the prophets, "but, I am, etc., of thy brother the prophet." And again, if there was but one of them, then is my position sustained, that angels are men! For, here an angel is affirmed to be a man, and only a man. (Time expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — We hardly expected that our friend was going over the first question to-night. We supposed that was dropped. It seems he is, instead of meeting the Scriptures we have brought forward, bound to talk on the question of last evening, and the evening preceding. He says, "I cannot meet the texts he has brought forward." I should like to have him meet a few of mine, before he accuses me of inability to meet his.

MR. LOVELAND. — Will do it in due time.

MR. GRANT. — He says, "man is inherently immortal." We call for the

proof of it. We have but one declaration harmonizing with that, and that is what a certain being said to Eve? We find that man was forbidden to touch the tree of life, lest he should eat, and live forever. Then where is his inherent immortality?

He says, the "resurrection is not of the body, but the spirit." We are not here to discuss the resurrection of the dead, but, whether a man dies or not. This point may come up again; if so, we shall be ready to meet it. He says, "immortality is not a gift, and is nowhere spoken of as such." We shall see what we will find before we get through. Says "the spiritual body rises from the natural." I will stop a moment on the resurrection here, as we know this is a strong point. He contends that the real man, or, in other words, that the body, is never raised. Paul says, "Why should it be thought a thing impossible, that God should raise the dead?" and then again remarks, "if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." What does he mean? How are they raised up? Now I suppose he wants the proof of it.

MR. LOVELAND. — Let's have it. That's it.

MR. GRANT. — "That which thou sowest thou shalt surely reap." Thou sowest the body. Plant wheat. First, it must die. The germ does die. The process of germination has been carefully watched, and it has been found that the germ never comes up with the grain. From the germ there sprouts out the radicle, forming the root, and the plumula, which becomes the stalk. Let us see where the analogy is between the grain and the resurrection. Does he mean to have us understand, that when we sow grain, it is the same which we shall reap? Is there any analogy between the growth of grain and the resurrection? There is an analogy between death and the sowing of grain, as we shall see. "So, also, is the resurrection of the dead." The dead are to be raised. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." What is raised? That which was sown. Suppose we never sowed any grain. No grain would ever come up. There is no resurrection of the dead, if there is nothing dead to be raised, of course. There is an analogy in the sowing; men are sown; and if there be no resurrection, "then they that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished," wasted away, come to nothing. Paul then goes on to speak of the resurrection: "it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body? What is a spiritual body? It is a body of itself, quickened by the spirit, — not a body slipping out of the old one. But my opponent will say, the elements of the body will be scattered. Can they be brought together again? Can God do it?

A certain prince once dropped a silver cup into some vitriol, thinking it was water, and no one essaying to get it out, it was soon dissolved, and the particles disseminated throughout the liquid. Was the cup there? No. But the elements were. The prince thought much of his cup, and wished it restored, if possible. A chemist passing by said, "I will get your cup out for you." By

a chemical process he brought all the particles of silver together in one mass, melted it over and made another cup, the exact counterpart of the old one. Cannot God do as much as man?

VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE.— Amen!

MR. GRANT.— Can He do it? "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Why call it a spiritual body? Because of the spirit of God by which it was to be resurrected.

My friend denies that. Paul goes on to say, "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory;" then we will say, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?" Mr. Chairman, it's this mortal that shall put on immortality — mortal first. It couldn't put it on if it already had it on.

My opponent says, "eternal life is not a synonyme of immortality." Webster defines these two words as follows: "IMMORTALITY.— The quality of never ceasing to live or exist. Exemption from death and annihilation. Life without end." "ETERNAL.— Without beginning or end of existence. Duration, everlasting, endless." He doesn't make any great difference between the two.

My friend then made allusion to the "tent," and "the tabernacle of the body." We didn't have time last evening to refer to the example of the body,— "absent from the body and present with the Lord," etc.,— and will, therefore, look at it now.

We will offer a Bible explanation. Romans 12: 5: "So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members of one another." 1 Cor. 12: 27: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular;" and the same in Eph. 1: 22, 23. Now "we are willing to be absent from the body and present with the Lord;" would like to be translated; but, said he, "I am in a strait betwixt two," i.e., living and dying. But he had no hopes "if the dead rise not." All rests there, unless he is translated. Col. 1: 18, 24: "And He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have pre-eminence." "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."

In relation to the "tabernacle and tent," we agree that it may be rendered tent. Wakefield thus renders it, as we have shown. If this be taken away, "we have a building (not buildings), a house (not houses) not made with hands, eternal in the heavens; for indeed, in this tent we sigh with the earnest desire of clothing ourselves with that heavenly habitation." John saw the new Jerusalem coming down, "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Jesus said, "in my father's house, there are many mansions," etc. Again, Peter says, "I must put off this my tabernacle." Let this book-case, in which I carry my Bible (holding it up before the audience), represent the body, and the book

therein, the spirit. The one who talks says, "after my decease." The book is not talking, certainly. Who is that one talking? Peter, who was near his death. This is only another expression representing death.

My friend refers again to the "spirits in prison." We think those who heard our remarks last evening, if they watched closely, observed that the "which" does not refer to Jesus, but the spirit within Him. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which,"— does "which" stand for Christ there, or the "spirit?"

MR. LOVELAND. — The "spirit."

MR. GRANT. — "By which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison. When did He preach? My friend says, "after his death." We read, "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," he did the preaching! Noah needed the same "spirit" to help him to preach.

"The souls under the altar" is again called up. We need not repeat what we said last evening. The altar is not said to be in heaven, anywhere in the Scriptures.

He refers to Revelation 22: 9: "For I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren, the prophets." We did not say that Enoch was an angel; still we admit he was "one of the prophets." We didn't admit it, but made the supposition. The affirmation is, it is an angel, who had feet. Let my friend prove that spirits take their feet with them! Tell us where they get their feet! These were tangible feet; they could be washed. This proves these angels were not disembodied human spirits.

We have now noticed all the points our opponent has made, and come back to the point we were discussing when we sat down last: that a portion of mankind are to be destroyed. The words rendered "destroy," and "destroyed," are defined as follows: "to annihilate, to end." These are applied to the punishment of the wicked in the following passages: 2 Peter 2: 12: "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Here, the word rendered perish is defined, "ruin, destruction, death." Romans 9: 22: "what if God, willing to show His wrath, and to make His power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." How long is that "destruction" to continue? Says Paul, "they shall be punished with everlasting (or eternal) destruction." When a thing is eternally destroyed it ceases to exist eternally. This, we hold, is after the resurrection of the wicked, and after the judgment. Revelation 21: 8: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abomiable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerors, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." Now, sir, what is death? Paul declares "the wages of sin is death!" They shall die the second death! When dead "we know nothing." We can see justice, mercy, and love in this. That God should

give eternal life to none but those who can enjoy it. This looks to us like God's dealings. They have not served God, they have rebelled against him, down to the last moment of their lives. "Justice" demands their life; "mercy" says, "let them die — destroy them." God says, in His word, "all the wicked will He destroy;" "they shall be destroyed forever;" "broad is the road that leads to destruction," and destruction is "the annihilation of that form of parts which constitutes a thing what it is." When it is destroyed, it ceases to exist as that thing. Hence, we maintain our proposition — that all men have not inherent immortality, but a portion will cease to exist, is sustained; and this we consider an act of justice — to put those out of misery that can never enjoy any thing. (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — In reply to the seeming complaint "that I have gone back to the first question," I have only to say that I have not, in my own apprehension. I am simply meeting the positions which my brother has taken. If I had "gone back," however, I should only have followed his example, for, instead of answering my positions and looking at my proofs, he stated his own before he noticed either.

He again calls for the "proof of immortality." He has not even looked at the mass of proof I have furnished him already. I should like to have him do that before I furnish any more.

Says "he is not here to discuss the resurrection." Well, he has been telling us of this in almost every speech he has made since the discussion commenced. He says, however, he "will stop a moment," and makes some comments on first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter. I think you cannot have failed to notice, that he took some trouble to demonstrate that "the thing which was sown, could not, in the nature of things, be raised; that the germ itself dies and cannot come up, but something springs up from it;" and that, after having demonstrated this, he did prove the thing would be raised up, which he had demonstrated could not be raised! He has repeated, again and again, that unless there is a resurrection, "they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Of course they are. I believe that as strongly as he does; and hence, I affirm, in accordance with the declarations of Jesus Christ, "that the dead are raised," and hence, those fallen asleep in Christ are not perished. But, according to my brother's notion, they are not living at all! But they live unto God, "for all live unto Him." Abraham and Isaac among the rest.

In referring to the phrase "eternal life," he gives Wakefield's definition. I prefer the definition of Jesus Christ. Wakefield may take care of his own definitions. Jesus says: "This is eternal life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This is my definition, and one that affords me much more satisfaction than Wakefield's, Webster's, or anybody's else!

(Loud and prolonged applause, during which the audience were again comparatively silenced by the pleasant smile of the presiding Chairman.)

MR. LOVELAND proceeded: My brother refers again to the "tabernacle." Paul says, the "earthly house of our tabernacle." What does my brother do with that? He goes on to prove that the phrase, "our body," signifies the church, which is called "the body of Christ." Of course I knew this; and I will prove to him, before we are through, that it is more than that — it is humanity. But here is my friend's argument: "the term body being used in this peculiar sense in one place, it is as good as proving that it is in this place." This is astonishing logic! Remarkable demonstration! It is the "earthy house of our tabernacle." He refers to Peter and asks, what does he mean by it? Of course I know he means a natural death, and Paul means the same in the connection here. The earthly house (or tent) of this tabernacle is here spoken about, and also something else which is to be present with the Lord and absent from the body! This is all very plain, to me at least. He does not talk of taking his body off with him, but of going away from it — being "absent from the body." Now let us know what it was that could be absent from the body and present with the Lord?" The "breath of life," perhaps!

My brother still sticks to his notion of the spirits in prison, and says, the "preaching was done in the days of Noah." I have always taken it for granted he could read plain English! Perhaps my impression has been erroneous. Let us look at this passage once more: "Quickened by the spirit." He says "this refers to the spirit that quickened Christ." Who don't know that? "By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison." When? He says, "in the days of Noah." Read on: "Which were sometimes disobedient." When were they disobedient — when? "When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." This is plain enough. The time of their disobedience is affirmed; the time of the preaching is affirmed; which "was after Christ was put to death in the flesh." Now this reads straight along. What does he do with the other argument I gave him on this, that it may read when corrected "by which he was carried and preached to the spirits in prison — in accordance with the promptings of that same spirit which quickened Him, He went and preached to the spirits in prison." I will give him a correct definition of it, if he wishes to "make a note of it."

MR. GRANT. I have one.

MR. LOVELAND. In reference to the "spirits under the altar," I said it (the altar) was "before the throne of God." He says, "the throne of God is in heaven," and argues some time on this point. No matter where the altar was. That's nothing to do with it; it is the fact that their souls were alive. This is the question for him to answer; not the location of the altar!

I can hardly bring myself to answer the question of my brother: "Do spirits take their feet with them?" I am mortified. All I have to say is, the Bible

says that "John fell down at the feet of the angel and worshipped him," and that is enough for me. That angel declared he was "John's fellow-servant, and of his brethren the prophets."

My argument for the dual nature of man has not been touched at all in connection with the Bible instances of the beings in the spiritual world after the death of the body, who were praising, enjoying, &c. He does not undertake to argue it, for then his position, that no being existed after death, would inevitably fall to the ground.

Again, the "spirits of just men made perfect," Hebrews 12:23. He pretends to show that the translation is not perfect, but it agrees with the text my brother likes to notice, namely: the multitude of witnesses described in the eleventh chapter, and in the first verse of the twelfth. They are alive. Do dead men ever "run the race that is set before them"?

I will notice briefly the case of Samuel, also. To the ridicule of my brother upon this passage I have no reply; he may settle that with his Bible, if he can! The Bible says, "Samuel said unto Saul." My brother denies that Samuel spoke to Saul. He says, "it was the woman." The Bible says, "Samuel spoke to Saul." He also denies that what was spoken was truth! Didn't Samuel say "the Lord would deliver Israel into the hands of the Philistines?" The book says he did say it; and says also that "Israel was delivered." Here was truth. The book says, Samuel declared that "Saul and his sons should be with him on the morrow." Was this not a fact? My brother says not — "it was three days afterwards." I affirm that there is no proof of any such fact; let him show it if he can.

Now I will notice the terms which have been brought up so many times, namely: "destruction," "destroy," "destroy both soul and body in hell." I have only to say on these terms that they are used with a variety of meanings. I find it (destruction, or destroy) used where it is meant to teach the idea of subjugation to evil, as where God says to Israel, in Hosea, "O Israel! thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help." Is that annihilation? Was Israel annihilated? If it was, there was still "help" for him, God himself being the witness! Again, Paul says, "if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy." The same word translated "destroy," in one clause of the passage, is translated "defile" in the other. "If any man annihilate the temple of God, him will God annihilate." According to that he must annihilate himself! But I have to present, in opposition to this the following positions.

It is admitted that the universe is a scheme of even and exact justice. He has admitted that justice renders retribution to men in exact accordance with their deeds. If "destruction" means "annihilation," or destruction of being, I submit that one of three propositions must be true; either that men are annihilated before they are punished, or annihilated after they have been fully punished for their deeds, or annihilation itself is their punishment. One of these must be true. But, if they are punished previous to annihilation, to the full

extent which their misdeeds deserve, then they are innocent, and being innocent, are entitled to life. If they are annihilated before they are fully punished, then justice is not fully meted out to them, and retribution is not rendered them according to their deeds. Hence, we are driven to the other conclusion, that annihilation must be their punishment; and it is simple extinction of being; hence it can be no punishment whatever, for that which has no being cannot suffer. That which is not, cannot be the subject of infliction! If he denies this, then he is thrown back upon the second position, which I have shown to be utterly inconsistent — more absurd! My brother may take "either horn of this dilemma" he chooses. None of them will help him very much, as I can see.

I now refer again to that class of texts in the New Testament, where we read of "demons, or unclean spirits." I said, last evening, that the meaning of the word *daimonion* is, "the spirits of men who have once lived on this earth." The Greeks also believed in two classes of demons; yet the higher class were also human beings, or had been so, for the Greeks knew of no other. It was spirit or hero worship, or the worship of men who had once been on this earth; hence, all their worship showed that they believed "demons" to be beings who had once been on this earth. These also are said to have had an existence in the spiritual spheres of being, and manifested themselves to men in connection with the affairs of this life. Hence, we submit a new proposition: that there is no account whatever from the Greeks, of a class or order of superhuman evil spirits. There is none in the Bible. There is no account of the formation of a "devil" — none whatever. ("Time expired.")

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — We do not believe the Lord ever made a "devil," or a wicked man; yet we do believe both exist. We read of the angels that sinned and kept not their first estate, and were cast down into Tartarus." We believe that they made themselves wicked; that the "devil" made himself so.

My opponent referred again to the resurrection, in relation to the seed that is sown, and argues that that is proof that man, when sown, "doesn't come up." Paul declares that he does come up. "Every seed shall have his own body;" that which is sown is the very body that is raised. In relation to grain, it is not so; but both are sown — both die; but there would be nothing to rise unless something is sown. When he says, "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust," and that "if the dead rise not, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" — that's what we claim; the Bible says so. Observe that word "dead" still remains there to be accounted for.

If Christ was not raised, then will not the dead be raised. Who are to have a part in the first resurrection? Those who believe in Him, in God, as the only true God. Suppose that they don't believe in Him, what then? All who

do believe in Him are promised "eternal life." How will it be with those who do not?

My opponent admits, "Tent may sometimes mean church," but thinks 2 Cor. 5:1, is literal; but Paul is using figures there, when he speaks of being "clothed," and "unclothed." It's a figure of speech to compare this "tent" with the one to come; hence, we argue that "body" is used figuratively there, in harmony with many other passages when he speaks on the subject.

We are referred again to the "spirits of just men made perfect." This we noticed last evening, briefly, and quoted from McKnight. "Now ye shall not come to a tangible mountain," but ye shall come to "Mount Zion," etc. We hold this is the true rendering. Dr. Clark remarks, in harmony with McKnight, that it does not refer to the higher state; yet Dr. Clark believed in the immortality of the soul or spirit. In that state, "there is no need of a mediator or sprinkling of blood, but these are mentioned in the state which the apostle describes." He says, of the spirits of just men made perfect, "We cannot understand these terms without the assistance of Jewish phraseology. The Jews divide mankind into three classes: first, the just perfect; second, the wicked perfect; third, those between both. The just perfect are those who have conquered all brutal appetites and gross passions; the wicked perfect are those who never repent; the intermediate are those who are influenced partly by the evil principle, and partly by the good."

We are referred again to the cloud of witnesses, in Hebrews, 12th chapter. Who are these witnesses? Go back to the eleventh chapter. The subject there is faith. It gives these examples to Christians. This is the argument, if I can understand it. It has nothing to do with spiritual witnesses, or the witness of spirits around them. Please read over the eleventh chapter of Hebrews and connections.

My friend again refers to Samuel, as being a genuine spiritual manifestation. But there is not one word said about Samuel's spirit! We read, "now Samuel was dead," and when dead, the Bible affirms, "they know not any thing." A man must know something before he can manifest himself in any way. Samuel died; "knew nothing which was;" hence, could make no communications. It was remarked that the prophecy was true uttered by that spirit. It remains to be proved true, Mr. Chairman. The question was asked, "who shall I bring up?" "Bring me up Samuel," was the answer — not bring him down — "bring him up." But the Spiritualists change these positions; they bring them down instead of up! (Laughter and applause, during which the Chairman called the meeting to order.)

Mr. Grant proceeded. They put them somewhere else. Yet, all the while, they are immaterial and intangible. They take nothing with them at death; nothing leaves them at death but the breath of life, and we challenge our opponent to prove the opposite.

The prophecy in reference to Saul's being with Samuel was not true. In the

31st chapter of 1st Samuel I find, "the Philistines followed hard upon Saul." So, then, he did n't go down where Samuel was in the earth the next day, for it was three days before Saul was dead.

Had that woman the power to raise God's children? Jesus declares the opposite. We must either impeach the testimony of Jesus or impeach this.

I am again referred to my remarks on punishment. My friend on the opposite side, affirms death to be no punishment at all! Mr. Chairman, we hold that death is the highest punishment, and that the punishment does not begin until the man is dead. Now he understands our position. He talks about mental suffering. Does the criminal, convicted and sentenced to death, suffer the punishment to which he is sentenced until death is inflicted? No, sir. When the punishment is death, is the punishment inflicted while he is alive? No, sir. It is not until the man is dead that the punishment begins. Does the punishment begin as he places his foot upon the gallows? No, sir. Does it begin when the rope is placed around his neck? No, sir. Does it begin when the drop falls? No, sir. When, then? It begins when the man ceases to exist consciously! Mr. Chairman, if my friend will show to me that eternal death is no punishment — prove to me that life is n't worth having — then I will admit the loss of it to be no punishment, not before! Yet it has been said, "all that a man hath will he give for his life." Now, if a man's mortal life is worth so much, how much more valuable is eternal life? "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul," or life. As eternal life is the highest possible reward that can be given to us, eternal death is the highest possible punishment that can be inflicted. To the one, life is lost; to the other, gained. We hope our friend will prove his point, and say wherein death is no punishment. If he means we do not suffer, we grant it. But suppose some of you had a favorite animal, a dog, for instance; he runs mad, and becomes dangerous, and is in agony. Would it not be an act of humanity to put him out of misery forever? On the same principle we understand that God will do when the wicked come to be judged. They have had their trial, are unhappy in their isolation, are full of iniquity, do not wish to be with God, could n't enjoy themselves if they were; they would be miserable even in heaven! Now, what can be done with them? That is the point. What can be done with them? We remark again, that justice demands their death. Mercy would say, put them out of misery." Obadiah 16: "And they shall be as though they had not been." Then are they still alive? Still alive and able to return to this world and visit us?

To those who believe they are in Hades, we would like to know how they get out, so as to come back and visit our friends here? Prove to me that unorganized mortals can come back, and I will believe in Spiritualism. But I shall want the proof; and repeat again that no man is alive when he is dead, and when he dies his breath leaves him and nothing else but his breath! And in the day the man died, "in that very day his thoughts perished." And again I read,

"sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." And yet, our friend on the opposite side claims there is no death; that an eternity of glory awaits all. Would it not look more like justice to destroy the wicked forever and give eternal life only to those who are capable of enjoying it? The good only are to have eternal life, consequently immortality depends upon the character of the receiver, and is not given until the conditions are complied with, and at a certain time, as we shall find hereafter.

We see no more points on the negative that we need refer to now.

We pass to notice a few more scriptural passages, which we wish our friend to observe, for we consider them very strong ones, to show that the wicked shall be destroyed!

Isaiah 1:28: "And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed." When an animal is consumed it takes the life of the animal. Will it take the life of man to "consume him?" Is a thing in existence when it is consumed? Not at all.

Isaiah 10:18: "And shall consume the glory of the forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body, and they shall be as when the standard-bearer fainteth."

Psalms 104:35: "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more." If they "are consumed," and are to be "no more," how can they return?

"Christ was crucified," says John, "that he might destroy the works of the Devil;" but, if some of them keep at work eternally, he will not destroy their works. But the Saviour will destroy the Devil also, and when all these things shall come to pass, the earth will be full of the glory of God, and we will live here as Adam and Eve lived, in innocence. (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — My brother has made an important discovery; and that is, that some things have been made, which were not made by the Divinity! The "Devil" has been made, wicked men have been made, "but they made themselves!" He has found out certain self-creating personalities! I would like to ask him how a thing can create itself? Will he please tell us? I would like to ask him how an angel, created, as he affirms, "perfectly holy," no sin in the universe, could make himself sinful? I would like to know the *modus operandi*, the power, the *motor* whereby this is done? A thing created pure, without taint or spot, falls from its position into one precisely opposite. It is a manifest absurdity, as well as inherently impossible. If it is so, then God himself can become a "Devil" by the same process. Angels can fall, and every one that is pure and holy can fall; the whole universe can, by the same process, plunge from their exalted position of holiness into sin and wickedness, and the whole world become one mass of festering and loathsome corruption. The process is as easy in one case as the other. Here is an argument, I affirm, that cannot be met, and never has been met.

He says, "the analogy in first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, does not apply to man." Why does he say it? It will entirely demolish his theory if he does. That is the reason!

I come now to the "spirits of just men made perfect." He says, "it is in the heavenly state." No matter where it is; it is the "spirits of just men made perfect." I suppose my brother doesn't mean the "breaths of just men made perfect." Then tell us what you do mean? You say, "spirit" means "breath." Is it the "influence" of just men made perfect? Let us know what it is? We are desirous of information upon this point. All this play upon words is foolish; it is mere "boy's play." "Medford rum" is spirit; no one denies that; but the spirit, as used in the connection we refer to, is, we affirm, the very essential power and life of things. We use these terms in different connections, and, of course, they denote different things. Rum is spirit, but it is not the "spirit that is in man," as Job says. We hope not, at least.

He says, "there isn't a word said about an immortal spirit in the Scriptures." He says, "the dead praise not the Lord," — quoting a disconnected passage in Psalms, — and yet we are told they do. It is the Bible that tells us so. It tells us, "there were multitudes praising the Lord." That's enough for me. The Bible affirms it. I am satisfied with the affirmation. He goes into an account of certain criminal cases, etc., to prove that punishment does not begin till men are dead! I believe I shall leave that this evening. It is such an ambiguous sentence that I don't think I quite understand it. "When a man ceases to exist, then punishment begins." Why, it is an utter and apparent absurdity. (Loud applause.) "When existence forever ceases, then, and not till then, punishment begins!" How can it begin when it is not in existence? He says, "if eternal life is no reward, then eternal death is no punishment." I repeat, that eternal life is not a future state of being, and have cited the definition of "eternal life" given by Jesus Christ himself. It is the "knowledge of God." "To know thee is eternal life." This is "eternal life," and it has no reference whatever to an after state of being; or else the Bible is not true, and Christ was mistaken — a conclusion not very probable, in my estimation. In confirmation of this Jesus says: "I am the resurrection and the life." Paul says, "and you hath he quickened — made alive, which were dead in trespasses and sins." If any man be in Christ Jesus he has eternal life, in that he has the knowledge of Jesus Christ in this life. Christ says again, "if a man believes in me he shall never die." Does my friend deny that many "believed in Christ" when he was alive? Where have they been from the time of their belief down to the present? "Dead," he says. Then was Christ again mistaken, for He said, "they that believe in me shall never die." I want to see how he will answer this. I put that question to him and patiently await a satisfactory answer. He will have to admit the truth of spiritual manifestations in order to answer it! But, he has not even looked at the proof we have submitted, concerning the spirits of men who have once lived on the earth.

Again, these "demons," it was said, "were cast down into hell, and reserved

in chains of darkness," etc. How came they then to be roaming about in the "air," or Tartarus — if Tartarus means the air, as he has brought considerable evidence and taken considerable pains to show. Is "hell" in the air? Hell (or Tartarus) is in the "bowels of the earth." He says, "the angels that sinned were cast down into Tartarus and reserved in chains of darkness." But they are in the "air." They are back here again. Tell us how they got back? We can find him other spirits who have come back in the same way. Let us know how they got back?

I have another question. Not only the "Devil," whom he tells us is to be destroyed, but "death" is to be destroyed also. If death is to be destroyed, then the power it exerts over men will be destroyed also. The relations it bears to men will die with it. There being no death, then all must live and possess the future. There is a question in *that* I would like to have answered.

I have now to present one positive argument. Paul says: "The creature" — the same word used to denote the rational creation — "was made subject to vanity, not willingly," — that is, not through the exercise of their own will,— "but by reason of Him who has subjected the same in hope; because the creature"— the whole creation — "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Not only they," — meaning all the creation, those who lived before now, — "but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." *Our* body. What body? The body of humanity; "for," says the same Paul, "Christ is the head of every man," and if the head of every man, then every man belongs to the body, and it is the redemption of this universal body, the body of humanity, to which He refers. It is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption, the sinfulness, the wickedness of sinful humanity, and delivered from this into "the glorious liberty of the sons of God," by the same power which produced him. We mean that the whole creation are now groaning and awaiting the redemption of the whole body of humanity, and that the whole creation will be "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God;" for the whole creation has waited and groaned until now. Then will follow the restitution of all things; all, the prince and the poverty-stricken, will enter into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Not a select few only, and the rest eternally lost. And, through the power at work in man and upon man, this grand consummation is to be wrought, when the fulness of the Gentiles is brought in, and "all Israel will be saved." Here is a principle which unfolds the final nature of man, and will tend to make him pure and holy. The principle is universal, and must be universal in its application. (Applause.) (Time expired.)

FOURTH EVENING.

Opened by Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Himes.

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — Our question this evening is — Is immortality a gift of God, dependent upon the character of the receiver?

Last evening we endeavored to show that the affirmative of that proposition is true, from the fact that the Bible affirms that "all the wicked will be destroyed;" "die the second death;" "be as though they had not been" — consequently have not immortality.

But before proceeding with an argument proper, this evening, we will notice a few points from our friend on the other side. He says, "I have discovered that demons and wicked men made themselves." I would say, I have discovered that I am very much misrepresented in this remark. We said that God created man perfect, and that demons and wicked men made themselves wicked by their own actions. It was in their own power to be better. We have the fact declared that angels sinned — that they made themselves wicked in the first place. Man was not created in sin.

The remark was then made, that "demons are the spirits of men, and were so believed by the ancients." Some of them did, and some did not. Homer, who lived nine hundred years before Christ, says, they are the souls of men. Thales, a noted Grecian philosopher, who died five hundred and forty-eight years before Christ, held that demons had never been embodied as men. Plato says, "The demons hold a middle place between God and men." The early Christians taught a similar doctrine. Justin Martyr calls the one who tempted Eve, "the man-hating demon." Tatian says, "The demons who govern men are not the souls of men;" "they were rejected from the heavenly life." Tertullian held "that they were invisible beings, endowed with spiritual power, living in the air, attending constantly on particular persons." We might bring more of the same kind of descriptions, if it were necessary, showing that the early Christian writers believed that they were a portion of the angels that had sinned.

2d Peter 2: 4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell (Tartarus), and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Our friend endeavors to show "that 'Tartarus' was in the interior of the earth." Some of the ancients did believe so. Others, and Greek writers, taught differently. Dr. Parkhurst says, "it appears from a passage in Lucian, that by Tartarus was meant, in a physical sense, the bounds

or verge of this material system." Dr. William Ramsay remarks, "that Tartarus means, according to Greek writers, in a physical sense, the bounds or verge of this material system."

The word here rendered hell, occurs in no other place in the whole New Testament. Dr. Whitely remarks, that "the word here used by Peter (Tartarus), and which our translators render 'cast down to hell,' is to be understood of our dark, gloomy earth, with its dull clouds, foul vapors, and misty atmosphere. may be made to appear." Socrates calls the abyss or sea, Tartarus, as does also Plato, who elsewhere calls our dim, lack-lustre earth itself, also Tartarus. Plutarch says our air or atmosphere is called Tartarus, from being cold, and is supported in this remark by both Homer and Hesiod. In no other sense or way can St. Peter be understood or explained. When Christ was on earth these demons talked with him. How came they out of there (Tartarus), if they are to "be confined in chains of darkness till the judgment of the great day?" So that we find that the argument in affirmation of "Tartarus being in the earth," is not supported by facts. Demons were upon the earth.

The remark was then made, "that the Bible says the 'dead praised the Lord.'" It says the very opposite. Psalms 115 : 17 : "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."

A passage was then quoted from John 11 : "They shall never die." The connection is, "And Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live : and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die. Believest thou this?" Wakefield's rendition is as follows : "And no man living who believeth on me will die forever." The point in this was the resurrection; the raising of Mary's brother at the last day. And then Jesus makes the remark, "he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." "Hence," says Paul, "we shall not all sleep, but be changed," etc. He who is alive, then, and believeth in Christ, will never die; he who is alive, and does not believe in Christ, shall die the "second death."

Our opponent says, we "have admitted that 'organized spirits' do come back." Haven't admitted any such thing, Mr. Chairman. If he refers to "demons," they have been here even since they were "cast down to Tartarus." We remarked there is nothing to come back but the "breath of life," unless the man comes back himself! Ezekiel 37 : 6 : "The sinews and flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, but there was no breath in them." Then the breath of life enters into them — there is the resurrection — the man is re-organized again.

Another point. "Christ said, into thy hands I commend my spirit." If Christ went to Hades, he didn't go to heaven; and if there, he certainly didn't stay long — only "three days and nights." After he came out he said, "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father. But I ascend to my Father and your Father," — showing that God wasn't in Hades; did not dwell there!

Christ did truly die, according to the records. Hebrews 2: 16: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels," but the nature of man, "the seed of Abraham." Philippians 2: 8: "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Luke 23: 46, we come to the passage: "And having said this, he gave up the ghost." Translators render this differently. One renders it, "I commend my breath." "And having said this, he gave up the ghost." The word rendered "give up the ghost," signifies to "breathe out," to "expire," to "die," and is thus defined by Lidell and Scott. Mark 15: 31: "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost." The word *expeneo*, rendered "give up the ghost," is defined "to breathe out," "make an end of," "to breathe one's last," "expire," "die;" and is translated "expired," in this verse, by Thompson, Sawyer, Campbell, Whiting, Wesley, and in the Syriac. Paul says he expired, or died. 1 Corinthians 15: 3, 4: "Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." My friend denies the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. 15: 13: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Rom. 1: 18: "I am he that liveth and was dead; behold, I am alive forevermore." Was he both dead and alive at the same time? We must admit he was dead, or impeach his testimony. He declares it.

Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. . . . And when he had said this he fell asleep, . . . and devout men carried Stephen to his burial." Stephen was dead. After he commended his spirit — the breath of life — then he fell asleep, and they buried him. Says Paul, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep."

Luke 8: 54, 55: "And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And her spirit came again, and she arose." Was it her that came again? Did she arise? The maid? The word here rendered spirit is the same that is rendered "breath." "Her breath came again, and she lived." Not "she came again," but the "breath of life that caused our first parents to live." James 2: 26: "For as the body without the spirit is dead," etc., meaning clearly "that the body without the breath is dead." Griesbach and Wakefield render it "breath."

We think, now, we have noticed all the passages that bear on this point. Some render it "breath," some "spirit," both from the same word.

My friend refers to Paul, where he speaks of the "redemption of the body," and says he means "the body of humanity;" but, when we quoted a passage in 2 Cor. 5: 8: where it is figurative language, more or less, my friend on the opposite contended that it was a literal body. To say it was the redemption of the literal body would not do, for that would prove the resurrection of the dead, and that would spoil the theory of the other side.

MR. LOVELAND. — Not at all, sir.

MR. GRANT. — We are referred to Matthew 10: 28: "Fear Him who is

able to destroy both soul and body in hell." He says the "body is not the real man." Then the soul is. We answer, it is the principle of life, which none receive only through Christ. Here men can take life, but they cannot take the "life to come." The word rendered "soul," in this passage, is rendered "life" forty times out of one hundred and five, and if rendered "life" there it will be in harmony with the whole Scriptures. Whatever the soul may be, it can be destroyed.

One other Scripture, and we have noticed all. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 1 Cor. 15: 26. Death is personified, and represented as doing its last work in destroying the wicked (Rev. 21 : 8) ; then, when it has done this, it is represented as being destroyed itself. After the hangman has hung the last criminal, and is then hung himself, then there can be no more hung ; then there is no more death.

We now come to our second proposition ; that the affirmative of this question is sustained by the Bible, which affirms, "that all shall not inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Corinthians 6: 9, 10 : "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived ; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." But the kingdom of God is an inheritance for the faithful. Matthew 5: 5: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Matthew 25 : 31, 34. He says to those on His right hand, "Come, ye beloved of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." No such saying to the wicked. "They shall not inherit the kingdom of God!"

Daniel 7 : 18 : "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." What kingdom? Twenty-seventh verse of the same chapter tells us. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

This corroborates second Peter 3 : 13 : "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth."

I read again, "the wicked shall not inhabit the earth!"

Philippians 3 : 19 : "Whose end is destruction." No salvation. There is no possible way to avoid these proofs, only to throw the Bible entirely out of the way.

Psalms 37 : 20 : "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs ; they shall consume ; into smoke shall they consume away." Then they are not in the kingdom, certainly.

Matthew 13 : 40 : "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world." When tares are "gathered and burned" are they growing in the field?

Second Peter 2: 6: "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample to those that should after live ungodly." They were "destroyed by fire and brimstone." Hence, we find "the wicked are cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death;" and this was represented by the destruction of the Sodomites; consequently, all do *not* have immortality. Rev. 20: 9. (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I feel most sincere pity for my brother (loud applause), in view of the unfortunate position which he has been compelled to assume. Again and again has he taken special pains to inform us that "he believes the Bible"—"relies upon the Bible." No one could mistake the implication thus insinuated that I did not believe the Bible. That because I am called a "Spiritualist," therefore, of course, I don't believe the Bible! I wish, once for all, to say, that Spiritualists, as a whole, believe more of the Bible and believe the Bible more than any sect of Christians whatever. (Applause.) Moreover, we will compel them to admit the fact of spiritual manifestations or to reject the Bible entirely! (Tremendous applause, intermingled with a few very faint attempts at hissing.)

MR. LOVELAND proceeded. Spiritualism does rest exclusively on the Bible; but the Bible has no foundation whatever when Spiritualism is ignored. (Applause.)

But is this the man who believes the Bible? (Turning to Mr. Grant.)

MR. GRANT. Yes, sir.

MR. LOVELAND. Yes, he says he does. Yet, in repeated instances, as I showed last evening, he denies its most explicit statements, not in reference to mere figurative language, but in simple historic narrations. But he cannot help it. His theory compels him so to do. He must deny, or spiritualize plain history, and literalize that which is spiritual and figurative, or else his whole theory falls to the ground. Nor is he alone in this position. But what is the reason of this strange position, of rational and sensible men? The Bible shall answer us. 2 Cor. 2: 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." Paul says, in reference to himself and fellow-laborers, "God hath made us able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." "To be carnally minded," it is said, "is death." I do not use this in an offensive sense. Jesus said, "the words I speak unto you, are spirit, and they are life." I don't believe He meant they were breath! And now I will say, once for all, in reference to breath, I do not care what construction is used, whether it be "breath," or "wind," or any thing else; it is the nature or properties of that breath that we wish to ascertain; and, I ask again, what is the "breath"? That is the question! Does my brother

mean to assert that the "air" which was inspired into the man, comes back again and re-animates that form? Will he say such a stupid thing as that to this audience? What are its properties? Let us know that, instead of quoting a hundred passages, more or less, to show that it is the same word translated in every place. We want to know the qualities of this breath. It seems, from the account of the creation, to have been breathed by the Almighty himself, and hence is not mere "air," or "breath," but something bestowing a vivifying or life-giving power to the form, as Jesus is said to have been made a life-giving spirit. And when He said, "the words I speak unto you are spirit, and they are life," I suppose Him to use precisely the same form of speech as when he said, "this is my body." The words are representative or explanatory of spiritual things; they have spiritual meaning. "This is my flesh." Not that you are to eat my body; but I mean there is a spiritual significancy in the words, and that you are to go above, into the interior, spiritual meaning, in order to understand what I say. If he did not mean this, what did he mean?

The course of argument pursued by my brother, reminds me of a discussion which occurred some centuries since, between one Martin Luther and some other reformers. It was in reference to the "real presence," as it was called, which Luther contended for, though not a believer in transubstantiation. What did he do? Why, there sat the "iron-hearted Monk," with his Bible before him, pointing to the literal translation — HOC EST CORPUS MEUM — "this is my body." 'Tis enough. That bread is the body, because the book says so; the book says, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM; there can be no meaning except this literal meaning.

So says my brother: because the term spirit sometimes means breath or wind, it means it in every case. And hence, when angels are called spirits, they must be "breaths," also. Demons were mere unclean "breaths," the "breath" of some being, provided "spirit" can have no other meaning, or else the spirit is an acting, feeling personality. Which is it? If a "breath," then the same breath must return and re-animate the same form, which we know is not the case. But here they are, thousands condemned to the gloom of the grave, and the darkness of despair, because of this so-called explicit literalism upon a few texts of Scripture. It is said Christ came to deliver them; but it must have been a failure, for still death is held up as the great bugbear.

Now for the application. But before proceeding with the direct argument, I will refer to a few of the remarks last made. My brother says, "no man is created pure." He has not proved it. His knowledge may be good enough, but not for me. I don't believe it. I deny it.

Then comes this question of Tartarus again. It was said, if I understand correctly, that Homer and Hesiod taught that "Tartarus" was in the bowels of the earth. I did affirm that Tartarus was there. I did not intend to stand before you to unravel the mysteries of Greek mythology, but to say that Tartarus was supposed to be located in the bowels of the earth, and that that view

was in accordance with the testimony of many eminent classical writers. But, the multitude of meanings which my brother gives this term, shows that he cannot determine very definitely where it was, or what it was, which is a very likely conclusion when we come into the domain of old heathen mythology.

As to fallen angels, he has not proved that any angels ever have fallen. He has not disproved one iota of the position which we affirmed, that angels are men, and called so, and that there is no evidence to the contrary, and that many of those angels were men in the form also. He quoted a passage from Hebrews, with which he endeavored to support that position, saying, that "Christ took not on him the nature of angels." He knows the word nature is not in the passage! "Christ took not hold of angels." This is its literal rendering, as everybody knows. It is no proof. It is his own assertion.

"The dead praise not the Lord." I have quoted to you a number of passages, in which multitudes were declared to be praising the Lord. I leave him to settle the apparent discrepancies with himself. There may be no clashing of truths to him," but if the dead praise not the Lord, there certainly is to me! I find hundreds — thousands praising the Lord, who once lived on earth, but are now, as to the earthly life, dead. He refers me to a passage to show that their praise is not the same as the praise of the living. Of course they do not praise in that way. But I cannot go into a critical examination of all his passages, as I said at the beginning. I have submitted proof enough on this point, I think.

He says, Christ went to heaven and nowhere else, for He went to his Father." We affirm that He did not. He told us, not long since, that the Greek word Hades was the corresponding word to sheol in the Hebrew. Now listen: "If I make my bed in hell (sheol), thou (God) art there;" so if Christ went to Hades He found his Father there. I want to ask my brother if God is in hell and nowhere else.

Demons can't come back because they are already here." I have never said that demons were the beings said to be cast down into hell. He has not proved this yet!

I come now to the application. "The spirits of just men made perfect." I know he does not like this passage, for he has not noticed it yet. He must have it to look at once more. The word rendered perfect (teleioo) had, among the ancient Christians, indeed, through all the ages of persecution, a specific meaning. It was applied by them to that completeness of the Christian character which was secured by martyrs, and was used as a synonyme for martyrdom. The person was supposed to be perfect in the highest sense who finished his course by laying down his life as a martyr to the cause of Christianity. Hence, the distinction which is made in this passage: "We are come," or we shall come, "to the church of the first-born, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." He alluded to some testimony, but not to this. Paul had this in mind, I have no doubt, when he referred, in Philippians, to his having given up every thing for Christ; "for whom," he says, "I have suffered the loss of all things,

if I might by any means attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect" (in this particular sense), "being made conformable to his death," it being a death of martyrdom. But, in another sense, he was perfect. He refers here to those perfected by martyrdom, and through the resurrection of the dead. I shall also call your attention to the phrase, "rise again" — rise again from the dead. What is the meaning of this? To comprehend it, we must come to Paul's grand exposition, in 1st Corinthians, 15th chapter. My brother, after arguing upon and explaining Paul's comparison, coolly turns round and denies the application of the analogy, in the very case, of the whole subject. But we have become accustomed to his denials of scripture affirmations when they upset his theory. But what does Paul say? Hear him: "But some will say, how" — mark the question — "how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool," says Paul, "that which thou sowest is not quickened unless it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain; — but God giveth it a body as it pleaseth him, and to every seed his own body. There are bodies," he goes on to say, differing from each other. All of these bodies, or rather seeds, produce bodies corresponding to the character of the seed which is sown. Then he goes on to say, it is sown in corruption, raised in or by power; sown in weakness, raised in strength; and then says, "so also" — after having given its analogy to the seed — "so also is the resurrection of the dead." Now look at it. My brother says, "the analogy does not apply to man." Paul says it does. (Applause.) He says, "so also is the resurrection of the dead." This is Paul's illustration — the seed that is sown, &c. My brother says it does not come up. Paul says it does: Who is right, he or Paul? He (Paul) says, "so also is the resurrection; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. (Time expired.)

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — I observe that my friend has not noticed the strong passages of scripture brought forward by us. He promised to follow us up pretty closely —

MR. LOVELAND. In all your positions — not all your texts.

MR. GRANT. Would like to have him look at some of the most prominent, then. We have endeavored to notice every one of his. We do not see much to notice in his remarks, save that our friend has helped us along some.

He says, we "deny the Bible." We shall plead not guilty, and ask him to prove this charge against us.

MR. LOVELAND. I have done that always.

MR. GRANT. Like to have it done once more. He says I "spiritualize the Bible." We think the spiritualizing is on the other side. We are com-

plained of for being too literal. That is the great charge against us. 'Tis said frequently by Spiritualists, "any one taking the Bible literally, as you do, can sustain the argument; but you let us put our construction upon it, and we can believe it then."

He asks, "what is the breath?" That which is in a man's nostrils, just where it was breathed.

Then comes another statement, "that we make 'spirit' mean 'breath,' in every case." We did no such thing Mr. Chairman. We said the word had four significations, and named them. He talks about "demons" being "breaths," "angels" being "breaths," and so on. We hold that there is no such thing as an immaterial being in the universe —

MR. LOVELAND. Nor is there!

MR. GRANT. Thank you for the admission. Glad to be agreed on one point. Then remarked that we said, "it was mercy to destroy." Said no such thing. Must have misunderstood us. He then refers to the passage where Christ did not take on the nature of angels, etc., and says, "He had no need to take that nature." Very well. We don't dispute that. It's a great deal worse for my friend, for that proves that angels are higher than men, and not men.

VOICE IN THE AUDIENCE. Amen! (Applause.)

MR. GRANT proceeded. He refers again to the "spirits of just men made perfect." We have answered it two or three times already. He says we "deny the analogy in 1 Cor. 15: We did not deny it. We said there was an analogy in the "dying" and "saving," but no analogy in the "springing up." Men don't sprout up like grain! That's what we did say. Paul don't intend to teach analogy in every point. And as my friend admits that bodies are produced like, or corresponding with, these which are sown, we will sow the bodies of men; sow men, and reap men. That's it.

MR. LOVELAND. True.

MR. GRANT. Well, he is coming round so much that we shall soon shake hands together, and take right hold of this blessed hope together.

We now come back to where we left off. The wicked shall not inherit the kingdom of God, and those who do not shall be destroyed. We were just referring to Revelation 20: 9. Can't see how anybody can support that passage, and believe the immortality of the soul.

John 15: 6: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." When branches are cut off from a tree they die.

Matthew 3: 12: "Whose fan is in His hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." If the fire could be quenched, then they might not be

burned up. But if a thing that is cast into the fire is not burned up, then there is no use in having a fire.

Malachi 4: 1: "For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." When a tree is burnt up, root and branch, is it still growing? Is it still a live tree, bearing fruit? Here are the records of the Bible, comparing the wicked to stubble, dry and seasoned for the fire, recording them to be "burnt up root and branch." Let my friend explain these texts to me. If I am spiritualizing these, not taking them literally, let him show it to me.

Once more, the last account of punishment in the Bible. Rev. 21: 8. In the Scriptures, the wicked are said to be cast "into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." "Then death itself is destroyed." This, and a multitude of other similar passages, all demonstrate, we think, that immortality or eternal life, is a gift dependent upon the character of the receiver.

We pass now to a third proposition: that the affirmative of this question is sustained because eternal life has been promised, therefore, not possessed.

1 John 2: 25: "And this is the promise that He hath promised us, even eternal life." He never promises us things we have got already. The very idea is absurd, unless we charge upon our Saviour as being *non compos mentis.*

Matthew 19: 16: "And behold, one came unto Him and said, good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life." Jesus said, if you do so and so — showing the man hadn't got it yet.

Mark 10: 30: "But he shall receive an hundred fold, now in this time;" and then He says, "in the world to come, eternal life." There's where he gets it. It is promised as a reward of faithful well-doing.

John 3: 14, 15: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up. That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Believe and ye will not perish; believe and ye shall have eternal life. That's the meaning of it.

John 6: 40: "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." There it is again. We must believe on Christ to get the eternal life he has promised.

Once more. Titus 1: 1: "—— In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Promised, not given. He has a "hope of it." Man doesn't "hope for" what he has already. Paul "hoped for eternal life."

We might cite many other passages similar to these, confirming the proposition that eternal life is a gift, dependent upon the character of the receiver, and not yet possessed.

Romans 6: 21–23: "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now, being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death, but the *gift* of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Here we find the gift of eternal life is made to the receiver in accordance with his character. All the Spiritualists deny that they are saved through Christ. He is no more our Saviour than any other. Is it a good doctrine? But the Spiritualists teach it, therefore they don't teach in harmony with the Bible.

We are charged with "being in the dark, in comprehending spiritual things." We leave that for the people to decide. All the facts of Spiritualism, we remark, can be accounted for; and the Bible harmonizes with the view we have taken, and we challenge any one to show a single exception.

Our fourth proposition is: the affirmative of this question is sustained from the fact that immortality is to be sought for and obtained by a certain course of conduct.

Romans 2: 7: "To them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Now if this doesn't meet the proposition, what does — that immortality is a gift from God, dependent upon the character of the receiver? No language could make the point plainer. Don't know how an opponent will get round this? Don't charge us with being too spiritual!

1 Timothy 6: 13–16: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting — Amen." He is speaking of God. Does that teach that all have it? Read from the first to the tenth verses of the same chapter.

The Heathen taught immortality, but denied the resurrection of the dead; but Christ records it, the whole Bible records it, if we can understand it.

1 Timothy 1: 17: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory, for ever and ever — Amen." That is the only passage where the word rendered immortal occurs in the whole Bible: it is then applied to the "King eternal." How or when, then, can we get it?

The answer is in 1 Corinthians 15: 54: "This mortal shall put on immortality," etc. How will our opponent harmonize this? "When this corruptible shall put on incorruption," says Paul. Not till then. Not till this "mortal puts on immortality;" not till "this corruptible puts on incorruption." We are not here told what is corruptible — the spirit or the soul; but something is corruptible and mortal. Now, I see how it is "brought to light through the gospel;" namely, the resurrection of the dead. Man has died, and Christ promises to bring him to life again, and they that have served him shall live forever, as He has promised.

If my opponent's position is true, why is there not something said in the

Bible about the immortality of the soul? Why this entire silence on the subject? Nothing about the immortality of the soul! I ask again, why is the Bible entirely silent on the subject, when it professes to be our guide upon Christian doctrine, as well as morals? It answers not! Let my friend tell why?

Some believe immortality is based on reason. Knock a man down, kill him, and you usher him into eternal life! It don't look reasonable!

Read Acts 20: 21–27. We feel we are sustained by the Bible on this point, and that nature itself can't contradict it. Let my friend attempt it. He and everybody else who does, will make a total failure!

VOICES IN THE AUDIENCE. — Amen! Amen! Amen!

MR. GRANT proceeded. A few facts on this point. The word rendered "soul" (nephesh), as we have before remarked, occurs seven hundred and fifty-two times in the Old Testament, and the corresponding word one hundred and five times in the New, making in all, eight hundred and fifty-seven times, and not a word about an "immortal soul," in the whole of them. No intimation that any thing leaves the man that is conscious when the man is dead.

The word rendered "spirit" is used four hundred times in the Old Testament, and three hundred and eighty-five in the New Testament. These added to the number of times that soul occurs, makes sixteen hundred and forty-two, and not a word about an "immortal soul," or "immortal spirit." Science, facts, and philosophy, as well as the Bible, sustain the proposition.

The words rendered "die," "death," "dead," occur in the Old Testament, nineteen hundred and thirty-nine times; in the New Testament, six hundred and forty-three times, making two thousand five hundred and eighty-two, and not a word said about any part of man leaving him at death, but his "breath." (Time expired.)

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: My brother, I suppose, thought he had made a very strong point in reference to the "dwelling in the form;" but the error is very easily seen. For if Christ took hold only of Abraham's seed, He has never taken hold of us, and never will; for we do n't belong to the Jews — Abraham's seed. So that his exposition does not amount to any thing, after all. He may take hold of angels, notwithstanding, so far as that passage is concerned.

He says, "eternal life is a gift that is promised to us." That is nothing new. We knew it. But he says, "if it is promised we hav n't got it." I gave my definition of eternal life, last evening. "To know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." If no man knows Jesus Christ, then no man has eternal life, and it is in the future to him; but if men do know God, then they have eternal life. On this point, no man is left in the dark. Any man that believes in Jesus Christ, has eternal life. Jesus Christ declares himself, that "God has given us eternal life." Has given? Every believer possesses eternal life.

He asks, "what is death?" and answers, "extinction of being." The Bible says, "to be carnally minded is death," while to be "spiritually minded is life." Here, then, persons who are living are still dead, according to this express declaration, while possession of eternal life is affirmed of all believers in Christ. So all his texts which he has quoted amount to nothing.

He refers to the text: "who only hath immortality." I understand it; my brother does not. The word that is translated immortality, in that passage, is used only in two other passages; and I can show that *that* immortality is not possessed by man. It signifies the absence of all forms of death; is from *alpha*, not, and *thanatos*, death. That cannot be affirmed of man, for his body dies — only of the being who has "lived forever, without beginning and without end." Man may become immortal, and get beyond the possibility of death. Other phrases which are translated immortal, apply to man, or may apply to him, but not this word.

He asks me about immortality again. I wish to ask him if he supposes immortality to be a substance? Is it something which a man puts on, as he puts on a garment? Something infused into him? Nothing of the kind. If so, he might easily be immortal. All his efforts in that direction fail entirely. But I will show you what is meant by this "putting on immortality," and also "seeking immortality," by repeating my comment upon 1st Corinthians, 15th chapter, the truth of which my opponent says I deny. I never made any such denial. I affirm it, and have affirmed here before, that the immortality of the body, which men are to have in the future, is dependent upon a resurrection, and it is through that resurrection that immortality is acquired; it is through that resurrection that immortality is "put on," and by which they are endued with immortality, like as it is said of "those endued with power from on high." He denies the analogy here when it comes to the resurrection, but allows it as to the sowing! Why, the very thing Paul is illustrating is the resurrection. "So also is" — what? The sowing? The reaping? No. "So also is the resurrection of the dead." That is the thing. It is the resurrection of the dead he is talking of, and refers to the sowing, which shows the comparison in all its bearings. Here, then, is the body dead, as my brother pleases to term it. It is sown, as he says. There is a germ; that germ must perish; there is something comes from it; it is a spiritual body; because a "natural body was sown, a spiritual body is raised;" and the raising of this spiritual body — its resurrection, is the means by which it is endued with immortality, or incorruption, or no death. Why is this peculiar phraseology used? Because of the peculiar thing it illustrates. Then this proves immortality to man's future body, through the resurrection. There is to be a body; not an invisible one, but a real, tangible body, such an one as very many in the audience have seen and felt and been addressed by — myself among the number. (Intermingled cries of "That's so," "Yes," "Don't believe it," "Nonsense," etc., etc., in the audience.) Paul says, "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." This is

Paul's argument. What does my brother do with it? He has not met this. Here is Paul's statement. Paul says, there is a natural body and a spiritual body. Which is first? The natural body — the spiritual body after.

I might also quote the passage which says, "Flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." How he is going to prove the "literal resurrection of the dead," as long as that passage stares him in the face, I can't imagine. (Applause.) "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive — every man in his own order." Here, all who die in or by the first Adam, or in consequence of the first nature, may live in, by, or through Christ, also forming the universal resurrection of man; as in the 44th verse it is said, "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." We think you will all see that here the resurrection is spoken of in the fullest sense; that Paul refers to this particular fact. "Raised from the dead." Dead what? The dead body that is laid down is the earthly house, the "earthly house of this tabernacle, which may be dissolved, yet we have a building of God." That is coming out from the earthly body that is sown. "So also is the resurrection of the dead" — that resurrection which Jesus Christ declares that "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob enjoyed, as was proved by Moses at the bush." Then also is the redemption of our body, that is, the universal body of humanity. I did not deny that the spiritual body meant the Church of Christ, in many instances. In many it has that significancy. It does not always mean so. It means Christ's body sometimes, the body of the church sometimes, the universal body of humanity sometimes, and sometimes it means the bodies of all men.

I wish now to notice an argument of my brother, made last evening. He attempted to argue from reason, "that if we desire any thing, that proves we haven't got it!" Let us look at this for a moment, and see how much it does prove. We desire life. Does that prove we haven't got life? He will say, perhaps, it proves we havn't got the continuance of life, or that life is not continued. But it proves this: that we have got life; that is, that we are alive; for, if we were not alive we could not desire it. But the being alive proves that we cannot possess the desire if we had not the faculties to live. So also is the desire for immortality. It proves, of course, not that immortality is condensed into the present moment, but it proves that the faculties exist, and that the desire springs from the faculties. It shows we have the power of immortality, without which the desire would be impossible. So much for that wonderful argument of my brother.

It is admitted that the universe is one of means and ends, and, I have also proved that progression is the great law and fact of all existence. As to Deity, it is the progress of more and more glorious manifestations of Himself in and through universal nature, while in man it is the expansion and strengthening of his powers of comprehension and of happiness. His present state of ignorance, weakness and sin, I have proved by Scripture, is not of his own making or choosing — "was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him

who hath subjected him in hope." The power which has given us existence has given it just as it is, with all the outward conditions and circumstances which surround us. I never made myself a sinner; no man ever made himself a sinner. By Adam, sin was brought into the universe, and through and by him we come into existence in sin; but we did not make ourselves so! By one offence all men were made sinners. This is explicitly asserted. They are subjected to sin through the sin of Adam. Still, in consequence of this condition, men sin naturally; that, of course, brings appropriate results — sufferings, which are God's chastisements. And He loves all. "For He so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten son as a propitiation for our sin." "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth." By chastisement men are ultimately made wise. In the nature of things they must be. Every experience teaches there is still a knowledge of something we do not possess; not all at once, perhaps, but by progress; and in the course of time reveals to us many a new spring of knowledge, and many a new fount of wisdom hitherto hidden in the misty darkness of ignorance, and only brought to light through experience.

Were it possible for man not to desire happiness, his case would be hopeless. So long as he exists, so long must he desire happiness; and, as he sees more clearly, by this experience, the inexorable law of moral sequences, begins to discover effects from causes, means from ends, and to see the inevitable retribution which justice places upon him. When any of these laws are transgressed, he becomes wiser, and finds the law of the Lord, even in the inflictions of justice, to be perfect, converting the soul, and teaching that soul to live; and he learns to love that law, severe though its penalties and inflictions may be, for he sees in it the strong undercurrent of divine and heaven-born justice.

This process is to go on, for Jesus is to reign till the last enemy — which is said to be death — is destroyed or swallowed up in victory.

When this is accomplished, then the universal adoption will be obtained, and the redemption of our body — the universal body of humanity — will be secured. Then will the kingdom be delivered up to God. The spiritual Christ will be then subject to His Father, and every man will be in sympathy with Him; will love Him, as He loves all. Till then mediation must continue, and the immortal Jesus is our intercessor.

In the mean time humanity will be groaning and waiting for that end. All those who are in sympathy with this Divine Being, see the promise afar off; they have not yet received it in full; some part is reserved. They rejoice over one sinner that repenteth.

The race is one vast brotherhood. Have we not one common Father? Are we not all the offspring of God? Hence, I call my opponent "my brother," though he, for some reason, styles me "friend." But we all look up to one Great Father, and I call him "brother," for we are all one great and glorious brotherhood. We are all created in His image, all can claim His parental care, all look to Him as the one Great Universal Father of this one great body of humanity! (Loud and prolonged applause.) (Time expired.)

The Chairman here announced "that a collection would be taken up to defray the expenses of the hall, and also to remunerate the brethren who had so highly edified the audience. He had no doubt of this," he continued, "as he himself had been much interested in the discussion as it had progressed, and was pleased with the gentlemanly manner in which it had been conducted, by both the parties. The proceeds of the collection," he said, "would be equally divided between the speakers."

After the collection was taken up, the audience were edified by the closing speech of

MR. GRANT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — These are the last remarks we can make. Our friend, instead of meeting our passages of Scripture, has changed the argument to the resurrection of the dead. Says we "are of the seed of Abraham." We claim to be Gentiles.

MR. LOVELAND. The Jews are from the seed of Abraham!

MR. GRANT. The Jews date back properly to Jacob. Abraham was a Gentile, and known as such. I claim relationship.

VOICES IN THE AUDIENCE. Amen! Amen! Amen!

MR. GRANT. My friend says, "When a man knows Christ, he knows eternal life." That's what we claim. We admit the law. He says, "Man may become immortal." That's —

MR. LOVELAND. That is not so. I didn't say so.

MR. GRANT. I certainly put it down correctly. I can't be mistaken.

MR. LOVELAND. Then I take it back. I never meant to say such a thing, if I did say it!

MR. GRANT. Then we pass it. He admits "this mortality shall put on immortality." Think he is coming over pretty fast. "The real body is coming up." That sounds like it. There's something tangible to it. It's a real, tangible body!

MR. LOVELAND. Yes, sir.

MR. GRANT. He then says the "material body is not raised." The real body coming up, but the material body not raised! I leave him to harmonize that contradiction. "The authority of the physical resurrection." Says he claims authority equal to us.

MR. LOVELAND. With you and Paul.

MR. GRANT. We claim to have Paul on our side in this matter. Says Paul, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" What is it that is dead? Havn't told us yet. There were

some then who didn't believe in the resurrection of the dead. There are some now. If it was possible for God to raise the dead then, it is just as possible for him to do it now. My opponent says, "I never made myself a sinner. Angels rejoice over one sinner that repenteth. I never made myself a sinner!" I didn't know as he did. But either he made himself so, or else God did. That's the only way I can see to get out of it. Then he isn't a sinner! Then he never did wrong! "He that knoweth how to do well, and doeth it not—he that knoweth how to do good, and doeth it not—is a sinner.

He says, "by one man's sin all are made sinners." Like the chapter and verse for it.

MR. LOVELAND. "All," or "the many," I said.

MR. GRANT. I would like the chapter and verse for that. "On account of one man's sin," we read, "he became mortal, and by that brought death into the world." That's the version the Bible gives of it. But that by "Adam's sin we are all made sinners," I should like the proof of it.

"Only physical death." That looks right enough. But to make a man a sinner because his grandfather or great-grandfather was, does n't look reasonable. We don't believe in such a doctrine as that.

"We find justice everywhere in life." Yes, but everybody does n't get it. It don't "run in the family." It does them no good. He says, "God creates some men to be happy and some not." Read the account, 1st chapter Romans, 32d verse. "Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death." It is the best that can be done with them, to put them back again to dust.

We don't see any thing else worthy of remark. Oh, yes! Here is a little word or two. We read, in Romans 8 : 21, "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The word here rendered "creature" is also rendered "creation." Several translators render it "creation," in all cases. "Waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God, for they are made subject to vanity, but not willingly"—yielded not—"but the whole earth is groaning" because of sin. "Not willingly." Nothing to do with it. And Paul seems to represent the whole earth as alive. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together. Not only they, but even we ourselves groan within ourselves,"—we have the same feeling, too,—"waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body"—when we shall come up from the dead, and this mortality shall put on immortality.

We come back now to what little we have to say in conclusion. We remarked before, on the words rendered "death" and "dead." In not one of the passages in which they occur does it intimate that any part of the man was alive or living on when the physical organism is dead. And it seems to us, if men will not believe all those evidences they have, that go to establish and sub-

stantiate the fact that nothing but "the breath of life" leaves man at death, and that his body sleeps until the resurrection day — we say, it seems to us that if men will not believe all the evidences they have of this, they would not believe "though one arose from the dead."

MR. LOVELAND. I don't believe it!

MR. GRANT. On the other side there has been manifested an indifference to the many plain passages of scripture that we have brought, again and again. They hav n't been noticed. Why has he not met them? We think he has utterly failed to prove that man is inherently immortal. We have proved,

First, That he is mortal, and is to return to the dust of the ground. The Bible account reads, "lest he should stretch forth his hand, eat of the tree of life, and live forever."

Second, The resurrection of the dead refers solely to the man made of the dust of the ground; hence we read, in Daniel 12:2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Third, Immortality is a gift to the righteous which are raised from the dead. Revelations 20:6: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

Fourth, There is no spiritual body that goes out of man at death — nothing but the "breath of life;" and our friend has utterly failed to bring a passage to show any thing else goes out of man at death, or a fact to sustain such a position.

Fifth, Eternal life is a synonyme for immortality. "Eternal" is defined by the words "without end," "endless," "immortal," "undying," "imperishable." "Immortality" is defined, "not mortal," "that which can never die," "endless," "exempt from death and corruption," "eternal;" almost the same words used in defining it, and this makes the synonyme. Let him show that it is not a synonyme, and also tell us what a synonyme is.

Sixth, Demons are an order of beings bearing the following names, as they are found in the Bible. "Familiar spirits," "unclean spirits," etc., the "spirits" of modern Spiritualism, manifesting themselves by all kinds of freaks, tipping tables, and many other things we might name.

Seventh, All manifestations and communications, so called, are the work of these demons. We are prepared to argue this point with them at any time.

Eighth, As all men are mortal, and know nothing when dead, it is impossible for them to furnish communications. Ecclesiastes 9:5: "For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing." Let my friend bring forward the Scripture that shows that the dead do know something.

Ninth, The fact that we desire immortality, proves we havn't got it, are not in its possession. It either proves we have got it or we havn't got it. If I desire to be President, does that prove I am? If I desire to go to a certain place, does

it prove I am there, or on the road? The very fact that we desire immortality, proves we havn't got it. But we can get it. "By continued patience in well doing" we shall see it.

Tenth, Immortality is not an inherent quality in man, because all the "wicked are to be destroyed," "die the second death," "be as though they had not been." Hence the conclusion. We now come to the clear conclusion, first, that human immortality is not taught in the Bible, by science, or philosophy, or proved by Spiritualism. Second, that immortality is a gift of God, dependent upon the character of the receiver. Hence, we think the negative of the first question and the affirmative of the second are fully sustained by declarations of God's word.

Oh, let us all seek immortality! it is worth seeking for; it is a gift that cannot be taken away when once attained; it is a noble prize to be gained and hence given to those who can enjoy the society of God and the angels and all the holy beings. May it be our lot to enjoy it!

MR. LOVELAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: — In concluding this discussion I do not propose to notice particularly the positions last made by my brother, save by a very few brief remarks.

He has not sustained his position that nothing goes out of the body at death but the "breath of life," or that nothing is raised from the body at death. Paul says, "there is a spiritual body," and I have proved to you, from explicit scripture testimony, that "spirits" were in the spirit-world and were preached to by Jesus Christ, after "He was crucified in the flesh and quickened by the spirit." This I have proved, if explicit declarations of Scripture are any proof whatever. So much for that position.

"Eternal life is a synonyme of immortality." It is the "knowledge of God;" hence it is no synonyme of immortality. I have also proved the continued existence of the spiritual body, and that it lives in the future. I have proved the universe to be one great scheme of means and ends; this has been admitted. I have proved that this universe is one of even and exact justice; also admitted. I have proved that no man ever made himself a sinner, but that, by the offence of one man all men were made sinners, and that men being born with the sins of by-gone generations hanging upon them, they were not accountable therefor; and that they did not make themselves so; that nothing could create itself, wicked or otherwise. "Men have been subject to vanity, but not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected them in hope," etc. Multitudes of passages have been quoted by my brother to prove his theory. I said, at the outset, that I could not be expected to wade through his interminable wilderness of passages; nor need I, for I have proved the fallacy of one of each class, and thereby disproved the application he seeks to make of the whole.

Sin is to be destroyed; but that destruction is not the annihilation which my brother has assumed.

I have proved that there is a dual nature in man — a natural body and a spiritual body. Paul confirms my position.

I have proved that justice is the sequence or result of all cause and effect, of all means and ends, instrumentalities and their uses. I have affirmed man to be a being of progress. My brother has denied it, but has failed to prove his position.

I have proved also that punishment is a means, and that it is a means to a certain end; and that that end is the bettering or making better of the persons thus chastized.

I have proved that the annihilation of man was not possible; that it would be vengeance, instead of justice, and that justice would be unknown in the universe of God were annihilation true. That justice, being an end in the universe, all men must receive the awards of justice as it is meted out to them. That punishment is the means of making man better; and that if the theory of annihilation were true, there is no chance for improvement, as existence ceases; consequently annihilation is no punishment at all.

See the blending of means and ends in this sublime drama of existence, as it is thus presented to us. But for sin, there could have been no Jesus, there would have been no mercy, there would have been no long-suffering in the bosom of the Father; there could have been no charity, that grace which sums all other goods in one. Indeed, all the most lovely traits of goodness could never have had a home in humanity without the prior existence of sin. Sin, then, is no accident in the universe — no unlooked for event or influence unprovided for in the grand scheme of the universe, necessitating, on the part of Deity, the frightful alternative of either totally annihilating, or else forever damning multitudes of intelligent beings, made in His image, and declared to be His children. We are not compelled to accept either of these monstrosities, but, as we have briefly shown in this discussion, we perceive that sin is one of the means in the grand economy of the universe, and as such, will as surely work out its end or legitimate result, as any other of the multitudinous means existing in the great whole. Human happiness is the fruit of human experience, and is in proportion to the number and variety of those experiences, which, in a strong sense, make up the whole of human life. We have shown that humanity constitutes one grand, unitary brotherhood. Each individual of the race is bound to every other human being, by the indestructible tie of a common nature — by real, vital connections, which no power can sever or destroy. As a consequence, the perfection and welfare of each is dependent on the welfare and perfection of all. Every person gives something to every other person, and receives from them in return, and, therefore, so long as there is one lost or suffering man or woman, so long the happiness of the rest of the race is diminished in a measure, and he is not, nay, cannot be, perfectly saved. No human

being has yet received his perfect rest. The spiritually unfolded in olden time, as well as now, saw the promises and believed them; but they could not receive the fulness of them, because the future generations were needful, in order to complete the perfect joy of humanity. As Paul says, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Each age of spiritual minds sees the glory of the coming age, and though that may be one of wonders, yet it will not, cannot be contented, because of the greater glory to come. Man feels the impulse of this living inspiration within him. By a power as resistless as destiny, he is carried into the future, and all the brightness of the present pales in the greater light which beams from the rising sun of his coming destiny. Therefore is it, that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together, until now;" "the desire of all nations" is still in the future. The revelations of the past and present are only precious to man, as they dart a ray over the swellings of that vast and billowy ocean, whose rolling surges are the cycles of coming eternity. In the incipient stages of human experience, this prompts to the more selfish work of seeking merely personal safety. "What must I do to be saved?" is the great question, and is based upon the erroneous conclusion that one can be saved, and another lost — that perfect salvation and utter damnation can co-exist. But as man grows in the knowledge of God, he begins to see what he has always dimly felt, that there is no perfect joy for one, until there is joy in all. There is no such thing as mere individualism in humanity; it is a holy unity — the dwelling place of Divinity. Then is seen what Paul meant by "the redemption of our body," and that future "adoption," not realized even by Paul himself. So, also, is the nature of "the groaning and travailing in pain together" comprehended. From the present state of sin, weakness, and vanity, is to be born the powerful, wise, holy, immortal, and glorified body of humanity.

Now, sin in man brings forth the fruit of death; a carnal or fleshly mind, i.e., one external, material, and gross in its intellectual conceptions, and sordid, selfish, and sensual in its affections. But every pang, as it rankles in pain to the core of the heart, adds another item of knowledge to man, and hence an additional instrument for his salvation. Thus, sin in its pain-inflicting power, is the means by which man is made wiser. It also co-operates with justice, or, we may say, justice is the iron chain binding the means and ends in one. Sin, then, is no extraneous thing in God's creation, but an inevitability, not of weakness on the part of God, He not being able to prevent it, nor of folly, but of wisdom; for man, of necessity, if he is to be a happy being, must of necessity be a growing or progressive one, which would be an impossibility were he as high in wisdom and goodness at his creation as he ever could be. But, beginning at the lowest round of the ladder, he orderly ascends, step by step, the whole. But again, these sins and weaknesses constitute the necessities for effort on the part of man. These efforts are the potent means by which man grows and becomes capacitated for those higer joys to which he aspires. The Christian system not only

recognizes this sublime idea of progress, adaptation of means and ends, but is itself one of the golden links in that divine chain of destiny. The cross was not raised in Eden, nor was "forgive them, they know not what they do," uttered on Sinai. Nor even now, is "the exceeding riches of his grace towards us in Christ Jesus," fully shown forth, but the "ages to come" are to accomplish this wonderous work, in the greatness and fulness of its glory.

So also are they opportunities by which the wisdom of the method is most conclusively shown. That which, in the wisdom of man, seems to vitiate and render imperfect the whole scheme, is seen to be, when fully comprehended, only the appropriate and necessary means for accomplishing the proposed end. And when to this we add our demonstration, founded upon the prehensile or desiring faculties of man's nature, we shall see the crowning glory of the whole. Man, from necessity, is forever drawing the horoscope of his destiny. The well of life within him forever rises up in deathless wishes for something better than he now possesses. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast," therefore, man rushes this way and that, seeking in multitudinous ways to satisfy the gnawing hunger of the soul. But he "misses the mark," he sins, he fails to secure the good he sought. But he has not made an utter failure, for he has learned that what was supposed to be enough to meet man's wants utterly fails. The experiment is repeated, over and over again, until man is forced to see that there is a soul as well as a body, and that time with all its joys cannot meet the demands of his higher nature. Here are means and ends, here is justice, here is progress, here is prophecy and its fulfilment. Sin has thus no conquest. Death has no victory, as they would have were annihilation or endless pain the fate of any. Death is swallowed up in victory, because the sting of death, sin, has ceased to be. Being a means it has accomplished its end, which remains, or is a means to ends still higher. Having thus conclusively and unanswerably demostrated that sin is a means, in God's economy, to an end of glorious use — human happiness — we have swept away the last vestige of a foundation on which my brother can base an argument to sustain his hopeless theory — a theory which instead of swallowing up death in victory, thrones him on mountain heaps of slaughtered souls and bodies to hold grim carnival forever. Victory is swallowed by death in *his* scheme. But he is mistaken; Jesus, not death, is to be the victor. Man is given to him, not to death. This leaves our argument in a state of tolerable completness, and hence shows that he is entirely mistaken in his expositions and conclusions. Nor need we regret it, inasmuch as that mistake is one so gloomy and horrible in its nature.

In conclusion, I only wish to say that the views which I have expressed in this discussion, are those entertained substantially by the great mass of Spiritualists, notwithstanding all the calumny heaped upon them. Of course, there are incidental differences, but the large majority agree with these views. To them this world is no vast Babel of jarring discord, which is to end in utter darkness, or eternal discord in the ages to come. Humanity is one, by sacred ties united,

and will, after its great deliverance shall be effected, never look back upon the means by which it has been effected with regret, but will see in them the incarnation of all-glorious wisdom and love. The light of immortality will cover the happy race with a robe of glory and peace. (Loud applause.)

Mr. Grant. I propose a vote of thanks be tendered to the Chairman, for the creditable and gentlemanly manner in which he has presided over this discussion.

Mr. Loveland. I second the motion.

The vote being put to the audience, it was unanimously carried, and the meeting adjourned.

[The reporter of the above discussion would state that the following argument of Dr. Lyon was not reported by him.]

THE

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND TRACTS, 11

FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF

THE ADVENT CHRISTIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

No. 167 Hanover Street, Boston.

WORKS ON THE PROPHECIES — THE COMING AND KINGDOM OF CHRIST, ETC. (*Prices by Mail.*)

Signs of the Times; or, A Glance at Christendom as it is. By H. L. Hastings. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 50c.

The Voice of the Church on the Coming and Kingdom of the Redeemer. By D. T. Taylor. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 50c.

Thessalonica, the Model Church, and **Reasons for my Hope,** by Hastings; and **Spiritualism,** by Dr. Ramsay. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 50c.

The Great Controversy between God and Man. With various tracts. By H. L. Hastings. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 50c.

Matthew xxiv. and xxv. An Exposition, showing Christ's Predictions fulfilled, and his Kingdom near. By I. C. Wellcome. 27c.

The Last-Day Tokens, No. 1, By S. S. Brewer.....09
" " No. 2, " 23
" " No. 3, " 23

Reasons for my Hope; or, Tokens of Redemption. By H. L. H.....20

The Kingdom of God, and Signs of the Times. By S. S. Brewer.....20

Thessalonica; or, The Model Church. By H. L. Hastings.....25

Revelation xiii.; a treatise. By S. S. Brewer.....20

The Great Controversy between God and Man. By H. L. Hastings....25

Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion. By Wm. Ramsay, D. D.....20

The Seven Seals. Exposition of Rev. vi. By S. S. Brewer 10

Looking Forward; or, Prospects of the Church. H. L. Hastings.....10

The Days we Live in; The Lord soon to come. By S. S. Brewer.....12

The Celestial Railroad; or, Modern Pilgrim's Progress.....10

The Three Kingdoms. By T. M. Preble.....15

The Slaying of the Witnesses. By S. S. Brewer.....10

The Ten Virgins; or, Wisdom and Folly contrasted. By T. M. Preble.05

The Great Image soon to be dashed to pieces. By S. S. Brewer 06

The Two Adams. By T. M. Preble.....07

The Great Symbolic Chart of the times of Daniel and John. Mounted on Rollers, by Express, $5.00. On Cloth, by mail, $4.00.

The Reign of Messiah, the King of the Jews, on the Throne of his Father David; its Nature, and the Time of its Commencement. By Wm. Sheldon. 10c.

ISSUED FROM THE SAME OFFICE,

The World's Crisis and Second Advent Messenger:

A Religious and Family Journal,

Published weekly, at $2.50 a year, in advance.

The Young Pilgrim; an Illustrated Sunday-School Paper.

Semi-monthly:

50 cts. a year, in advance; 10 copies, 40 cts. each; 50 copies, 35 cts. each.

BOSTON:

BERRY, COLBY & CO.