

---

---

CHRISTIANITY *vs.*  
SPIRITUALISM.

---

---



REPORT  
ORAL  
DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

MR. M. W. GREEN,

MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,  
(CHRISTIAN CHAPEL, LANGRIDGE STREET, COLLINGWOOD.)

MR. THOS. WALKER,

THE YOUNG

SPIRITUALISTIC TRANCE MEDIUM

OF LANCASHIRE, ENGLAND.

(REPRESENTING THE VICTORIAN ASSOCIATION OF SPIRITUALISTS.)

HELD AT THE

TEMPERANCE HALL, MELBOURNE,

ON THE EVENINGS OF THE

5TH, 6TH, 7TH, 12TH, 13TH, 14TH, 19TH, 20TH, ADD 21ST

MARCH, 1878.



SUBJECTS.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

" THAT CHRISTIANITY IS OF DIVINE ORIGIN."—AFFIRMED BY MR. GREEN;  
DENIED BY MR. WALKER.

SECOND PROPOSITION".

"THAT THE BIBLE SUPPORTS AND PARALLELS MODERN SPIRITUALISM  
IN ALL ITS PHASES, TEACHINGS, AND PHENOMENA."

AFFIRMED BY MR. WALKER; DENIED  
BY MR. GREEN.

PHONETICALLY REPORTED BY MR. CLARENCE PITMAN.



MELBOURNE

PRINTED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY J. WING, 33 WELLINGTON STREET,  
COLLINGWOOD.

MDCCCLXXVIII



# INTRODUCTION.

---

For the purpose of introducing the following Report to the reader, it may be remarked, that on account of certain lectures which had been delivered by Mr. Green, a correspondence arose between him and the Melbourne Spiritualistic and Free-Thought Association, with a view to a Public Debate being held upon the relative claims of Christianity and Spiritualism. On account of Mr. Green's leaving Melbourne on a visit to England, no debate was held. A short time after his return, Mr. Thomas Walker, a Spiritualistic Lecturer, came to Melbourne and excited considerable interest by his lectures, and, whilst these were being delivered, Mr. Green received the following anonymous communication:—

Rev. Sir,—The overtures for a Spirito-Christian Discussion, made about twelve months ago, are now open to repetition with Mr. Thomas Walker, the "Trance-Lecturer."

Yours, Ac,  
E. G. S.

Mr. Green paid no attention to this note; but a few days afterwards a letter was sent to his care, by Mr. Walker, for "E. G. S.," and as Mr. Green had no knowledge of such a person he returned it to Mr. Walker, with the simple intimation, that not knowing "E. G. S.," and having no means of delivering the letter, it was returned. Mr. Walker then sent the following communication:—

84 Russell Street,  
5th February, 1878.

Mr. M. W. GREEN:

Rev. Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your note enclosing letter (returned) addressed to your care. I may state here that my knowledge of "E.G. S." is about equal to that possessed by yourself, and was obtained in a similar manner. That you may become acquainted with the nature of the communication to me, I forward my reply to you, which I wrote without knowing whether "E.G.S." had authority from you to write to me or not. However, I hope that you will not consider me intrusive upon your time, or your notice, in thus making you aware of the cause of this correspondence, for which, if it occasion you trouble, I crave your pardon.

Yours respectfully,  
THOMAS WALKER.

---

The following is the letter referred to:—

84 Russell Street, Melbourne,  
2nd February, 1878.

Mr. "E. G. S." (c.o. Mr. M. W. Green):

Dear Sir,—I received your note this morning, and take the earliest opportunity of replying. I do not know what Mr. Green's position in relation to the causes I represent is, and would be glad to have it clearly defined before engaging in dis-

cussion with him. If he represents popular Orthodoxy, then I have no hesitation in saying I will engage to take the negative in the following proposition: "Resolved—That Orthodoxy is capable of proof, and Spiritualism is not."

Conditions might be made by mutual committees, and final arrangements agreed upon by further correspondence, or future interviews.

In the meantime I should be glad to receive from Mr. Green himself a letter, stating the objects he has in view, and whether truth or victory is his aim.

In conclusion, I am,

Yours Respectfully,

THOMAS WALKER.

Mr. "E. G. S.,"

Address, c.o. Mr. Terry.

The following correspondence will sufficiently explain itself:—

98 Gore Street, Fitzroy,

7th February, 1878.

Mr. THOMAS WALKER:

My Dear Sir,—Your courteous letter of the 5th inst. was received by me last evening, and, from its contents, I judge that some interested person has been writing to each of us in an anonymous manner, with a view to bring about a public discussion upon Christianity and Spiritualism. For my own part, while not seeking to rush into debate, yet, as I have only a desire for the advancement of truth and the exposure of error, and believing that public discussion is a means of advancing truth, if conducted in a kindly and Christian spirit, I should not object to engage in a debate upon clearly-defined propositions directly bearing upon Spiritualism and Christianity. With all deference I would suggest that the proposition suggested by you,—viz., "That Orthodoxy is capable of proof, and Spiritualism is not,"—is not so clear and defined as to make a debate upon it at all profitable. We should need to define orthodoxy, and in order to do so should require a standard of reference. Without dwelling upon this point, I think you will see that a vast amount of time might be wasted in debating what Orthodoxy is. I need scarcely remind you of the hackneyed saying,—that "orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy." If you substituted "Christianity" for "Orthodoxy" the proposition would be more acceptable, though I should prefer an alteration in the latter portion, which I need not now state, as, if there is a sincere desire for debate upon fair and equitable terms (which your letter leads me to think), these matters could all be arranged satisfactorily.

May I ask you to do me the favor to peruse a letter which you will find in the files of the newspaper, kept in the Public Library, in which details are given of a communication with the Melbourne Spiritualistic and Free-Thought Association *in re* a public discussion, which will put you in possession of certain facts it would be well for you to know, and in which you will see the propositions I stated my willingness to debate. You will find the letter referred to in the issue of "The Daily Telegraph" of April 5th, 1877, and the following correspondence in the subsequent issues. I may just state that I am still willing to take up the propositions, as there stated, with yourself or any representative of Spiritualism whom the M. S. and F. T. A. might select, who is of good moral character.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

M. W. GREEN.

---

84 Russell Street,

8th February, 1878,

Mr. M. W. GREEN:

Rev. Sir,—I received your prompt reply to mine of the 1st inst. this morning, and take the earliest opportunity to thank you for the explanations tendered in reference to your position, and opinions held, *re* a public discussion. I had the pleasure of perusing your letters, and the replies given by a member, or re-

presentative, of the M. S. and F. T. A. where it appears that there, have been mutual challenges to debate, but no satisfactory arrangements agreed upon, consequently postponing the discussion, but leaving an open challenge on your side to all after-comers who should be placed forward by the above Association of Spiritualists and Free-thinkers as a representative man, provided, of course, your statement of the proposition to be considered be accepted. I was not aware of any previous correspondence upon the matter until I had written you my letter; therefore my action, in virtually accepting your challenge, cannot arise from a previous knowledge of its existence or the part you, no doubt, have conscientiously taken in the past in regard to the cause I espouse, and, I trust, worthily labor for. The sole cause of my occasioning you this trouble of correspondence is the anonymous post-cards we mutually received; and thus you will have already inferred that I am put forward as the representative of *no Association*, and am individually responsible for the course I have taken, not even having the advice of my friends in the matter. I need not inform you that I am at present lecturing under the auspices of the "Victorian Association of Spiritualists," not the M. S. and F. T. A., the two being distinct and separate societies, agreeing to agree and disagree as they see fit.

Another matter—if you will allow me still to trespass upon your patience—that I would desire to inform you upon, is my method of speaking in public, which I sincerely hope will prove no obstruction in bringing the object of our intentions to a culmination. I speak whilst in a psychological condition (usually, but erroneously, denominated *trance*), in which state I honestly believe I am an instrument in the hands of invisible forces, or powers, to express their views. This I do not ask you to believe, or even temporarily to admit, but I ask you to treat me, should the discussion occur, as though I were individually responsible for the arguments used and intelligence displayed—in fact, to address *me*, criticise *me*, and answer *me*, as though I were in a similar state and possessed similar capacities to those you, on such an occasion, possess.

My object is, as yours, to assist in "the advancement of truth and tike exposure of error," and I, with you, believe that a public discussion, if rightly conducted, will tend to that end. Your suggestion in regard to having the pro? positions clearly defined is very good indeed, and I trust I shall profit by it, though (if you will pardon me) I venture to express the opinion, that the substitution of the word "Christianity" for "Orthodoxy" will not expedite matters, as the two words are open to the same objection. My views of Christianity are not, it is presumed, yours, and thus the question is raised,—What is Christianity?—as would be the case with the word "Orthodoxy." May I be allowed to put a proposition in the form of a question, which I think would get at the root of matters. It is this: "Is the New Testament of Divine Origin?"

The above will include any definition you may have to place, either upon Christianity or Orthodoxy, if logically deduced from the New Testament.

Asking your forbearance for this lengthy communication, which I deemed necessary, in order that you might know accurately my position,

I am,

Rev. Sir,

Yours respectfully,

THOMAS WALKER.

---

98 Gore Street, Fitzroy,  
8th February, 1878.

Mr. THOMAS WALKER:

My Dear Sir,—Yours of to-day is to hand, and I would ask kindly to correct an impression which I perceive you have taken.

You have misunderstood my motive, and my letter, when you say that your virtual acceptance of *my challenge* cannot arise from a previous knowledge of the correspondence to which I had called your attention. May I kindly say that I considered your letter to me to be an *actual invitation* to me to communicate

with you with a view to a public debate. My reasons for so doing are as follow: I had received a letter sent to my care for a person with whom I was not acquainted, and to whom I had no means of delivering the said letter. On becoming acquainted with the fact that you were the sender of the letter I simply forwarded it back to you with my compliments, stating that I was not acquainted with "E. G. S.," and had no means of delivering it. I made no remark in my short note of a debate, nor did I say anything which necessitated any further correspondence between us. The utmost that the most fastidious could have expected would have been a simple acknowledgement of its reception, and a possible expression of regret at any trouble which might have been given. I did not expect this, but I am sure this is the utmost which any one could have looked for. When, therefore, your courteous letter was received by me, inclosing the one which you had written to a person of whom I have no more present knowledge than of the man reported to be in the Moon, I *naturally* regarded it as an invitation to debate, and wrote accordingly. Had I not so understood the letter I should not have written as I did; but when, in the letter, you desired to know my mind and views, I gave them to you; but had you not invited them they would not have been given, as, for health's sake, I had desired to avoid unnecessary mental work; but I can never, even in appearance, shrink from defending what I regard to be the truth. Having said this much upon this point, I may say that it does not affect the real question as to the holding of a debate, seeing the correspondence has advanced thus far.

In regard to your speaking in a "psychological condition," I am not at present aware that I should have any ground of complaint upon that head, providing that the rules of debate were observed, and the arguments rebutted. As it would, however, scarcely be profitable that you should speak psychologically, unless when on the negative, you replied to the argumentation used in support of the affirmative. This, I presume, you would doubtless do. May I kindly suggest that there is what appears to me a very great difference between the use of the words "Orthodoxy" and "Christianity" in the propositions. Orthodoxy has no real standard by which we could tell what it is, but Christianity has. The New Testament is that which defines what Christianity is, and it is the Christianity of the New Testament which I mean when I affirm that it is of Divine Origin. Though it is true, as you say, we might differ in our views of what Christianity is, as we might also as to the meaning of a word, but just as the dictionary would be our authority to settle the latter question, so would the New Testament the former.

In your proposal you omitted all reference to Spiritism. I do not know if this is intentionally, or merely through inadvertence. I may say that I would scarcely care to enter into the debate unless Spiritism formed one of the topics of discussion.

The proposition, "Is the New Testament of Divine Origin," is inadmissible, inasmuch as I could not take the affirmative. It is not *all* of Divine Origin, in my judgement, but I believe the Christianity which the New Testament presents is of Divine origin, and this I could affirm. I would still suggest the following:

Resolved—"That Christianity is of Divine Origin."

M. W. Green affirms, and Mr. Walker denies.

The proposition upon Spiritism I would leave for you to state, I simply pledging myself to take a negative position, and to show the worthlessness, unreliability, and general dangerous tendency of Spiritism.

Permit me to say, that if we can agree as to the propositions to be discussed, I shall be happy to name gentlemen to act on a committee to make all necessary arrangements.

I am,  
Dear Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
M. W. GREEN.



84, Russell Street,  
9th February, 1878.

Mr. M. W. GREEN:

Rev. Sir,—Your considerate and explanatory letter is received, from whence I gather that my explanation of the cause of my giving you the trouble of this correspondence was not sufficiently understood, or I did not, as is most probable, make my statement clear in the body of my last letter. As you wisely say, it does not affect the real question of a public debate,—yet permit me kindly to repeat my meaning in other language. My attention was called to the fact that there had been a mooted debate,—which suffered postponement prior to my advent here, and that you were still open to engage in it, providing a suitable person could be procured to meet you,—by the post-card signed "E. G. S. That, of course gave me to understand that some kind of a challenge existed on your part, as I could not see why, for the time being, any one should take the liberty to so address me, with no authority from you. I am perfectly satisfied the author of the card in question had no authority from you personally, but he evidently, from what I have since learned, had a knowledge of the correspondence between yourself and the M. S. and F. T. A. I deemed it my duty to acquaint you with the nature of the anonymous communication I received, that it might meet with either confirmation or denial from you, consequently I sent you my reply, which both explained my position and the nature of its cause. Far be it from me to force you into a discussion that would injure your physical health, by too great mental labor; and receive my sincere sympathy, if, from over-exertion, you are suffering at present. I admire your zeal for what you conceive to be truth, and will ever laud he who says "I can never, even in appearance, shrink from defending what I regard to be the truth." Such a sentiment is a noble one, and were it more general than it is, I am of opinion error would not be so popular as we behold it. Truth never suffers by examination, and it is thus that in all candour I say: "Let us reason together, and by all means publicly give vent to our opinions, *pro.* and *con.* on any disputed point between us.

May I be pardoned for saying I still fail to see that we have a standard of Christianity, inasmuch as I cannot compare the New Testament to a dictionary, where the meaning of words is expressed in definite language. The first lecture I gave in Melbourne was chosen by the Committee, to be on "The harmony existing between Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism," so that, you see, I take Spiritualism to be the Christianity of the New Testament; therefore, you and I certainly place different meanings upon the word. If your Christianity is my Christianity, there is no need for debate, but as you are not *with us* I suppose you are not *of us*.

I trust you will excuse the liberty I take in propounding a few questions to you, which are called forth in consequence of the ignorance I am in in regard to the position you maintain, and the sect you represent.

1st. Do you believe in a Trinity of three persons in one God?

2nd. Do you believe that Jesus *v* as the SON OF GOD, and the only SON OF GOD?

3rd. Do you believe that by Jesus alone we are redeemed individually, and that by his DEATH a world, that otherwise would have perished, was saved?

If you do not thus believe, may I make bold to ask you to go to the trouble to give me some of the positions you take, in consequence of the acceptance of *your* New Testament Christianity? If you believe in the above, then I accept your statement of the proposition.

In reference to Spiritualism, I omitted its mention owing to the fact that it was not mentioned in the proposition in question, and because I thought it just as well to settle one point at a time. As you have done me the kindness to request my statement of a proposition involving the merits and proofs of the cause advocate, I give one that I think will meet with no objection from you. Resolved: "That the Bible (King James's version), supports and parallels Modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena."

Thomas Walker to affirm; Rev. M. W. Green to deny.

In conclusion, I trust that matters may be brought to a climax, mutually agreeable, and that our discussion may be the means of doing good in separating truth from falsehood—on whichever side error may be found.

I am, Yours Respectfully,  
THOMAS WALKER.

---

98 Gore Street, Fitzroy,  
12th February, 1878.

Mr. THOMAS WALKER:

My Dear Sir,—Your favor of the 9th inst., with the kindly explanation there tendered, is to hand.

Without occupying more space in writing as to who may have given the challenge, I may just say, that had I not received your note, inviting me to give my views as to a debate, I should not have written you upon the matter. "E. G. S." was then, and is now, perfectly unknown to me. As an evidence of the absence of any intention on my part to invite debate, I may say that I laid the anonymous post-card of "E. G. S." aside as an impertinence (I use the word in its accurate and inoffensive sense), and as not requiring notice, because of its being anonymous. No doubt he had seen the correspondence, as it had been made public through the press; but, as we are free agents, I regarded your action as quite voluntary, and as indicating a wish for debate, and in this I do not think you are to be blamed, but rather to be commended. I feel that I must still adhere to the proposition as worded by me, as I have no "ism" to defend, but only Christianity, as revealed in the New Testament.

For your information, and in reply to your inquiry, I may state that I belong to the body of believers whom you have probably heard of in the United States as "Disciples of Christ," and who reject all man-made creeds, and hold that the New Testament alone is an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

I believe in the Trinity, as the doctrine is to be found in the Scriptures. The two following passages of Scripture will illustrate my conviction: 1st Corinthians, 8th chapter, vs. 5, 6; Ephesians, 4th chapter, v. 4th, with the teaching also derivable from Acts, 5th chapter, vs. 3, 4. I do not agree with the theological expression of the doctrine of the Trinity. The Bible alone will be my textbook.

I do believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God—the only Son of God in the special sense of his human nature, having been miraculously begotten by the agency of the Holy Spirit; but not the only son in the general sense, seeing that God is pleased to give to every faithful believer, the privilege of adoption as a child into his family (see Romans, 8th chapter, 15th. verse).

I do believe that "we (believers in Christ) have redemption through his (Christ's) blood,—even the forgiveness of all sin,"—and that this redemption is a provision for the whole race; but the reception of the benefits of redemption, to those to whom it is brought, and who are capable of understanding it, is conditional upon their belief in Christ, and submission to his laws.

Just as I have a desire that the proposition on Christianity should convey what I feel prepared to affirm, so I accord to you the right to word your proposition as will best express your convictions. The proposition as stated by you, and which you express your willingness to affirm,—viz., "That the Bible (King James's version) supports and parallels Modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena." I accept—with the understanding that the other necessary preliminaries can be satisfactorily arranged.

May I ask if, in the debate, the Victorian Association of Spiritualists for whom you are lecturing, will endorse you as their representative?

May I also further call your attention to my remarks, in my last letter, as to your speaking in a psychological condition. I do not at present understand if you bind yourself to observe the ordinary rules of debate as to replying to matter which may be advanced. This, of course, is a most important point, if the debate is to be profitably conducted.

We have conducted our correspondence thus far, and yet are entire strangers to each other. I should be glad of a personal interview with you, and would be glad to call at Mr. Terry's to see you, if you would name a convenient time. I may state that each evening this week I have engagements, but any morning, except Saturday of the present week would be convenient.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

M. W. GREEN.

---

84 Russell Street,

13th February, 1878.

Mr. M. W. GREEN:

Rev. Sir,—Your letter of the 13th inst. just received.

I am still in doubt as to what you mean by the Trinity, and would like to have your meaning definitely stated in your own language (which, of course, you will be able to support by New Testament Scriptures if necessary.)

I would like you to give, for the sake of perspicuity, your three answers to the questions I asked of you, and with which you have not favored me, attached to your proposition. Then there could be no mistake as to what your meaning of the word "Christianity" included. For instance, there would be the doctrines of the Trinity in some form or another (to be yet definitely stated), the Miraculous Conception, and Salvation through Jesus. If you would be kind enough to do this, then we can commence making arrangements for the debate, as soon as it is convenient to yourself.

In reference to the Victorian Association of Spiritualists endorsing me, I could not give you any decided answer at present, inasmuch as it would necessitate a meeting of the Association, so as to act with due authority. So far, I have done everything on my own responsibility, and I venture to hope that my course will prove creditable and profitable, if not to the Spiritualists of Melbourne, at least to Humanity; for, even on our side, should defeat be suffered, I am satisfied it will be for the general good, in the interests of truth, however mortifying it may be to those who give me their support. However, from a consultation with the officers of the Association, I am led to believe (should you require it) that they will do me the honor to make me their humble representative.

In my "psychological" condition you are permitted (in fact, we might make it one of the conditions) to speak to and of me as though I were in my *normal* state, and to act accordingly, without making any reference to my state. I shall therefore adhere to the rules of debate, or submit to be ruled *out of order*.

If you can make it convenient to-morrow morning (Thursday) I shall be glad to meet you at Mr. Terry's office at 10 o'clock, or between then and eleven.

I am Rev Sir,

Yours Respectfully,

THOMAS WALKER.

98 Gore Street, Fitzroy,

13th February, 1878

Mr. THOMAS WALKER:

My Dear Sir,—Your favor of this day is to hand. I fully endorse the sentiment you express in the latter part of your letter as to the interests of truth which may be served by the debate, and that it will not matter which may be

supposed to suffer defeat, so long as truth triumphs. I trust that if the debate does take place, we may so give each other credit for sincerity of conviction, and use the language of gentlemen, as that at its termination we may yet have the conviction that good will result.

In regard to your desire that I would more fully explain, and in my own language, my view of the Trinity, permit me to say that I should not have used the word of my own choice, simply because such a word does not occur in the Scriptures, and I prefer to use only Scriptural language in such a case. As your question was, "Do you believe in a Trinity of three persons?" I replied that I did, but not in the form in which it is theologically expressed. I know nothing of the Deity but what He Himself has revealed, and I prefer, in giving my view of the Deity, to use the language which inspired men have used in speaking of God. The statement I gave is, I think, sufficiently explicit for all practical purposes. It is Christianity as found in the New Testament, and not as theologically defined, that I am disposed to defend; and, therefore, whatever is said of God or of Christ in the Scriptures, I am prepared to defend; nothing more, nothing less.

If you desire to know my views of Christ in his pre-existent state, and prior to his being on Earth in human form, you will find them expressed in the 1st chapter of John's Gospel, the language of which I adopt as my own. I wish, and intend, to take my stand simply upon the Scriptures, and, whatever your view may be, I feel quite sure that Christianity is there so clearly presented that the ordinarily careful student will not have much difficulty in understanding what it is. If your understanding of Christianity is, that it is simply modern Spiritualism, you will have the opportunity of sustaining that position, if it be sustainable, in opposition to the view which I may endeavour to present and sustain.

I do not think it would be well to hamper the proposition by attaching the matters to it which you desire; but your purpose can be served by preserving my letters and using them in the debate. I shall not be found going from the positions I have taken up in the matter,

I will (D. V.) meet you at Mr. Terry's at half past-ten to-morrow (Thursday) morning.

With kindly sentiments, and with the sincere hope that truth may be advanced and the divine will accomplished,

I am, Dear Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
M. W. GREEN.

---

The interview referred to was held, and the following propositions agreed upon:—

1st.—"That Christianity is of Divine Origin." Mr. Green affirms: Mr. Walker denies.

2nd.—"That the Bible (King James's version) supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena." Mr. Walker affirms: Mr. Green denies.

It was arranged that each should appoint a Chairman, and these two select a third, who should preside over all the meetings. Mr. Green selected Mr. William Robertson; and Mr. Walker Mr. Wm. Trenwith; and they chose Mr. Jno. Ross as presiding Chairman. The debate was to be from live to eight evenings, the opening speech on each proposition to be forty minutes, and each subsequent speech twenty minutes. The actual length of debate was nine evenings, five upon the first proposition, and four upon the second.

In regard to the character of the Report of this Debate, it is not so perfect as could have been desired, the reporter, by some means, having failed to record many points presented by each speaker. This is greatly to be regretted, as it materially affects the value of the Report. And it may be added that Mr. Walker has been placed somewhat at a disadvantage, in consequence of his unavoidable absence from Melbourne, in not having had an opportunity of personally correcting the proofs of his speeches; and though he has every confidence in the ability of those who have so kindly undertaken this part of the work for him, yet, as they could simply trust to their memories, having nothing but the shorthand writer's notes to assist them, they could not be expected to have each point stated with such a nicety as would have been otherwise attainable; so ill, notwithstanding these and other imperfections in the Report, it is considered to be so far perfect, and the themes treated upon of so much importance, as to justify its being given to the public in its present form.

It is therefore sent forth with an earnest desire that it may, to some extent, aid the truth-seeker in the attainment of that for which he so ardently longs.

M. W. GREEN.  
THOS. WALKER.



# ERRATA.

----- + -----

- For 'leave,' in 20th line from bottom, page 3, read 'have.'  
,, 'first,' in 5th line from bottom, page 6, read 'second.'  
,, 'but what proves this?' in 6th line, p. 9, read 'but what does this prove?'  
,, 'we,' in 5th line from top, page 14, read 'he.'  
,, 'Arian,' in 8th line, page 24, read 'Arms.'  
,, 'or,' in 4th line from bottom, page 29, read 'and.'  
,, 'being,' in 3rd line from top, page 30, read 'been.'  
,, 'was drawn,' in 22nd line, page 48, Read 'were drawn.'  
,, 'promised,' in 4th line from bottom, page 53, read 'premissed.'  
,, 'there were *two*,' in 4th line, page 56, read 'there were not *two*.'  
,, 'terpolations,' in 3rd line, page 71, read 'interpolations.'  
,, 'in definite outline,' in 28th line, page 80, read 'of indefinite outline.'  
,, 'applied to then he,' in 3rd line, page 82, read 'applied to him then he.'  
,, 'he,' in 18th line from bottom, page 86, read 'we.'  
,, 'found,' in 5th line from top, page 87, read 'formed.'  
,, 'sanctified,' in 18th line, page 91, read 'sanctioned.'  
,, '*daios*,' in 7th line from bottom, page 145, read '*daioo*.'  
,, 'descended,' 8th line from bottom, page 145, read 'derived.'  
,, 'are,' in 4th line from top, page 148, read 'were.'  
,, '*ipsi dixit*,' 16th line from bottom, page 157, read '*ipse dixit*.'  
,, 'not,' in 4th line from bottom, page 230, to be omitted.  
,, 'clergyman,' last line but one, page 250, read 'clergymen.'  
,, 'Phillipians,' 7th line from bottom, page 251, read '2nd chap. Phillipians.'  
On page 110, 'Mr. Green denied this' should be omitted.







# THE DEBATE.

~~~~~  
*FIRST EVENING:*

TUESDAY, 5th MARCH.  
~~~~~

MR. GREEN, having been introduced by the Chairman, opened the Debate with the following forty-minutes' Address:

MR. CHAIRMAN and RESPECTED FRIENDS—Under other circumstances I might possibly have found it needful to have made an apology for standing here to-night to defend the Christian religion from what may be regarded as charges that are made against it, but as I believe in a statement made by a very old writer—to the effect that we ought to be able to give a reason for the hope that is within us—I feel, on this account, no apology is necessary for bringing before you some, at least, of the evidences that we believe are reliable in regard to the religion we profess, as proofs that it is of divine origin. There are one or two circumstances in connection with the present debate which make it somewhat peculiar, and which seem to call for remark in my opening address: the special singularity in connection with this debate is, that my friend Mr. Walker will speak, not in his normal condition, as I do, but he will speak in what he terms the trance state,—in other words he believes that spirits are using him as a medium for communicating their thoughts to this audience, and therefore to-night, taking Mr. Walker's statement as being actually a fact, I am here to contend with spirits, speaking through him, in defence of the holy religion which I am yet happy to profess, and of which I feel proud to have the honor of being an advocate. (Applause.)

It is not my intention this evening to refer further to Mr. Walker's state, because our agreement—and I believe in keeping agreements—is, that after my opening remarks no reference should be made to this matter which is not absolutely necessary; therefore no further reference shall be made to his condition, and I shall speak to him as though he were like myself—viz., in his *normal* condition. I feel that this is necessary to be emphasised at the commencement, because of the apparent inequality of our relative positions, seeing that, though to many I may appear somewhat young, I am nearly double Mr. Walker's age, according to his account of that age; and because I am more practised in public speaking I should feel that

there was an inequality were it not for the fact that he appears as the representative of the Spiritualists of Melbourne, and professes to be a medium through whom these spirits communicate their ideas: and as one part of the theory of his friends is, that the spirits expand the mental. Capacity of the medium to its highest tension, therefore Mr. Walker is placed, if not on a superior plane, at least on an equal one; and I think, if we take his statement to be correct, he occupies a higher plane of advantage when unseen spiritual beings are supposed to speak through him, while I am depending on my own natural powers, though not unaided. I would therefore just simply ask any Christians present to remember the great source of all good, and to remember me in connection with this defence of the principles in which we glory.

Without, then, detaining you, or occupying my own time with further preliminaries, I may just state that we have at the present time, as a fact, the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. We know that it exists now, and we have the information given to us, upon authority which cannot be questioned, that there are more than three hundred and thirty millions of persons at the present time who profess the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ—(applause),—and who declare that all their hopes for time and for eternity are based upon that religion.

Now, in noticing the prevalence of Christianity at the present time, it seems advisable to mention that these persons who profess the religion of Christ are not barbarians, nor are they semi-barbarians, but they are the most civilised portion of the human race—they are the most advanced in science, art, and every species of culture—they are people who are really in the van of all movements that have for their object the welfare of mankind and the amelioration of the race; and therefore it does appear to me that the principles which these people profess must be principles of importance, and the questions How came they to profess them? and How did that religion which they profess originate? are questions of very great importance.

Now the question which naturally suggests itself here is—What do we understand by Christianity? What is meant by that term? Now, I am not intending, during the course of this debate, to be at all a hair-splitter; I do not intend to enter into mere technical explanations, but I mean to act fairly and honorably, as I believe every Christian man ought to do, and I have no doubt it is the intention of my friend Mr. Walker to act in the same manner,—and I hope we shall be able to look back upon this debate with pleasure after its termination. I must say, in this spirit of giving general definitions and not mere technical ones, that I understand Christianity to be a history of the life of Jesus Christ—a history of the incarnation, of his pure and noble life, of his wondrous miracles, of his death as an atonement for the human race, his resurrection and ascension, and the sublime truths spoken by Christ and his apostles, and which have been handed down to us by the inspired apostles and prophets. Now, as I have mentioned, Christianity is at the present time an existing fact, and we find that it is professed by more persons, and that it exercises a more potent influence wherever it has been brought, than it has ever done before, I have propounded, as one of our en-

quiries, and with a view to establishing the special divine origin of Christianity, the question, How came Christianity into the world? Now, in order to answer this question, I would ask you just to run over in your minds with me some at least of the centuries that have passed since Christianity was started, in order that we may see its continuity, and that it may lead our thoughts in a clear and logical manner up to the point which I seek to prove during the several speeches which I shall have the privilege of making before you on this and successive evenings.

Now, referring to what I have before said, Christianity exists at this present day, in this nineteenth century, in a day when science has attained its highest pinnacle—so far as we have any information of past times—when geology has unlocked the secrets of the Earth; when astronomy has revealed lessons from the other worlds; when the moral philosopher brings his theses with all the powers of his mind; when the natural philosopher lives in the broad Creation as we see it around us, examining all its varied phenomena, and pouring upon us the floods of facts that are so clearly presented to his eye, and by means of which many scientists seek to overturn the basis of our faith,—I say, notwithstanding all this advancement in science, Christianity exists now, it is a power in the land, its houses of worship are increasing in numbers, its public proclaimers are being multiplied, and it carries softening and civilising influences wherever it goes; its literature is translated into every known language of the Earth, and its missionaries are found in every land: and we ask again, How came this religion to be accepted by the people?—How came it into the world? Now, if we look back beyond the boundary of this present century we find it existing in the prior one. Though the French revolutionists tried to stamp it out, imagining that it was a mere superstition that would give way to their power and be made to fade away even as the "baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind," still it remains. (Applause.) Though such French writers as Voltaire, Rousseau, and others determinedly opposed it—though Collins, Hume, Lords Shaftsbury and Bolingbroke, Tyndall, and others opposed it in England with all their might and power, yet we see it remains. It found able defender in such men as Clarke, Bentley, Campbell, Butler, and others—men who were prepared to lay down their lives in defence of that which they believed to be true. Then, if we cross that boundary to the seventeenth century we find it existing; that century was made illustrious by such names as Cromwell, Hampden, and others: its literature was enriched by the writings of Barrow, Jeremy Taylor, and John Howe,—its poetry by Milton, and its science by Newton. Christianity existed then, and triumphed. It was an age when the Bedford Tinker wrote his immortal "Pilgrim's Progress," when he and George Fox labored and suffered for liberty of conscience. Then, looking back to the previous century we see it still existing. Luther rose, and, with his sledge-hammer force, endeavoured to break the Papal power, which,

as a dread nightmare, seemed to have clouded the minds of men: he, with his coadjutors, labored hard for what they believed to be simple Christian truth, and the liberty to carry it out in practice. Henry was then the reigning monarch of England, and as a reward for his

opposition to Luther, was dubbed "Defender of the Faith," but who, led on afterwards by his lust, severed himself from the Papal power and became the head of the present established Church of England. It was the day when Mary lit again the fires at which the martyrs died; it was the day when Knox labored in Scotland, and many martyrs there died; it was the day when Latimer, and Ridley, and Hooper, and others perished because of that religion which we are here to-night to defend, and which we affirm is of divine origin—in the sense that no other religion under the heavens is. It is the only religion that has divine authority, and is given for the guidance of men.

Now, it is not necessary for me to pass over in review all the intervening centuries, because it is admitted that Christianity then existed; but I wish to make sure of my work, as far as I am able, in regard to this matter, and will therefore take a leap backwards to the fourth century, in order to show the continuity of Christianity right up to the time when it is said to have commenced early in the first century. I shall also read a few extracts for the purpose of establishing upon a firm basis that which I believe to be Christianity.

If I understand correctly, the position taken by my friend Mr. Walker is this: that the Christianity of the present day is not the Christianity of the early ages. He regards himself as a believer in Christianity, but his contention is that my Christianity and the Christianity of the people professing that faith in this time is not really the Christianity of Christ and his apostles: therefore I feel this evening that, in laying the basis of my argument broad and deep, it is needful to read a few extracts, not only to point out the continuance of this religion from the present time over the centuries up to the date when it is supposed to have begun, but also to establish the identity of the principles, the facts, and truths held now with those held by the primitive Christians, and to show that they are part and parcel of the Christianity founded by Christ. In taking the fourth century I will only mention one writer during that time, viz., the Emperor Julian. I might mention that Francis Claudius Julianus, or Julian, was nephew of the Emperor Constantino. In his early life he had professed to be a Christian; he afterwards left this faith and became a Pagan, and strove, with all the energy he was capable of, to overturn Christianity and establish Paganism over the whole empire. Now Julian, writing—or rather, Libanius, writing of Julian, speaks in the following words:—"In the winter season, during the long nights, the Emperor set himself to confute those books which make the man of Palestine a god, and the Son of God, and in a long and unanswerable argument he showed how trifling and absurd those things are which are admired by them: in which work he excelled the Tyrian old man Porphyry;—let the Tyrian forgive me, that I say he was exceeded by his son." Here we have the fact of Christianity existing in the fourth century and Julian opposing it. Then, again, Julian admits the gospel account of our Saviour's birth, and adds: "But Jesus, having persuaded a few among you, and those the worst of men, has now been celebrated about three hundred years, having done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance,—unless any one thinks it a mighty matter to heal lame and blind people, and exorcise demoniacs in the

villages of Bethsaida and Bethany." We have here the origin of Christianity cast back three centuries from the time of Julian. Now, in another sentence we have admission of the records of the gospels: "But you are so unhappy"—(he was addressing the Christians)—"as not to adhere to the things delivered to you by the apostles; but they have been altered by you for the worse, and carried on to yet greater impiety; for neither Paul, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark have dared to call Jesus God. But honest John, understanding that a great multitude of men in the cities of Greece and Italy were seized with this distemper, and hearing likewise, as I suppose, that the tombs of Peter and Paul were respected and frequented, though, as yet, privately only, however, having heard of it he then first presumed to advance that doctrine." Then, just two more brief quotations. Speaking of the purity of Christians he says—(and he is now addressing Pagans and inciting them to live soberly, &c.):—"If Hellenism does not prosper according to our wish it is the fault of those who profess it. Why do we not look to that which has been the principal cause of the augmentation of impiety, humanity to strangers, care in burying the dead, and that sanctity of life of which they make such a show, all which things I will leave to *be* really practised by our people." Now, I wish you to notice this: he says why don't we look to that which has been the principal cause of the augmentation of impiety, that impiety meaning the refusal to worship Pagan idols. He says the cause of the increase of this was humanity to strangers, care in burying the dead, and that sanctity of life of which they made such a show,—"all which things I will have to be really practised by our people." Then, speaking of the benevolence of Christians he says: "You are also to erect hospitals in every city, that strangers also may share in our humanity, and not only those of our own religion, but others likewise, if they are necessitous. It is a shame, when there are no beggars among the Jews, and the impious Galileans relieve not only their own people but ours also, that our poor should be neglected by us, and be left helpless and destitute." We thank Julian for such testimony, which I may epitomise thus: We have Julian testifying to the existence of Christianity in the fourth century, showing that Christians at this time had existed for more than three hundred years, at the same time admitting that books had been written by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and that Paul also had been a writer; admitting, also, that the Christians of that day worshiped—mark the expression—*worshipped* Jesus as the Son of God, and as a divine being. Now, passing on to the third century, let me give you one quotation from a writer during that century—Porphyry. In his treatise entitled "Philosophy of Oracles" the following passage, preserved by Eusebius, occurs. I may just remark that Porphyry was born at Tyre about A.D. 233, and wrote much against the religion of Christ, and we have a description by him which is certainly very creditable as coming from a heathen. Speaking of Christ, and the opinions in connection with him, he says: What we are going to say may, perhaps, appear to some a paradox, for the gods declared Christ to be a person most pious, and become immortal; moreover, they speak of him honorably." And, going on, he adds—"Being asked concerning Christ, whether he is God, he (Apollo) answered that he who is renowned for wisdom

knows that the immortal soul survives after the body, but the pious soul of that man is most excellent. He therefore affirmed him to be a most pious person, and went to heaven, as pious persons do, for which cause you ought not to speak evil of him, but to pity the folly of the men—(viz., who worship him). Now we have the fact here stated by Porphyry that Christ existed in the first century, and also that he was worshiped. That he was spoken of in a manner so favorable by one who felt himself called upon to oppose Christianity is worthy of note. Passing from the third to the second century we come to Celsus, who is well known as one of the most violent adversaries the Christian religion ever had. "Celsus represents Jesus to have lived but a few years before: He mentions its being said that Jesus was born of a virgin, and that angels appeared to Joseph: he speaks of the star which appeared at the birth of Jesus, the wise men that came to worship him when an infant, and Herod's massacring the children—Joseph's fleeing with the child into Egypt by the admonition of an angel; the Holy Ghost descending on Jesus like a dove when he was baptised by John—and the voice from Heaven declaring him to be the Son of God; his going about with his disciples, whom he calls boatmen, publicans, and wicked sailors; his healing the sick and lame, and raising the dead; his foretelling his own sufferings and resurrection; his being betrayed and forsaken by his own disciples; his sufferings; his praying "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" the ignominious treatment he met with; the robe that was put upon him, and the crown of thorns; the reed put into his hand; his drinking vinegar and gall, and his being scourged and crucified; his being seen after his resurrection by a fanatical woman (as he calls her—meaning Mary Magdalene), and by his own companions and disciples, his showing them his hands that were pierced, and the marks of his punishment. He also mentions the angels being seen at his sepulchre, and that some said it was one angel, others that it was two, by which he hints at the seeming variation in the accounts given of it by the Evangelists. Upon the whole there are in Celsus about eighty quotations from the books of the New Testament, or references to them, of which Origen has taken notice; and while he argues from them—sometimes in a very perverse manner—he still takes it for granted, as the foundation of his argument, that whatever absurdities could be fastened upon any words or actions of Christ recorded in the Gospel would be a valid objection against Christianity."

Now, we have here evidence of Christianity existing in the second century. Moreover, we have the identity of the Christianity of that day with that held by Christians of the present day historically proved: We have the admission by Celsus of the existence in his days of our gospel records, and of those facts which are contained in the gospels as we have them now; and it is shown that those facts were then so widely known that Celsus had access to them.

Leaving Celsus, and going to the first century, to within ten years of the time of the apostle John, I would call your attention to the statement of Pliny the younger: You remember, Pliny, in writing to the Emperor Trajan in reference to the Christians, asked him what he was to do in regard to the Christians who were not intimidated by

the threat of persecutions, but were rather rusting forward to seek a martyr's crown. Now, without reading, the whole letter—though, if time admitted, I should be glad to do so—I will just read one extract where Pliny says: "All these worshiped your image and the image of our gods; these also cursed Christ. However, they assured me that the main of their fault or mistake was this: that they were wont, on a stated day, to meet together before it was light, and to sing a hymn to Christ, as to a god, alternately, and to oblige themselves by a sacrament, or oath, not to do anything that was ill, that they would commit no theft, or pilfering, or adultery, that they would not break their promises, or deny what was deposited with them when it was required back again; after which, it was their custom to depart and to meet again at a common but innocent meal, which yet they had left off upon that edict which I published at your command, and wherein I had forbidden all such conventicles. These examinations made me think it necessary to inquire by torments what the truth was, which I did of two servant maids which were called deaconesses, but still I discovered no more than that they were addicted to a bad and extravagant superstition. Hereupon I have put off any further examination, and have recourse to you, for the affair seems to be well worth consultation, especially on account of the number of those in danger; for there are many of every age, of every rank, and both sexes, which are now and hereafter likely to be called to account, and to be in danger,—for this superstition is *spread like a contagion*, not only into cities and towns, but into country villages also, which yet there is reason to hope may be stopped and corrected. To be sure, the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin already to be frequented, and the holy solemnities which were being intermitted begin to be revived: the sacrifices begin to sell well everywhere—of which very few purchasers had, of late, appeared,—whereby it is easy to suppose how great a multitude of men may be amended, if place for repentance be admitted."

Now you notice that Pliny the younger not only admits the fact of the existence of Christianity in the year 107, but also that the Christians were in such immense numbers that the temples were closed, sacrifices stood in the markets unsold, the idols in the temples remained unvisited, and that it seemed as though the whole Pagan worship was about to be dispossessed of its power: and Pliny testifies here most unmistakably that the worship we now pay to the divine Son of God was offered by the Christians in the year 107.

Now there is but one more extract which I will read you, when, I think, judging by the clock, my time will be expired. The extract I refer to is from Tacitus, who, after giving an account of the fire at Rome in the tenth year of Nero and the sixty-fourth of our Lord, in which a large part of the city was consumed, observes: "But neither all human help, nor the liberality of the Emperor, nor all the atonements presented to the gods availed to abate the infamy he lay under of having ordered the city to be set on fire. To suppress, therefore, this common rumor, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishments upon those people who were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. They had their denomination from Christ, who, in

the reign of Tiberius, was put to death as a criminal by the procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again and spread, not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the city also, whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect—afterwards a vast multitude—discovered by them, all which were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city as for their enmity to mankind. (Simply because they refused to worship idols!) Their executions were so contrived as to expose them to derision and contempt: some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night-time and thus burned to death. Nero made use of his own gardens as a theatre upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator in the habit of a charioteer, at other times driving a chariot himself, till at length these men, though really criminal and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated as people who were destroyed, not out of regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Now, here Tacitus testifies that in the year 64 there were even then multitudes of Christians: they were followers of one Christ, or Christ, who was put to death as a malefactor under Pontius Pilate. He traces up Christianity to within thirty years of the time when we understand it is said to have really commenced. Now, in regard to this testimony I would just rapidly call your attention to the facts: It is established that Christians existed in great numbers thirty years after the death of Christ—that they derived their name from Christ, and that this Christ was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate; and I ask you now, dear friends, this question: If, as you have seen, we have traced Christianity up to the period when our records testify to its beginning, and if all the historians testify to the things we have recorded in our scriptures as being believed then as we find them believed now,—if we find that Christ was worshiped then as we find he is worshiped now, then, I say, we have not only proved in an unbroken chain the existence of Christianity, but we are justified in the assertion that Christianity began at that very period, and that there is such evidence in regard to its claims as ought to carry great weight with those who are impartial. And more: let me tell you there is not one scintilla of evidence to show that it existed before the time that Christ is said to have been born and entered upon his ministry.

I cannot go further now, but shall continue the theme in my next speech; but thus far, I trust, the point has been clearly manifested—that Christianity can be traced up to its very origin, and was identical with what it is now. (Applause.)



MR. WALKER:

After the consecutive and elaborate review of Christianity, during its existence from the first century up to the nineteenth, given by our friend, we must now refute some of the arguments in a logical manner, and examine them to see if they really will prove the position our friend has taken. In commencing he says that Christianity is a fact—that it now exists, but what proves this? Mohamedanism is a fact—Buddhism is a fact. If the mere fact of existence is to prove the divine origin of Christianity, the fact of the Mohamedanism existence proves the divine origin of the Mohamedan religion; and the same may be said also of the Buddhist religion. Then our friend has undertaken to show that, as there is a connected chain in the beliefs and in the opinions of Christians, that this proves the divine origin of Christ and of Christianity as inaugurated some years ago. In proof of this he has quoted to you, most elaborately, from such writers as Julian and Libanius, Celsus and Tacitus, Porphyry and Pliny. Julian is described as having embraced the Pagan religion, which followed after he had been a Christian, and he must certainly have examined all the evidences in support of Christianity, and known them before he rejected them. Tacitus says that the superstition, or Christian religion consisted, according to the philosophers, in making a man of Palestine a god. Now, all the rest of these philosophers except, perhaps, Porphyry, believed that Jesus was simply a man. Not one of them, though their testimony might go to prove the existence of Jesus—not one of them has ever said, or given evidence to the fact, that Jesus was more than a man: they may have said, and given testimony to the effect, that the Christians believed this—and that they believed it there can be no doubt; but does the mere fact of their belief, and these authors crediting them with it, prove the *truth* of that belief? If so, then it proves the truth and divine origin of other religions. Suppose we trace back the Mohamedan religion, and take its principal professors from the time it commenced till the present time: we shall see that the views established by Mohamet have been maintained through successive generations up to the present day,—but does this prove that the Mohamedan religion is of divine origin? No! Therefore the Christian religion cannot be proved to be of divine origin by this method of reasoning.

Our friend has very eloquently described to you the sufferings that Christians underwent in supporting, or giving testimony by their lives—and especially by their deaths—to the faith they held. Is *this* used as an argument in proof of the divine origin of Christianity? If so, let us examine the logical sequences: The Hindoo, seeing the car of Juggernaut coming with all its force and fury, throws himself beneath the wheels of the chariot which carries in procession the idol of his god, in the hope of obtaining eternal bliss: he suffers mutilation, and even death, in the belief that his faith is the true one, and that it is, in fact, of divine origin! Because he dies for it, and believes it,—therefore it is of divine origin! Now, the very fact that Christianity exists in the nineteenth century—in this age of science and literature, when geology and all other sciences are arriving at that approach to perfection which the last few years have given to them—when the ablest minds are dealing with all

questions and subjects, physical and metaphysical, of importance to man—the very fact that Christianity exists at this time does not prove its divine origin. Spiritualism exists in an age of science and literature—therefore Spiritualism is of divine origin! The Mormon religion exists in an age of science and literature—therefore the religion founded by Joe Smith and Brigham Young is of divine origin, because the efforts of science and literature have not yet effectually, or even seemingly crushed out its existence. (Applause.)

Then, again, if we are simply to take the evidence of the fact that these religions exist in this century we would, in reality, prove that *all* religions are divine that now exist—and exist in an age of science and literature.

The assertion made by our friend) that some of the ablest minds are engaged in support of Christianity, and in establishing proofs of its doctrines, will not really bear the test of scrutiny—(and if it would, it would prove nothing); for some of the ablest scientific minds in all ages—we might say a greater portion of them—are, and have been, opposed to Christianity—such men as those mentioned by our friend: Voltaire, Huxley, Spencer, and Darwin, Hume, Volney, Bruno, Bolingbroke, and a host of others. These opposed Christianity,—and it cannot be said they did not understand the evidences, the basis, and claims given for it by Christians. Strauss and Renan fully understand the force of those arguments; and yet they are opposed to Christianity: and this at once will show that where reason has been exercised, and where science has been made use of, they have gone to prove the fallacy of our friend's position.

We make the assertion, which we are prepared to maintain in the course of our argument and debate, that science and religion—that is, religion as it is advocated by its professors in the churches—cannot be consistently reconciled—that they are at variance, one opposing the other; and if science can be demonstrated by fact and argument—by logic, and experiment, and reason, which we assert it can, then the Christian religion—such as at the present day exists and in accordance with the claims made for it by its professors—can not be of divine origin, nor, consequently, can those claims be true.

It was amusing, during the arguments in support of the claims of Christianity, given by our worthy friend, that he should have introduced Porphyry (who testified to the superior quality of Jesus, and Who gained his information from the oracle of Apollo, a heathen god) to prove the divine origin of Christianity! Is *that* logic which will Stand a crucial test? We are prepared to admit that Christianity, as advocated *by some*, has been in existence since "the first century," and We also concede that it took its origin from Christus, who was executed by Pontius Pilate as a malefactor. We are prepared to admit, that from that time—down to the present if you like—Christianity has had a *name*, and *had* worshipers in its churches; but does this prove that Christianity is of divine origin? We have asserted that Buddhism existed prior to Christianity; and, therefore, as far as antiquity is concerned, Buddhism has a priority in claim—but this does not constitute it of divine origin. Then, again, we have observed how studiously our friend avoided noticing the different versions of Christ-

ianity that have manifested themselves during the many centuries which he has so ably reviewed. He has, however, omitted to mention that there have been really no decisive tests running through all these ages as to what Christianity in reality was. For now, *who are the Christians?*—the Roman Church, the Greek Church, the Wesleyan Church, the Presbyterians, the Unitarians, the followers of Swedenborg, or the sect represented by our able opponent? Who are the Christians, we again ask? Go back to the first century and see if you can decide who the early Christians were—for there you will find as great differences as those which are to be found at the present day. Our friend has alluded to the gospels as bearing the record of the history of Jesus; but he has omitted to mention other gospels than those which are ordinarily received. What about the Gospel of Nicodemus; what about the Gospel of Thomas; of Barnabas; the Shepherd of Hermes; the Infancy; and several others? What about the letter of Jesus to the King of Edessa, at a time when no king there reigned? No mention has been made of these; nor are we told how those gospels we now have were decided upon as being superior to the rest; and why these *alone* were compiled into our present New Testament. Our friend has alluded to the book as the "blessed book," and has referred to all it contains as received through the inspiration of those early and primitive disciples of Jesus, and that now the Bible may be taken as an inspired record of the life of Jesus, and a history of his character, doings, and teachings. What claims can be made to divine inspiration for a book that contains errors and interpolations? We would refer just for the present, in proof of this, to that text which is in the first epistle or John, 5th chapter, 7th verse. It reads thus:—"For there are three that bear record in heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." Now, was that in existence during the first century, or during the second or fourth? Can our friend show the real, genuine Greek manuscript, (out of 113 Greek manuscripts extant) that contains that passage? Can our friend point to more than one that contains this text? Now, if it be shown that this is a forgery, and has been inserted by some individuals who delighted in making scriptures to suit themselves—if it can be shown that this text did not exist in the early centuries, it seems to us clear evidence that some portions of that book are not revelations from God, but the interpolations of some finite mind. If there be one New Testament epistle which we thus convict—one text which we can detect in this way—how can we know that many other parts of the so-called inspired writings are not forgeries? We have no possible means of knowing that the gospels we have now are in reality true copies of the originals. We know that some of the gospels which are not included in the Bible are written in quite as logical a manner as those that are. They relate just as wonderful events, and contain just as miraculous things—even *more* miraculous in some cases. Now, what are we to think of the evidence in support of the divine origin of Christianity when here we see so manifestly and clearly the work of human beings—when we see, as we now do, that there is *one* text that will not bear the ordeal of historical research and reason—does this not engender a doubt as to all the other so-called divinely-inspired texts? (Applause.)

proposition) I say the very demons testified to him when they cried out "We know thee who thou art, the holy one of God." We believe these oracles from the ancient deities were the result of this same spiritualistic intercourse. We do not wonder, nor is it at all a matter of perplexity, that Apollo and others—*i. e.*, their votaries—possessed the mediumistic power when they did profess to testify: it is just what we might naturally expect.

Now, in regard to Buddhism existing before Christianity, and therefore must be more divine, this has been answered in the statement that we do not hold the mere fact of the existence of Christianity as a proof of its divine origin. Buddhism, as existing now, is very modern; and I have testimony which I shall be able to produce by and by to show that the reformed Buddhism is very recent—and so are many other matters which people suppose to be ancient. It is said I carefully avoided noticing what Christianity was in these early ages which I reviewed. I referred to it when I was speaking of the Christianity of the New Testament.

Now, a point was made in regard to the differences found in the gospels; I do not want to anticipate my argument, but I shall prove that there is not a single variation in the New Testament Scriptures but what is an argument for the veracity of its writers. I will admit there are variations,—many of them arising from natural causes, such as you might expect when several men wrote an account of the same events,—but I say there is not a single variation but carries with it demonstrable proof of the veracity of the authors. I would ask my friend who it was that found out these apparent differences in the gospels, and the fact that the verse in St. John's Epistle was not authentic? was it his spirit friends? It was such Christian men as Bengel, whose mind was struck with the apparent discrepancies, and who determined to sift them thoroughly. He, and others, never rested till they had examined all the discrepancies they could find, and what was the result? a firmer grounding of faith in the record and its truthfulness, and a conviction that the discrepancies themselves only made the truth shine more resplendently. I would point out that this is a matter worthy of being emphasised, that all these discrepancies and passages which have been proved not to be authentic, have been discovered by Christians, and not by unbelievers, showing the jealousy of Christians in regard to receiving anything as the word of God that is not really so. We are asked about the gospels of Nicodemus, and Thomas, and so on. I will leave my friend to produce them. I am here to defend the four gospels we have, and when he produces the gospels he mentions, and proves to us that they have equal claims to the ones we possess, I will be prepared to meet him on that point. I will leave it to him as a rebutting line of argument.

Now, leaving these matters I will resume the thread of my affirmative argument: You will remember I had attained to this point, I had shown the identity of Christianity in the present day with the Christianity in the days of the apostles as well as its continuance from then down to the present. Now in going on to the matter of divine origin I would ask, How did this religion originate? I wish to notice in order to proceed cautiously, two theories that have been advanced as explaining its origin, one of which has been referred to by my friend;

It has been said that Christianity is altogether a fiction, and has simply originated in the minds of men as many other systems and theories have done—such, for instance, as the Sim-theory, which was very popular at one time, and was supported by advocates of more or less note. Now, in regard to this Sun-theory, the holders of it affirmed that no such being as Jesus Christ ever existed at all—that he is simply another name for the Sun-God, like the Krishna of the Hindoos, the Osiris of the Egyptians, the Mithras of the Persians, and the Sun-God of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. This theory was first brought forward by Sir William Drummond: it was afterwards elaborated by Sir Godfrey Higgins in his "Anacalypsis," and supported by Dupuis, Volney, and others. I have heard a gentleman within the last two years affirm that this system is the only legitimate explanation of the origin of Christianity. Now, the advocates of this theory affirm that Christ is simply a personification of the Sun, and when it is said that he had twelve disciples, and that he went in and out among them, that this only represents the sun going in and out among the twelve signs of the zodiac, bringing in the twelve calendar months: his dying and rising again are, moreover, merely symbols of the sun setting and rising. He is said to have been born at Christmas time, when the sun has run its yearly course, and the days are shortest—this is the sun who may be said to be born again on the shortest day. If this theory be correct, then what shall we do with the testimony of these heathen writers who have affirmed the existence of persons who never lived at all? These men were all opposed to Christianity: did they fight against a shadow? Now, this Sun-theory is held by some in the present day. There is a gentleman in this hall who has circulated tracts broadcast, and he has had the boldness to affirm that all these statements in regard to the Lord Jesus Christ, even from his birth to his crucifixion and burial, are found detailed in the life of Krishna. I give the matter my direct and emphatic contradiction. We have this question to ask in connection with this Sun-theory: If it be the case that Christ is a mere fancy, if no such person ever existed, How came it that Julian, Porphyry, Pliny, Tacitus, and others, have written on a matter which had no existence, and have spoken of the person who was crucified by Pontius Pilate, if that person never lived? How, I ask, can you explain the fact, that these writers thus asserted, in clear and unmistakable terms, the very things that are affirmed in our New Testament of Christianity? Had it no foundation in fact? But if the Sun-theory be the true solution, at what time, and under what circumstances did it originate? Let us have testimony on this point. I am sure this intelligent audience must see that this theory has not one foot of ground to rest upon. There is another theory known by the name of the *mythical* theory, the father of which I may just generally give as Strauss and Kenan. Now these persons do not deny the existence of Christ: they admit he was born of poor parents—[time expired.]—As I have only just begun this line of argument, I will continue it when I next rise.

Mr. WALKER:

Really, we are a little surprised at the elaborate review of Christianity our friend gave in his first address, for he gave it for no purpose if he did not intend to give it in proof of its divine origin. But let us to the arguments: He admitted the fact that there were Buddhists and Mohamedans, but said their religions could not be on the same basis as Christianity, because they had not the same scientific or literary men in their ranks as Christianity had; but he did not, however, mention the Spiritualists or the Mormons, who live decidedly among these, scientific men,—and not only live among *them*, but number some of these in their ranks—such as Professor Crookes, Varley, and others. Our friend ought to have explained this away, in order to have rendered his objection valid. Now, whilst admitting that Christianity may have existed from the first to the present century, yet our friend never showed us what that Christianity really was; nor has he shown us why the Greek Church separated from the Roman Church during the eighth or ninth centuries; nor mentioned any of the different sects we now have to represent the real or true of Christianity. Where is the uniformity? If our friend disregards these differences (for there has been no real standard, or set principles of action, thought, or belief among any of the various churches that have been known in Christendom) then there is no difficulty in showing that Christianity, of a kind, has existed from the time of Christ to the present age.

In reference to the arguments of our friend about the reformed Buddhism being of recent origin—is not the *reformed Christian Church of recent origin*? Did the Lutheran Church exist before the time of Luther? or the Wesleyans before the time of Wesley? Did the sect our friend represents *always* exist? That there have been Christians no one will doubt—from the time of Christ in "the first century;" but that there has been any real criterion of Christianity is what is now questioned. Can our friend point to any one sect, or any one body, and say that it truly represents Christianity? Our friend may here say that the New Testament is an evidence of Christianity; but, we ask, whose interpretation of the New Testament are we to take—our friend's interpretation, or those of the Roman Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians, Unitarians, or any other of the different sects of the present day? Where is *the* Christianity? Tell us what it consists of, and then we shall be able, no doubt, to rebut the arguments as they are advanced in support of its divine origin.

Now, we have not given the argument to prove that the Sun is the representative of Jesus, or Jesus of the Sun, in the sense that Osiris is to the Egyptians, Apollo to the Greeks, or Mithra to the Persians; and as we admitted the existence of Jesus, what right" had our friend to introduce this into the debate? It is outside the issue. However, let that pass.

Noticing the assertion that our friend made—with reference to scientific men first agreeing among themselves before they pass criticisms on religion, or making assertions that the facts of science are opposed to the real, bent, direction, or existence of Christianity,—we think this comes with small grace from his side, where so many differences exist, as we shall yet attempt to show. Now, Jet us see if

his remarks can be substantiated. It has been asserted, and believed by many, that Jesus came into existence by immaculate conception! The law of Nature—the laws of embryology and generation, as advocated by all science, make no provision for this: our knowledge of Nature at once decides this as being outside the law—not only so, but in direct opposition to it. Now, what scientific man will doubt that this is a fact? All scientific men, on the contrary, will come to the conclusion that the laws of embryology and generation are necessary, and cannot be laid aside in the production of human beings. What scientist says this is no fact at all?

In the first chapter of Matthew, and the third chapter of Luke, you have two genealogies, one tracing Jesus to Abraham and the other to Adam. Joseph in both cases is called the father of Jesus. Now, strange to say, one of them makes David the ancestor of Jesus through Solomon, his son; and the other, through Nathan: and only the two names of Joseph and David are alike in each genealogy of the same person; one gives twenty-eight ancestors, and the other forty-three! As these statements contradict each other, one of them must be false. Now, we take the position of Thomas Paine—"that the agreement of the parts with the whole does not necessarily prove the whole to be true, for the parts may agree and the whole may be false; but when the parts disagree then the whole cannot be true;"—so that if Matthew tells the truth when he says there were twenty-eight ancestors, then Luke, who says there were forty-three, tells a falsehood. Now, who is to decide these matters? And why give the genealogy of Joseph? What had Joseph to do with Jesus? Joseph was espoused to Mary, and was told to take her to him because she was with child of the Holy Ghost! Where was the necessity of tracing Joseph's genealogy? Why these contradictions? And why do not the other gospels mention these matters?

And now, to return to the point our friend raised, we have to again remind him that science has contradicted the birth of Christ, as to his being brought by immaculate conception into existence; and the records themselves also contradict each other.

In reference to the books we are challenged to produce does our friend doubt their existence? If he does, then on some future occasion we may influence our friends to procure them for us, and submit them to his examination. But it is not our duty to *show* these books and prove that they are superior to the gospels: it is the duty of our friend to show *why* the gospels now in use were selected in preference to those rejected. They all have equal claims to be of divine origin, and they all profess to record the acts of Jesus. We have not these records by us, but we promise you we could easily produce them if their existence be denied.

We need not follow our friend at present in the production of the views and explanations of the opponents of Christianity in the Sun theory, and mythical theory of Strauss and Kenan, whom he has quoted,—for we have already admitted that Jesus may have lived and conferred a certain amount of good on those related to, and connected with, him—but we say, that if all related of him be true, (in the general acceptance of that term) it would not prove him to be of

divine origin, or that Christianity was of divine origin. Our friend, as yet, having advanced no argument in support of his position, we will leave these matters here for the present. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

In regard to the remarks that have been made, *my* friend asks, if I do not give the matters in my first speech as evidence of the divine origin of Christianity what do I give them for? Well, I think that matter was clearly stated in my previous remarks: it was because of the understanding I hail that he would deny that the Christianity of the present was the Christianity of the early times that I felt it necessary to lay that basis.

Now, the statement that it is necessary to testify that one sect has held the truth from that time till now in order to establish the connection of ideas and identity of beliefs, appears to me to rest altogether upon a mistake. We have Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and others, and though they differ *in* such matters as Church government, &c, they all agree as to the facts of the incarnation, the life, and miracles of Christ, his death as an atonement for our sins, his resurrection and ascension, and his sitting on the right hand of God. I may say that my definition of Christianity is, that it is the life of Christ as presented to us in the New Testament, and along with that life certain truths and facts that we are called upon to believe, and on which our salvation is made to rest. We have the statement as to the incarnation—I will not trouble about the scientific bearing of that just now, for I shall come to it by and bye—we have, I say, the incarnation and atonement as fundamental principles of Christianity, and without which Christianity cannot exist. It does not matter, though, at the present time, there are Christians professing different names: so far as their special organisations are concerned it does not alter the fact of their Belief; nor does the fact that there may have been differences during past times affect the identity of belief in these facts by Christians at that time. Differences we know have existed in all ages, but these do not at all affect the fact of the birth of Christ, &c., nor the things that were taught by Christ, and which are recorded in this book. As to the Essenes, there is very great reason for believing them, to have been a body of Christians. In the writings of Thomas De Quincy (which may be found in the Public Library), is an elaborate argument which proves, to my mind very conclusively, that they were really Christians, who in days of persecution surrounded themselves with safeguards to prevent themselves from being brought to death because of their professing the name of Christ. I may be mistaken, but I am not aware of any mention of the Essenes prior to Josephus, who wrote subsequently to the destruction of Jerusalem, and, consequently, long after Christianity had been established.

In reference to the remark, that I have no right to mention the Sun-theory, and those matters in regard to Christ being the Sun-God, seeing they have not been brought forward by my friend, you will understand that I am building up an affirmative proposition: I am



endeavoring to establish my proposition, and to do so I am going step by step, and I was in my legitimate course in referring to this theory.

I now take up the subject at the point at which I had arrived when my time expired; I was mentioning the mythical theory of Strauss and Renan, and that that theory admits all the facts in connection with the Saviour's life, but gives this hypothesis—that the Saviour did not arrive at the idea of his being the Messiah all at once, but that by pondering over the idea he at last came to believe himself to be the Messiah in accordance with the prophecies in the Old Testament. In regard to miracles, Strauss and Kenan say that no such things were performed as alleged—that miracles are in fact an impossibility. They admit that he may have cured a few sick persons through the power of sympathy, or mesmerism, or animal magnetism, but that these were greatly magnified through love of the marvelous. Eventually he was put to death, but this was not remarkable, seeing that the good in all ages have been persecuted—as Socrates, &c., and that, speaking as he did to the Pharisees, no wonder they did not rest until they had shed his blood. As to his resurrection, it was pure fancy: one woman imagined she saw him, and others, influenced by her, were led to suppose they had seen him; then ten men in a room with closed doors dreamt they saw him, and a week after eleven men dreamt in a similar way: that after the death of Jesus, and when his disciples were convinced that he was the Messiah, they imagined and ascribed to him many marvelous things. This in substance is the mythical theory. In support of this theory it is affirmed that the gospels are largely of a mythical character, and that from the period, say, dating from 33 to 175—when it is admitted by all leading sceptics that our four gospels just as we have them now were in existence,—these additions were made, and they suggest corrections which they think ought to be made in the gospels to bring them into harmony with facts. They further say we do not know who Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were. We do not know when, or where, they wrote these gospels, and it is affirmed that while Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John, or some other disciples of Christ may have written short statements concerning the life of Christ they certainly never could have written these narratives, or gospels, such as we have them now. Now we are getting nearer to the point that my friend is desirous I should come to., viz., as to the means we have of proving, not only that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, wrote gospels, but in addition to this, that these really are the gospels, and that all the things they wrote are the things we have in our volume now; and also that we have reason to imply, reason for affirming, that they give in connection with the life of the Lord Jesus Christ a true narrative of all that took place. Thus we are getting on, and may say that after that will come the main proof as to the divine origin, based on the prophecies that are found in the Old Testament. I wish to go step by step.

In reference to these gospels, suppose we take the statement that we do not know who the writers were—that so far as we are concerned they have really no identity whatever. Now, if we turn to the New Testament we find, that so far as Matthew is concerned he had an identity. It is said that he was a publican, or Customs' officer, and was called by the Saviour to leave his vocation—that he was a man

accustomed to some extent to use the pen, and was one naturally fitted among the simple Christian apostles to write that gospel narrative which we now have. Surely we know this much of him! But it is urged, while we may have something that will enable us to arrive at the identity of the writer, yet we have nothing to show us where Matthew wrote his gospel. In the early fathers we have extracts from every writing that comes down to us as being inspired writing: These extracts are so numerous and so copious as to indicate a very high regard in the minds of the early Christians for these books. Now, I would ask you, is it likely that these persons who so venerated these writings, would not have had some means of knowing—would not have made inquiries as to when, and where, these writings were written? I will just give an example or illustration of the great importance attached to these writings, and the frequency with which they were referred to. On one occasion Dr. Buchanan was dining with a literary party at the house of Sir Ralph Abercrombie, and a gentleman in the company suggested this question: "How would it have been if at the end of the third century the whole of the New Testament manuscripts had been lost,—would it have been possible to have gathered them from the extracts that are found in *the* writings of the Fathers?" Sometime afterwards Dr. Buchanan called upon Sir David Dalrymple, or "Lord Hales," as he was called, who had been among the company on the evening referred to: He pointed to some books lying on the table, and said "Look at these; that question about the Fathers and the New Testament, which was put by one of the company at Mr. Abercrombie's aroused my curiosity. I knew I had copies of all the ancient Fathers, and I determined therefore to sit down and give the matter a thorough lifting: I commenced the search, and up to the present time I have found extracts in these Fathers that make up the whole of the New Testament, with the exception of *eleven* verses." We may infer, that when his search had been carried further, the whole would have been found. We can see by tin's the value put by these Fathers of the second and third centuries on these writings. We are not far, probably, from having some data on which to rest the conviction as to when? and where? these gospels were written. It is very rarely that we have contemporary statements as to the authorship of any book. Now, the Fathers, who knew the writings of the apostles, declare that the gospel by Matthew was written in Jerusalem—that it was written for the Church there, a large but poor church,—and was written in their own dialect before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. Now, this testimony is confirmed by the gospel itself: for instance, Matthew refers to Jewish customs, but never explains them, because, writing for Jewish readers, he knew that they would understand them. The twenty-fourth chapter of his gospel, which most people think alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem, he seems never to have so referred. As to the certainty of these things, we have the testimony of Papias, a disciple of John and companion of Polycarp; Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp; Origen, a disciple of Irenaeus; and Jerome, Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, all testifying as to what was in their days the general understanding, that the Gospel of Matthew was written by him in Jerusalem, prior to the destruction of that city.

Now, taking the Gospel by Mark we ask, is this writer not known? He is called the sister's son of Barnabas, or in other words the nephew of Barnabas, who is represented as selling his possessions and laying the proceeds at the apostles' feet. It was at the house of Mark's mother that the Christians met for prayer when Peter was in prison and the angel liberated him. We find, further, in the Acts of the Apostles, that he was the companion of Paul and Barnabas; and though Mark was not an apostle, he was not only intimate with the apostles, and frequently in their assemblies, but had probably seen Christ. He was therefore not an unfit person to write the Gospel. Now, what was the testimony of the Fathers in this matter? Irenaeus living and writing in the year 175—having travelled much prior to that period—testifies that Mark wrote his gospel at Rome; also, that the gospel was the substance of the apostle Peter's preaching—that Peter knew of this writing, approved of it, and corrected it; and, consequently, it was written during Peter's own life-time. This testimony is also borne out by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and others.

Now, taking all these things into account, we think it is untrue to say, we do not know who wrote the gospels by Matthew, and Mark, and that we have no information as to when, and where, they were written.



MR. WALKER:

Though it is a painful duty for us to perform, we must draw the attention of our friend to the fact that he has avoided the real question at issue—as to whether the Christian Church has continued from the first century down to the present—and has attempted to evade the question by asserting that the only differences which exist in Christian Churches are those which relate merely to church government.

Now, if we show that these are *not* all the differences we think we shall have weakened his position. Let us go back to the first century, and first let us take the Gnostics: Did they believe in the incarnation; did they believe in the crucifixion, or in the resurrection of Jesus? Did they believe that he was a human being; that he lived with humanity in the form and, as it were, with the habits of mankind? Those who have studied this matter will know that they did not, but that they rejected all those so-called legends of his birth, of his early life, and existence after his death and crucifixion. His burial and resurrection they treated—according to Gibbon, and according to other historians—as mere tragedies and dramas acted on the boards of the Jerusalem theatres. They believed the real Jesus—the real Christ—had no material human body, no earthly father or mother: that he came as a phantom, not as a man, and appeared on the banks of the Jordan teaching them for about three years. This is the view given by Gibbon, who is no mean authority.

Then let us take the Nazarenes, who believed that he was simply and purely a man, begotten as are other men, but more highly endowed. These held views somewhat in common with the Ebionites. In addition to these sects, so opposite, there were the Essenes, the Marcion-

ites, the Basilideans, the followers of Cerinthus, and a number of others. Cerinthus (who lived on the confines of the Jewish and Gentile world) united the opposite beliefs of the Gnostics and the Ebionites by teaching that Jesus was a man like unto all others, until his baptism, when the chief of the *aeons* took possession of his mind, and afterwards directed his actions, up to the hour of his crucifixion, when that being, returning to the *Pleroma* (or World of Spirits) forsook him, which called forth the words from Jesus—"My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me!" These differences existed, then, in the first century; and our friend would have you believe they were simply differences in church government.

Let us now come to the present time. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the real body and blood of Christ are really present at the sacrament. There are other churches who believe these to be simply symbolical. Are these differences in church government?—No; yet these are all Christians—They are a difference in belief, founded upon the conception each sect has of the teachings of the New Testament. Then, again, take the Presbyterians, who are *also* Christians; and understand that they believe in three individual persons that are distinct individuals and yet form only one God—three in one. Then you may take the Unitarians, who believe Jesus to be purely a man (as the Sabellians and Arians did) divinely guided only in the sense that all are divinely guided, but that he may have been possessed of more susceptible faculties for spiritual illumination. Are these simply differences in church government? Then we will take the Universalists, who believe that at death all men will enter that blissful abode called heaven, and compare this with Calvinistic theology, which at one time taught that hell was *paved with infants a span long!*

Are these merely differences in church government? No! They are vital differences, going to the very root of all Christianity, and their unity and harmony cannot be made apparent.

There may be those who term themselves orthodox Christians who may be agreed on some points. Our friend has told us he does not accept orthodox Christianity: then we ask him to define that which is essentially *his Christianity*, in order that we may know with what we are dealing, and to what we have to reply.

He again has made no reference to the arguments we adduced in pointing out those contradictions, as he promised to do. He has carefully allowed that matter to go past, and, instead of this, has merely taken the views and opinions of the opponents of his Christianity, or of orthodox Christianity, or of some Christianity that he has not clearly defined, and merely endeavored to rebut their assertions. He has attempted to show that Mark and the other gospels were written by the authors claimed for them, and, that in the early Fathers you find quotations from them. What has he endeavored to prove by all this? Supposing we admit it: what does it prove? It may-be a step towards arriving at some other conclusion, we grant, but it proves that the gospel by Mark is not of divine origin, for according to our friend's own showing, it was written by Mark,—known to have been written by him, according to our friend's statements; and if written by Mark, how can it be of divine origin? Whilst the fathers have quoted from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John,

they have also quoted from the apocryphal gospels. Has not Eusebius quoted the before-mentioned letter of Jesus to Abgarus the King of Edessa? Have not the Fathers retained this in their productions? So that if the Fathers, quoting the gospels to be of divine origin, prove that they are so, the apocryphal ones are thus proved to be of divine origin also. Supposing that at some future time—say after a few centuries have glided away—some one should arise and assert the divine existence, or the divine origin of Spiritualism, and then, in proof of that position, attempt to show that certain men who believed in Spiritualism had quoted from Andrew Jackson Davis,—and therefore the views of Andrew Jackson Davis were of divine origin! Would this be considered logical? Then to what purpose has our friend introduced these Fathers into the argument? We may admit that Mark wrote Mark, Luke wrote Luke, and Matthew wrote Matthew; but nothing is proved by this. As our friend has challenged us to produce the Gospels of Thomas, and Nicodemus, and the other writers, we now challenge him to produce the original Gospel by Matthew, or to quote *one* author who ever saw it, and thus positively knew of its existence. It matters not, however, even if he did show this: (which he can not) we should still have no proof of the divine origin of Christianity. Supposing we were now to admit that each gospel and epistle was written by the author claimed for it? What then? Does merely Mark having written a thing make it so? Does Luke having said this or that, prove it to be a fact? Why did not Jesus, when here upon Earth, write these gospels? Then we should have had no contradictions. If he were Deity, certainly he could have remained a few more years—or a short time at all events—upon Earth, till these gospels, were written, that he might have reviewed them, instead of leaving them in the hands of men who, according to our friend's own showing, were fallible? Even the great reformer Luther has made mistakes—Luther in his day (with Eusebius and others before him) having repudiated the genuineness of Revelations, of the epistles of James and Jude, &c. Matthew and Luke are contradictory; Luther and St Augustine are contradictory; Presbyterians and Unitarians are contradictory;—then where are we to go for the basis of the divine origin of Christianity? Evidence is quoted on every side: evidence stated as facts by one writer is repudiated, or not mentioned, or told in a different manner by another. If such contradictions were so numerous in other books—hay in the Vedas and in the writings of Homer, Hesiod, or Confucius, they would at once be cast aside as unworthy of man's credence; and yet, when these contradictions (so glaring) are here present to our gaze, we are asked to accept them as of divine origin. Our friend has told us that Christians discovered the interpolations in the Bible. It is well for them that they did, for if they had not others would. And now that the interpolations are discovered are they expunged? Does King James Version yet contain them? What! Christian ministers upholding as a divine revelation a book with acknowledged interpolations in it Sunday after Sunday, and congregations throughout the world reading the supposed Word of God *with the interpolations by dishonest men therein?* This is no argument for the divine origin of Christianity,—or there is at once

suspicion thrown upon the whole! for if it can be proved that there is *one* interpolation, how can it be proved that there are not *more!* How do we know that future Christians may not discover far *greater* interpolations? When these books were in the hands of the Fathers, who labored for Christianity, (honestly or otherwise)—when they were carefully guarded and kept among them, and books of other men, which opposed them, destroyed and burnt (as instance the writings of Arius) how can we accept their evidence in favour of Christianity, when, they had to maintain the position of Christianity through the first centuries by *such* means? Why burn the writings of Arius and leave us but the fragments of Celsus? Why have we not these books? How comes it that, after all, there has not been that honest impartiality displayed, and that preservation of the literature of opponents which would have been the case if the early Fathers had not been afraid of their position?

We shall not attempt this evening to show you that the Testament may not have been written by those men claimed for it (for there is great doubt on this point) but we shall maintain this position next evening: that whoever wrote the Testament, wrote without being actually present at the events therein described—that these events, were described in such a manner as to leave doubts upon every sceptical mind which honestly endeavors to find the truth. The contradictions will appear so glaring as we proceed, that if we accept *one* gospel we shall be obliged to reject *all the others* when we wish to decide which one speaks the truth. Has God given us a Revelation? How has he done it—directly or indirectly? Through man, or by his own unaided powers? If through man, did man make mistakes? If man made mistakes, did God correct those mistakes? If he could inspire the fact in the first instance could not God correct it in the next? We do not wish to be considered guilty of blasphemy, but we must say, that if God did not correct these mistakes he is guilty of *misleading* his children by withdrawing his power, which he might use, to give us his divine word and revelation, so consistent, so harmonious, as to have no discrepancies—in fact, a divine revelation *consistent in all its parts* But, alas! such is not the case.

In our friend's next address, if he will attempt to show what his Christianity is, and endeavor to prove its divine origin, we shall be able to rebut his evidence as he brings it forward. We will deal further with that matter of the immaculate conception, which he wisely (or unwisely) brought forward without shewing how the laws of Nature, as established in such matters, could be set aside, There are other matters we can point out in this direction when the occasion arrives.

Then, again, what was the good of Christianity? What was it for? Why the Old first, and then the New Testament? It is just like saying this: God, by one dispensation, attempted to do a certain thing, and, failing in his endeavors, was obliged to have recourse to a new dispensation in order to accomplish his designs.

If Christianity was intended to supplement the Jewish religion, then of what use was Judaism? Surely the infinite Ruler of the Universe would not create a religion to destroy it! Imagine Jehovah bringing forth [more things than one] into existence simply for the

purpose of destroying them—such, for instance as his own children! Will our friend, in his next address, state how many Jews Christianity has converted? There are Jews to day—one or two of them here and there may be Christians, but in the "main, they still retain their Jewish form of faith and religion.

SECOND EVENING:

WEDNESDAY, 6th MARCH.

MR. GREEN, after a few Introductory remarks by the Chairman,  
resumed the Debate as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN and RESPECTED FRIENDS—During the course of the debate last evening, I endeavored to establish the fact of the continuance of Christianity in an unbroken line, from the time it is said to have commenced in the early part of the first century, down to the present time. I also established the identity of belief existing in that early time, with the teachings that are now found in the New Testament, and which are held by professing Christians at the present day. My friend has not attempted to dispute this point, although I anticipated, from what I understood his convictions to be, that this would be one of the points on which a severe contest would take place: and I am the more established in the impression I then had from the fact, that even last evening there was circulated in this hall a copy of a trance-lecture delivered by Mr. Walker in the Opera House on the 20th January last, which was delivered with the object of showing the harmony of Primitive Christianity, with Modern Spiritualism. Now, I contend, that under these circumstances I was justified in anticipating that there would be an effort to show that the Christianity of the present day, and the Christianity of the early times, were not one and the same; but as my friend has not attempted to do so, I conclude that the evidence has been so conclusive as to undermine all hope of gaining that part of the argument.

I also pointed out in regard to two gospels (which I had time to consider last evening) viz., Matthew and Mark, that these persons really did write the gospels to which their names are attached, and that we have such an amount of evidence as to the place where, and the time when, they wrote these gospels, that it cannot with any truth be said either that we do not know who wrote them, nor when, nor where, they were written. It is true my friend asked several times—"Supposing it is true that these men wrote these gospels; how does this prove the divine origin of Christianity?" Yet he did not attempt to show that they were not written by them, and I may take it for granted that he feels the full force of the argument. The point which I seek to establish beyond a doubt by showing that these gospels were written by the persons whose names are attached to them will, I think, be seen very clearly by-and-bye. But now in connection with this matter, there arose certain points to which I will



endeavor to reply in the present speech, and if I can spare a little time, I should like to go on with my affirmative argument. The question which I am charged to answer, rather than the one which is really at issue, is, as to the identity of the special body of Christians who have held those truths, which, as I explained, are included in Christianity, with the Christians of the early times. I am asked did the Gnostics, the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, and many others of the early schools, hold these vital truths of Christianity? In reply, I would first venture to call attention to the proposition; that proposition is, "Is Christianity of divine origin?" In establishing this proposition then, all these people that I have referred to do not affect the matter, though were it necessary to refer to them, I should be able to say something in regard to each of these classes of persons. In some sense they of course professed to be Christians. Both the Cerinthians, and Ebionites were Gnostics. It was certainly not Christianity in its true sense which they held, nor was it a new and distinct philosophy. The theories of the Gnostics were made up of selections from almost every system, and some Christian ideas certainly formed a part. But whatever may have been the views of these various parties it in no way invalidates the argument I am endeavoring to present, and really my argument remains just as strong as if they had not been mentioned at all. I do wish to remind you that the question to night is, not are these various sects of divine origin? but it is simply what I have before mentioned, and what our placards state, viz., "Is Christianity of divine origin?"

Now supposing we admit that all these people did not believe all that we hold to be the vital truths of Christianity. I ask you, will it affect the question at issue which refers to Christianity as taught in the New Testament, and not by the founders of any of these parties? The question really is, is the Christianity of the New Testament,—not that professed by the Cerinthians, Gnostics, or any other of these sects,—of divine origin? I affirm that it is, and it is the duty of my friend to prove, if he can, that it is not.

Now in order to point out the reason why I do not consider that these parties, and the questions asked respecting them, in any way affect my argument, I would just seek to remind my friend of certain statements made in scripture in regard to certain errors that would arise in the latter times. For instance in the first epistle of Timothy, 4th chapter, reading from the 1st verse, it is said "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Again, in the 2nd epistle of Timothy, 2nd chapter, 16th to the 18th verses: "But shun profane and vain babbling, for they will increase unto more ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a canker of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus. Who concerning the truth have erred" (even in that time when Paul wrote to Timothy) "saying that the resurrection is past, already, and overthrow the faith of some".

Now, again, in the 2nd epistle to the Thessalonians and 2nd chapter, we read. "Now we beseech you brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him; That ye be not soon shaken in mind or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition."

Now here in these statements we have intimation made that there would be a great and a sad falling away. We find also that even then the resurrection was denied by some. In turning to the epistle of John, we find that Gnostic errors were then existing; that persons were denying that Christ had come in the flesh, and reducing hi in to a mere phantom, and hence his epistle was written against this. We say all these errors that came to full and mature growth subsequently to the apostolic age, existed in their incipiency in this 1st century: that the apostles foresaw their existence, and predicted, not only their existence, but their might and power; so that it is evident there was some necessity for making our proposition as we have done,—not Is the Christianity of Cerinthus, or of the Gnostics, or any of these others, of divine origin? but, Is that Christianity which is taught in the New Testament of divine origin? Has it been given to us by God? But I am further asked to state what my Christianity is. Now surely Mr. Walker knows what the New Testament teaches of Christianity; if not he has certainly not acted in harmony with that reason, and knowledge, which our Spiritualistic friends claim that his guides possess. If he h;is been rejecting the Christianity of the Corinthians, or of the Calvinists, or Romanists, or any of these named, I say he may have been rejecting them, and si ill not have been rejecting the Christianity of the Bible. I certainly think he ought to have greater knowledge of the subject than he appears to possess, judging by the fact, that although I have already stated what Christianity is, he so repeatedly calls for a re-statement of Christianity.

Now I will again briefly state what I understand to be the general outlines of the religion of Christ. First, I understand Christianity to include the incarnation of the Eternal Word in the person of Jesus Christ. Next, that he, Jesus Christ, was a prophet acknowledged by God by means of miracles, signs, and wonders which God did by him in the midst of the Jews; that Christ was pure and sinless, and an example divinely set for human imitation: that his death upon the cross was an atonement offered on behalf of the whole world; that he was buried, and rose from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of God; that eternal life is attainable only through him, and will be given to those who accept him and live according to his laws; that those who will not accept him, and die impenitent, will be punished. These are the vital truths included in the term Christianity.

Now I am asked, further, that since I uphold the Christianity of the New Testament, I would state whose interpretation of it I take—my own or that of the Trinitarians, Unitarians, Calvinists, Church of Rome, or others? In my reply I say neither mine nor theirs, but the simple, unvarnished statements of the book itself. If Mr. Walker

can show that my Christianity is not in keeping with this book he puts me out of court. It is no use beating about the bush, as he did last night, and asking what does this prove, or what does the other prove. I have stated clear and definite issues. There is a clear path for him to pursue, and I do cordially invite him to pursue that path.

Now, in regard to another matter, our friend says: "Supposing we admit that Matthew and Mark wrote the gospels under their name, this does not prove their divine origin." We do not seek to prove their divine origin, but the divine origin of the Christianity they teach. I do not say these gospels are of divine origin: they are of human origin, written by men, but aided by the divine spirit of God. While we do not say that they are of divine origin, we do affirm that the Christianity they teach is of divine origin. I wish that to be clearly understood: There is a distinction between the two.

My friend asks why did Christians burn the writings of Celsus and others? I may ask, Why were many Christian writings burned? Though there have been the writings of a few preserved, the writings of a large number of Christians have been lost, as well as those of the opposers of the Christianity. We regret the loss, and it was caused by the wicked passions of men who got into the Church of Christ by unlawful means. I say we regret these things, but we are not dependent upon these writings: If they had been every one destroyed we would have been in just as good a position as though they had all been preserved; for our Christianity depends not on them, but its own inspired records.

We are asked how many Jews have been converted, as if this had anything to do with the refutation of our proposition; but our friend must be in great ignorance, or he would never have asked that question, for we are told that a vast multitude believed, and that many of the priests were obtained to the faith. Does not my friend know that all the first converts were from the Jews alone; and that the first Gentile convert was Cornelius, some seven years after the commencement of Christianity? We may say that thousands and thousands of Jews believed, but mark, we do not find them now—and why? Simply for this reason: they have lost their identity, and are merged in other nations and peoples. Tens of thousands of people do not know that Neander, the learned and able writer of the best ecclesiastical histories of the day, is a Jew; because when Jews become Christians their identity *as Jews* is gradually lost. We say that for a man to ask whether Jews were converted, and in what numbers, shows, to say the least of it, an ignorance of history upon this subject. We say millions of Jews have been obedient to the faith, though millions of them have not been. But, friends, remember—it was predicted. I would ask you to notice the statements in the 49th chap. of Isaiah, 7th verse: "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One: to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers—(but now observe the change)—kings shall see and arise; princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful or the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee." In the 53rd chap, we have other statements, clear and explicit, in regard to his rejection: "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted

with grief, and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not." But, friends, we can thank God for this, even now, because it has being overruled for good. If all, or the chief part, of the Jews had accepted Christianity, do not you think our unbelieving friends would have cried out: "Oh, yes! there was collusion; this people—these Jews have fabricated Christianity, and made it harmonise with their conception of the prophecies. Now no person can at all question the fact of the Old Testament scriptures containing prophecies concerning the rejection of Christ by the Jews; and mark, friends, just as those prophecies which have been preserved by the enemies of Christ have come true, and as certainly as they have rejected him, so certainly, in the time to come, will those which speak of their acceptance of him come true; and then grand results will follow, And these Jews, who are found in every part of the known world, will become the willing proclaimers of him whom they now reject.



Mr. WALKER:

In the opening remarks of our friend he asserted, or intimated, that we had acceded to one of the most important points he had attempted to make, and that was, that there was the continuity of Christianity from this century away back to its origin over all the past time; and he has labored this evening to prove that this is not the case,—at all events as Christianity was promulgated by its first professors: I ask you how are we to know what Christianity is but by those who profess it? It is all very well to take us to the New Testament and say this is New Testament Christianity; who knows but that the Christianity of the Roman Catholics, or of the Unitarians, is the Christianity of the New Testament? And if the definition of our friend last night be taken as correct, when he said that Christianity was the life of Christ, who but knows all the varied sects go to the New Testament for their belief on this point? And all equally claim its support.

In reference to the text in Timothy, about false prophets and false Christ's arising in the latter days &c., how variously applicable is that text! Who but knows that this text has been applied to the Roman Catholic Church, for they in their profession forbid the marriage of priests, and in this they have the authority of Paul where he advises them to be as he was, unless they "cannot contain." And now we have the self-same text this evening applied to Spiritualists. But this text will not apply to the various divisions of the Christian sects we have mentioned as presenting intrinsic differences; for the Unitarians neither have "their consciences seared with a hot iron," neither do they forbid marriage. We know not whether they "speak lies in hypocrisy," though we firmly believe they do not; therefore this text will not apply in such a case. Again, the quotation made from Paul simply proves that there were differences of opinion in those days—differences that have come through all the succeeding ages, and in all these differences whom are we to believe? Shall we believe the Christianity of this, or that, or the other sect?

Our friend has avoided answering the objections we brought to his Christianity and to the gospels of the New Testament, where we asked him how he knew that these gospels were superior to the other gospels that were rejected; how the others were rejected, and by whom were they rejected? Has he produced the gospel said to have been written by Matthew in the original dialect? Or quoted any others who had seen this gospel? Is he able this evening to show us any original manuscripts? Is he able to take us back to a single original copy written by Mark, Luke, or John, or Paul, or Peter, or even of the Revelations? If he is unable to produce these manuscripts, (all these that we possess being simply copies, and many of them copies of copies), what guarantee has our friend to give us that they are what they claim to be, and that there are no more interpolations such as the one we pointed out last evening? What proof have we that the early Church writers have not made these gospels to suit themselves? Now our friend has told you plainly that the gospels were written by certain men. We have not entered into the objections that might be raised to this, simply because we do not deem it necessary, though we could throw much doubt upon his assertions in this respect; yet, taking it for granted that they did write them, then certainly God *did not*; and if human beings wrote them, what proof have we that they did not write fallible nonsense instead of divine truth out of their own minds and intellects? Granting that all the positions our friend has taken can be supported from the New Testament—and that all he has asserted in reference to his Christianity can be found there—what then? It simply proves that Mark says this,—Luke that. When our friend asserts that God providentially, or by some other means, inspired these writers, whose authority has he for saying this? Of course he will quote Paul, where he says: "All scripture is written by inspiration;" but as we are just trying Paul, his evidence in this case is not admissible, therefore we must rule him out of court, especially since that Mr. Paul gave such ridiculous information to Timothy, to whom, he wrote (1st Tim. V, 23) saying: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine other infirmities." Was this given by inspiration? Is the quotation he makes from the 15th chapter, 1st epistle to the Corinthians, 33rd verse (where Paul says: Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners"), given by inspiration from God? This, as our friend will know, is a quotation from Neander the Grecian comic poet. The very words put into the mouth of Jesus at the conversion of Paul: "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," are to be found in Euripides. Now if there be one fallible saying, one thing described by these men as the result of their own thoughts, or reflections, what proof have we that all did not emanate in this wise?

We really did expect that our friend would have followed our arguments of last evening, and noticed those important differences we pointed out with such care with reference to the discrepancies of Matthew and Luke concerning the genealogy of Jesus. Which of these two writers are we to believe? One or the other must be false, for two contradictions cannot make one truth. Now, if this is so, what is it we can prove by reference to the New Testament? If they falsify themselves concerning these things how are we to believe

them upon other matters? Were these scriptures written at the time when Jesus lived? Were his speeches reported on the spot? Did they engage short-hand reporters to takedown the words of Jesus? If they were left to be written years after they had happened how do we know that the memories of the men who wrote them were infallible?

Now, coming to the belief of the Jews, concerning these matters, we have little to say, inasmuch as last evening we asserted that the Christian religion, in some form or other, was commenced by the Hellenist Jews. They were Jews who commenced to promalgate it, but this goes to prove nothing concerning the divine origin of Christianity. Even if all the Jews had been converted, it would not prove that Christianity is of divine origin. But let us here ask, should the Jews suffer at the Christians' expense? When Jesus came to those of the lost sheep of the house of Israel—when he said—"Cast not your pearls before swine," and talked of meat not being fit for the dogs, and blessed a woman because she made a good hit in asserting that she would eat of the crumbs which fell from her master's table—should not they have been the first convinced? How comes it that all the Jews were not converted when all these revelations were made to them? Those who are converted are those who get these matters third, fourth, or fifth hand; whilst those who know their own scriptures, who can read their own prophecies and understand their own original language are not converted.

Now, we shall ask our friend in his next address to commence at the basis—that is the incarnation of the divine being, or divine word, or divine Christ, or divine something superior to all other men. Let Kim speak of Jesus when the immaculate conception took place, and let us commence at this beginning. Let him prove this, after noticing the objections we have taken to the contradictions between the books which record the miraculous conception, and then show how these contradictions can be harmonized. Let him attempt to prove from this source, or any other that is rational or reasonable, that this affair took place as it is described. We may assure him that mere assertion will not prove these events, unless he can prove that in all *other* instances these writers told the truth. If it can be found that they told a falsehood in a *single* instance, what is there to assure us, we ask, that they may not have done so again? Historical mistakes, mistakes in events, different descriptions of the same occurrences: if these occur, then whose judgment are we to rely upon? Our friend's judgment? when he assures us that his judgment is fallible? We will not rely upon that, but we will rely upon the evidence of our own reason and judgment, if reason and judgment have to be the umpire to maintain or controvert the position our friend has taken. In one sense we admit that Christianity is of divine origin, as all things are of divine origin; but our friend has to prove to us that Christianity is of *specially* divine origin in a sense that all other religions and revelations are not of divine origin. If we are merely to depend upon assertions, as we said before, that these authors were inspired by God, to what conclusion do we come in the natural course of logic? Simply to the conclusion that the book of Mormon, written by Joe Smith, is a revelation from God, or is of divine origin: that the Koran,

written by Mahomet is of divine origin. And if the unity of the book has to be taken into consideration as evidence, certainly the book of Mormon has greater unity than the New Testament. And the Koran, though written by one man, contains greater impulses, on the whole, to virtue and morality than the Bible. We do not allude to the nonsense that may be found in it, for nonsense *may* be found in the New Testament. If unity be taken, then these books have the best of it. Now, what our friend has to do in his next address is to attempt to prove his first basis—that Christ, or God, was manifest in the flesh; that he was superior to other individuals in every sense; that there was no sin and no guilt in him; that in every respect he fulfilled all the prophecies relating to him; and that he was of *speciall*y divine origin,—that there was a necessity for his coming before the affair took place, and that this was either to fulfil prophecies or to do some benefit to humanity. I dare say our friend's position will be that he was thus manifested in the flesh, and became man that he might "redeem the world." We will ask, ".Redeem" the world from what? From sin? How came sin to enter the world? By the temptation of Satan? That will take us back to "the fall," as related in Genesis. Let us get at the foundation of this matter—for if there be no "fall," and if men are sinners, and do not die because of their transgressions (and this can be proved), then there is no necessity for Christ to come into the world at all. If he came into the world to save sinners, unless he was a man like unto us in every respect, what availed his example? Can human beings follow the example of a God? Can mere fallible finite man imitate the example of infinite Deity? Can human mortals such as we are follow in the steps of One infinitely superior to us? Because, forsooth, we cannot do it, or our intellect rebels against believing it, will that Deity make us to suffer throughout eternity, whilst those who can, or will, believe will He give them glory and light for ever, banishing all others from the light and the sun of happiness? As Theodore Parker might well ask, is not God amenable to His own justice and His own laws? If so, we say on these grounds the position thus taken by Christians cannot stand the test; for if God be just he will try all according to their deserts, independent of all belief they may have whatever. (Applause.)



Mr. GREEN:

I must congratulate my friend Mr Walker on his ability to walk round a point and yet not touch it, and also upon his efforts to change places. I understood I was the affirmant this evening, as well as on all the other evenings, on this proposition. I understood it was the duty of the affirmant to lead, and the one taking the negative to follow. Mr. Walker showed a disposition last evening to reverse that order, but I assure you I am not going to reverse it. I am not going to be led by Mr. Walker. However, we will come to the matters he has asked for by-and-bye, when I have laid the foundation so securely that he will have some difficulty in getting away from it. In the meantime I am satisfied that we are progressing safely and satisfactorily, though I regret he has not taken up the points I have touched upon. It is

all very well to say "we could say something against the genuineness, of these gospels, but forbear." Why does he forbear? It is all very well also to say, "Will Mr. Green tell us wherein these gospels are superior to those other gospels?" Let Mr. Walker produce those gospels: let him show that they are superior to these, and give us his evidence. Until then I will not be drawn by these side issues from the point which I am determined thoroughly to establish. Now, in regard to some of those statements which have been cited I will refer to one or two of them now. That from Timothy about a little wine for his stomach's sake, and also that in Corinthians in regard to marriage. Now I am surprised that Mr Walker should refer to statements of that kind. Of course it is the old hash; it is nothing new or original. My friend knew that I declined to take the affirmative proposition, that the New Testament is of divine origin, because, as I stated in my letter, all the New Testament is not of divine origin, the statement of advice to Timothy is not of divine origin, and very much more is simply history, and intelligent Christians make a distinction between what is of divine origin in the record, and what has come from man. Then again, that very hackneyed subject in regard to marriage. How studiously it is kept out of sight that Paul does not discountenance marriage—that he simply says it was not advisable, because in the times of the persecutions' the Christians had to prepare themselves for lives of self-denying faith, to control their feelings, and dispense with social intercourse and the pleasures of the family circle. Because, by marrying, they would trouble themselves by having families, and bring sufferings upon innocent beings, he advises that it would be better to remain unmarried, but if Christians did marry they had a perfect right to do so, and in-fringed upon no law.

I must now finish the references on my paper, for I omitted a point last evening, and which it was well I did, for Mr. Walker's sake, but to which he has again called attention. I refer to Matthew and Luke in reference to the genealogy of Jesus. In regard to his complaint that I have not replied to all his questions, I may say that a little child might ask more questions in a few minutes than I could answer in many weeks, but I assure you that I will answer all that the time will admit of. Before referring to the genealogy, however, let me refer to the statement about the law of generation and embryology as given by my friend last night—the only statement given as proving my friend's assertion, that science and Christianity were in opposition. Now may I ask if science is in opposition to Christianity in this matter? May I ask if the original pair came into the world in accordance with the law of generation and embryology? If science cannot deny, as she dare not, that there are at least two exceptions to this rule: then, how can science say, that he who made two exceptions had not the power to make the other, when he thought it necessary to do so? Where is the contradiction of science? Science does not presume to affirm, as my friend has done, that there is a contradiction here. Now, taking up this genealogy, it is a very old objection; there is not an infidel book you can take up but what it is there. I am surprised that it is still referred to. In this very lecture by my friend, delivered in the Opera House, it is re-hashed, and



we have had it again to-night. I am glad, however, that the matter has been repeated, because the statement which I am about to make will have the more emphasis. Now in regard to the difference in this genealogy my friend ought to have reserved his dictum from Paine until he had proved—and he will have very considerable difficulty in proving—that there is any contradiction at all. I would ask you to notice that there could have been no collusion between Matthew and Luke. Depend upon it, if these men had conspired to impose this fraud upon the world they would have taken good care to have had at least apparent harmony between their narratives.

In the next place I would ask, have you taken into account the various ways in which these differences in the genealogies may have been caused? Have you remembered that law which required a brother to marry his deceased brother's wife in order that this brother's name might be perpetuated in Israel? Have you taken into account that fact, and which fact I would emphasise, that there is not a single person, either Jew, or heathen, during the first centuries, that ever made the genealogy of Christ a difficulty? and why? because they knew that these genealogies were kept in accordance with the usual custom of the Jews, and were correct in regard to these matters. I say the fact that these men, who did all they could to oppose Christianity, did not say one word against the truthfulness of the genealogies, proves that they knew that they were authentic. I would first suggest to you—and it is nothing new: it has been stated over and over again—that in the gospel by Matthew we have the genealogy of Joseph properly so speaking, and in Luke we have the genealogy of Joseph, simply as representing Mary his wife, whose line is there given. When the decree of the Roman Emperor went forth to enroll all the people, Mary was in that condition which would make travel exceedingly inconvenient, and which would have prevented such a journey from being taken, but for the most urgent reasons. Now how came it that under these circumstances Mary should travel all the way from Nazareth of Galilee to Bethlehem to be enrolled? Simply because, although Joseph, by adoption and marriage, had become the head and representative of her father's house, her genealogy being affected, she needed to be there in person, in order to go through all the forms of the enrollment. Then we are asked, how is it that the generation of Joseph should be given at all? That seems a very needless question. Multitudes after Christ's death, who may not have accepted the account of his birth, would need to have proof that he was descended from David on his fathers side, in order, apart from any idea of his divine nature, that they might receive him as their Messiah. Now in this we have a reason why the genealogy of Joseph is given,—it was in order to show, on his reputed father's side, his descent from David, as well as upon the side of Mary his mother, and this point is clearly established in Matthew.

I will now take up one or two of my arguments. I was endeavoring to establish last evening that these gospels of Matthew and Mark were genuine. I will add, in regard to Luke, that his identity is capable of as clear establishment, and his connection with the gospel which bears his name, as that of those previously noticed. The first reference to Luke is found in the book of Acts, when in the 16th chapter he is seen to be a companion of Paul; and, later on, in

the 21st chapter, he is seen to be in his company on his journey to Jerusalem. Whoever the writer of the Acts may be, he was evidently an earnest man, and one likely to write an account of Christ's life. That he did write such an account may be seen from the preface to the book of Acts; that the author of the Acts was the author of the third gospel is clear from the reference to "the former treatise," and from the fact that both are inscribed to the same person. That Luke was the author of the Acts, and the third gospel, we have the direct testimony of Irenaeus, and Tertullian, in the second century, corroborated by Origen, and Eusebius; while Justin Martyr frequently quotes from Luke, though he does not name him. In the end of the second century Marcion attempted to mutilate Luke's gospel, and pretended the Church had not the genuine copy. Tertullian's book against Marcion has come down to us, and after enumerating certain churches founded by the apostles, he says: "I affirm, then, that in those churches—and not in those only which were founded by the apostles, but in all which have fellowship with them—the Gospel of Luke which we so steadfastly defend, has been received from its first publication." Irenaeus states that there are many facts and parables mentioned by Luke not found in the other gospels, and that its loss would be a calamity to the Church. Can there be a stronger proof that this gospel was written by Luke than this given within 150 years after the death of Christ? Paul and Luke were evidently attached to each other. Luke was with him in his imprisonment (2 Tim. IV, 4), and is called the beloved physician (Col. IV, 14). If Luke was a physician, then he must have been an educated man, and his gospel would show signs of this. It does so. It is the purest Greek of the New Testament. Not only is Luke called a physician by Paul, but it is so reported by Eusebius, and Jerome. Careful reading of the gospel confirms this. Luke narrates more miracles of healing than the others, and describes them more accurately, and fully, and uses some words only found in the works of Greek medical writers of his day. The whole language of Luke's gospel is such as would be expected from one of his profession. Several Fathers say the Acts was written in Greece; and, as it does not mention Paul's second imprisonment and martyrdom, the conclusion of Lardner seems correct, that he left Paul in Rome, and finished his gospel and the Acts, in Greece, not later than A.D. 64 or 65. It is, therefore, not true to say we do not know by whom the third gospel was written, not when, nor where.

Now, in regard to the gospel of John I may say it was probably written to supply some facts left out by the others, and to give us some of the more advanced teachings of Jesus. Now, I have just one argument and then I find I must terminate these remarks: In reference to this point I want you to remember that John lived till about the year 100; that he had a disciple named Polycarp, who lived a considerable time into the second century and was martyred; and that Polycarp had Irenaeus as a pupil, who stated that Polycarp received the teachings of Christianity from John, with whom he had familiar intercourse. Thus we have a chain of three links. Now, supposing, as is asserted by some, that the raising of Lazarus was a fabrication, and had been inserted in the days of the Apostle, and that it was brought

winder his notice,—“he might, and doubtless would say. “I wrote the gospel, and I have a distinct recollection of all it contains, but I know nothing of Lazarus,—it is a forgery!” Suppose it was written in the days of Polycarp, he would have said: “I was bishop of the church at Smyrna, and I received my copy from John’s own manuscript and there was nothing of this about Lazarus in it; where does it come from? Away with it!” That it could not have been fabricated in the days of Irenaeus is equally clear. He was living in the year 175. It could not have been done without his knowledge for he was a traveller, and a man of action. He went on a mission to Rome from the French churches, and was corresponding with Christians in many parts of the world as to the doctrines of the church. He was a disciple of Polycarp, from whom he had heard much of the teachings of John. Could it have been concocted in his day, or any of the other circumstances narrated in this gospel? A moment’s consideration shows that it could not, and that the connection of names forms a chain which cannot be broken. Irenaeus declares that this circumstance was in John’s gospel: he was willing to suffer for his attachment to the gospels, and he did suffer grievously. And what has been said as to John’s gospel *will* also apply equally to those by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. We have thus a chain—John, Polycarp, and Irenaeus—up to the very period when, in the year 175, the gospels are known to have been in existence, just as we have them now. Now, I ask you in the name of reason—I ask my friend, whether he can get out of this position? How can these gospels have been fabricated and imposed on the world, and not have been written by the persons whose names are attached thereto? (Applause.)



Mr. WALKER:

We must, in commencing, follow the example of our worthy opponent, and compliment him, as he did us, upon his ability to avoid the main points. In our last address we endeavored to show him that he was in error in taking the position he did, even supposing we granted that all the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and all the epistles were authentic, and written by their claimed authors. When we have denied this,—when we have taken a position against it, then it is time for him to attempt to prove who the writers of the New Testament were; but why, when we take no such position, does he go round the bush, and avoid the main point at issue? Why cannot we get at the root of matters? He attempts to show that our Arguments are invalidated by the fact that they have been produced—and he says refuted,—over and over again; that in a certain place in your city, some time ago, arguments of this kind were adduced. Thomas Paine has, in his works, set forth all the discrepancies in genealogy as argument, and the great materialistic thinkers and writers have repeatedly inserted them in their works; but they are left till this evening to be thoroughly exploded by our friend. When the antiquity of a book is held up as evidence of its genuineness, why, because our objections are ancient, should our friend hold them less valid than if they were new? Now let us show again the real contradictions that are therein manifest: Matthew in the first

chapter gives twenty-eight ancestors, from David to Joseph, and brings him through David's son Solomon. Luke, on the contrary, gives forty-three ancestors, and makes Joseph the son of David through Nathan. Thus, you will perceive, in the two genealogies there are two names, David and Joseph, at the two ends: all the centre names are different. How is this explained? Why, simply that there were certain laws in existence among the Jews for the purpose of perpetuating a man's name, and by which a man had to marry his brother's wife! How does this answer the question? Did not Luke know this as well as our friend? Did not Matthew know it? If not, they were not fit to write the gospels they are credited with. So that, to give Jesus authority with the people, we are told that he must have an Earthly father, that he must come through David; but at the same time we are to believe that he had in reality no Earthly father! For this reason, therefore, the genealogy of Joseph was given for no other purpose but in order to deceive! Now, does our friend mean to tell this intelligent audience that in the first instance Christianity was established by a *deception*? Does our friend mean to tell this people that the Deity of the Universe had to resort to deception to accomplish His work? Whether or no, little do we think of such an argument upon such an important question. We ask, if these writers contradict each other, can they both be *true*? We have shown that they *do* contradict each other, therefore they both can not be true. Now, now is our opponent going to tell us which is right and which is wrong? Are we to have a correct genealogy of Jesus? Will our friend, in his next address, review the matter again, and show, in a different manner than he has yet done, how these contradictions can be reconciled. (Applause.)

Our friend has told you again that he does not say that the New Testament is of divine origin; yet, according to his showing, the New Testament is the basis of Christianity! How, then, can Christianity be of divine origin if its basis be not? Then he speaks very eloquently upon the presumption of science, as an offset to the arguments we adduced concerning the immutability of law destroying the value of the evidence in the case of the immaculate conception. However, to show that it was possible for such a wonder to happen, our friend instances another apparently similar case, and, strange to say, takes it from the same questionable source, as though he argued that, if one be true, the other must be true. Let our friend prove the first case, and then we may possibly grant the second. But the illustration was false, because in the last instance there was already a woman, and, therefore, at least one parent; but in the first instance there were no Earthly parents at all. So, in reality this neither proves one case nor the other. We are prepared to prove by the aid of science that the first generation of man was by the operation of law, and depended upon reproduction just as much as did all man's offspring; but it would be a side issue, and it is foreign to our present purpose to enter thereon. The original first pair had to have generation in accordance with the laws of Nature. All life is the result of generation, either in protoplasm, the cell, or in the individual; and this generation takes place from the lowest to the highest forms of life; and human beings are not exempt from the law. Therefore, our

friend's argument—even if his illustration, or parallel, were a good one—here falls to the ground.

Now, let us again refer to the contradictions of the New Testament, and if we succeed in proving that there are such, we shall have shown that the source of Christianity is unreliable. Will the Chairman kindly refer to the third chapter of Mark, 18th and 19th verses, and read. [The Chairman read as requested.] "And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of, Alphaeus and Thaddaus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him, and they went into an house." (Next refer to Luke 6th chapter, 15th and 16th verses): "Matthew, and Thomas, James, the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor." Now, here, in naming the Apostles of Jesus, Simon is called in one place the Canaanite, and in the other Simon Zelotes. One mentions Thaddaeus, and the other calls him Judas. Are they thus so differently named by divine revelation? Will our friend now refer to the 23rd chapter of Matthew, 35th verse? [The Chairman here read as requested.] Here are the words of Jesus after the harangue against the Pharisees and those in power, whom he is supposed to be addressing. He speaks of "all the righteous blood from the time of Abel the just, to Zacharias, son of Barachias, that was slain between the temple and the altar;" and yet at this time, when this was supposed to have been said, there had been no such individual slain! In the fourth book of Josephus, you will find the same individual alluded to as being slain by a faction of zealots: this taking place during the time when Titus destroyed Jerusalem, after the so called resurrection and ascension of Christ had taken place. Now, what becomes of the reliability of Matthew as an historian after this? What we are endeavoring to prove is this: that even if we were to admit our friend's argument, as we have said before, that the gospels were written by their reputed authors, we are prepared to show, that this statement just read from the New Testament shows, beyond doubt, that by whomsoever they may have been written, they are unreliable; and the mere fact of our friend's intended explanation of the contradictions we have noticed, by saying the early writers did not notice these objections, but believed them to be genuine, or at all events remained silent about them; does not answer the point at all. In reality how do we know that these errors were not mentioned by the early objectors to Christianity? Our friend showed you conclusively last evening, by his scholastic learning, that all we have of Celsus is that which is preserved in the writings of Origen, a Christian "Father." The rest was destroyed with the works of others opposed to Christianity. Now, do you think Origen would quote the most vital objections? Do you not think he would like our worthy opponent—answer what he could, and leave the rest unanswered? So that, really admitting that there is no antagonism on these points, it proves nothing. (Applause.)

We have again to call the attention of our friend to the fact, that he has not yet advanced anything in the shape of argument to prove that Christianity is of divine origin. He has not adduced a tittle of evidence during all the time he has spoken to you, to establish the point. What he has endeavored to prove is, that Mark wrote Mark,

and Matthew wrote Matthew. We for the sake of argument admitted this last evening: therefore, why repeat it? We will remind our friend, as he so courteously reminded us, the question is not. Who wrote Mark, but is Christianity of divine origin? Give us your Christianity in detail, commencing with its early proceedings, and we will then see if your conclusions are correct. This is the most vital question, the one in dispute, and the one into which you should enter. Now lay down your basis of argument, and we will endeavor to follow you in all the claims you make: We will grant you what you have endeavored to prove, so that you may make the best of your case. If, in the end, you can produce sufficient proofs to show that Mark, Matthew, and the other books, are reliable, and given by divine inspiration, and are in this respect infallible in their histories and teachings, you will have proved your case. If you cannot do all this, if you will kindly tell us where man left off, and where God began, then we shall be very much obliged and indebted to you. If you admit that Paul, Mark, and others, wrote these histories, pray what portion do you suppose God wrote? Those portions which are in unison with the natural laws of the universe, or those that contradict them? Those that are consonant with reason or those that are antagonistic to it? What are we supposed to think that God would most naturally write? Should we expect that Deity would, write, that portion which in itself cannot be maintained on the mere grounds of assertion, or that he would write that which had proof and evidence upon its surface? Tell us which part God has inspired, and which he has left to take its chance, for "infidels" to grapple with, and sceptics to hurl weapons against. Tell us how you know that any of these parts were written by God. Is it your judgment which decides these points? Has Deity made any special revelation to you? You have already admitted that the quotations from the Greek authors were not written by God, that the interpolations were not and you have also admitted that those genealogies were not written by God. You have admitted that the advice of Paul to Timothy about the wine drinking was not written by God, nor was it an act that a good templar would approve of.

We humbly and courteously ask you to be the revealer of God's word to us, and to now tell us where His writings are, and whether Matthew and Luke laid their pens into the hands of the Infinite, Who, thereby revealed His infallible will to man. If you cannot make that distinction, then the divine origin of Christianity cannot be affirmed consistently, and cannot be logically maintained. We would not here trouble you further, but you have, so far, only adduced *mere assertions* as evidence in favor of the divine origin of Christianity; and, instead of meeting the objections we have advanced against your argument you have only tried to prove that Matthew wrote Matthew, that Mark wrote Mark, and that Luke wrote Luke, which we already had granted; although if we considered it necessary for our purpose we could bring rebutting evidence to disprove this. As we before stated, even allowing that the gospels were written by the authors claimed for them, that would not prove the divine origin of Christianity; for if so, on like reasoning, if it be admitted that the Book of Mormon was written by Joe Smith, to whose authorship it is ascribed,

then Mormonism must be of divine origin also,—and the same in regard to the Koran, if it is admitted that Mahomet wrote it. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

I will just call your attention to the case of Matthew and Luke again, and to the ingenious suggestion of our friend in regard to it. Is it not likely, if Mary descended from a different family to that from which Joseph descended, that they would have descended from two sons of David? There is nothing contradictory in the fact that Joseph's generation should be traced up to David through Solomon, and that of Mary's up to David through Nathan: Where is the contradiction? I should be glad if our friend would point it out. Then as to the other contradictions, I am surprised at the nature of my friend's objections. That, for example, in regard to Simon the Canaanite, and that about Thaddeus being also called Judas. If our friend would remember, many in these days have two or three names—just as the kings of Israel are known by two, or three, or more names. Is it not rather a confirmation of the veracity of the narrative, and an evidence that these men were sincere, and were speaking the truth, when, instead of keeping to the same names, they used different ones, but still names belonging to the persons? One calls a person John Mark, and another simply says John; one says of Simon that he is Simon the Canaanite, and another says Simon Zelotes. I ask, where is the contradiction? Then, again, our friend would correct the gospel narrative of Matthew because, in the account of the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, John must have been killed, seeing he was only six months older than Christ. This was stated by my friend in a lecture delivered some few evenings ago. Our friend forgets that Christ was born in Bethlehem, and John in the hill country. How the slaughter in Bethlehem could affect John twenty-five miles away I am certainly at a loss to imagine. I shall refer more to this by-and-bye.

I wish now to bring up my argument, and for brevity's sake, and that I may be the more perspicuous and pointed, I have reduced it to writing. Having established the fact that the four gospels existed in the 1st century, we have now to deal with the question as to whether these writings have been preserved in their original form to the present day. If they have, and that fact can be established, then we shall be in a position to inquire whether they came from God at the first. We therefore consider the question as it arises in logical order, Have the New Testament writings been preserved from the time of their origin to the present, without material alteration? "This question has reference, not to the translations of the New Testament but to the Greek original. We are not affected by the last few years, for on the 10th of January, 1514, the Greek New Testament was first put into print, and since then, thanks to the perfection with which copies of a book may be multiplied by printing, there can have occurred no serious alteration of the text—none but typographical errors which were easily detected and promptly corrected. Our inquiry has reference to the period from the close of the first century, when books of the

New Testament are supposed to have existed in the handwriting of the authors, to the beginning of the 16th century? We seek to know whether any alterations have occurred within those 1400 years, when copies were made by the slow, and comparatively uncertain method of handwriting, and we are at no loss to answer. Nearly 1000 of these written copies called MSS. have been carefully compared with each other, and no two have been found precisely alike. Dr. John Mill, of Oxford, spent thirty years of hard labor, comparing copies word by word, and letter by letter, and in 1707 the results of his labors were published, which showed the discovery of about 30,000 instances of differences among the copies which he, and others before him, had examined; others also have engaged in this work,—Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tichendorf, Tregelles, and others,—and have discovered other differences, so that we admit that a multitude of mistakes have crept into the New Testament. Let there be no misunderstanding. It is not affirmed that 30,000 errors have been found in the Greek text from which our English version was made, nor that any such number has been found in any *one* Greek MSS. but that all the various readings in all the MSS. combined, which have been so far collated, amount to this number. We admit that these facts, when first made known to a believer, have a startling effect. They suggest the query, which was again put by my friend last evening, "If so many errors have crept into the text, how may I know, when reading a passage, and think of relying upon it, that it is not one which has been corrupted?" It was this inquiry, and the fear connected with it, which led Christian scholars to enter on this department of study. The result has been a joyful confirmation of faith, and such has been the experience of all who have pursued these inquiries until they have attained to a proper understanding of the facts.

Now as to the character of these differences: as all the ancient copies of the scriptures were in writing, it will be admitted that, many mistakes might be made in copying which would not affect the sense, as for example, mistakes in spelling and grammar, and we may therefore assume, that there might be many thousands of errors of this kind in the Bible, and yet not one of them affect the sense. Let me illustrate this by a statement of the facts:—

1. Many errors consist in different ways of spelling the same word.
2. Many in the insertion of a noun or pronoun where it was left to be understood.
3. Many arise from wrong numbers, and cases, of nouns and pronouns, being written, and the wrong tenses of verbs.
4. Many errors consist in the insertion, or omission, of articles and conjunctions, where these sometimes might affect the sense, yet much less so in Greek, than in English.
5. The substitution of one word of similar meaning for another—*e. g.* "came," for "drew near."

Besides the immense number of various readings of the kinds named, there are a few of another class which do, to some extent, affect the sense. They are the genuine passages of scripture copied into the wrong places—*e. g.*, Acts IX, 5, from chapt. XXVI, 14.



2. Interpolated ideas, which, though truly scriptural, are nowhere found in the same words, *e. g.* Acts VII, 37.
3. A few, where the fact is wrongly stated, one name being given in error for another, *e. g.* Acts. VII, 6, where Abraham is given for Jacob.

It will be seen, that while errors are numerous, the effect upon the whole is really small. The relative results may be stated in the words of Dr. Davidson, "No new doctrine has been elicited by its aid, nor have any historical facts been summoned by it from their obscurity. All the doctrines, and duties, of Christianity remain unaffected by it" This is the consistent, and united testimony, of all acquainted with the subject, and it proves, that in all matters of doctrine, duty, and history, the New Testament of to-day, is the same as when it came from the hands of its authors.

We now come to the question, how these errors originated. The causes from which these errors originated are both natural and various:—

1. Inattention. Persons copying know how difficult it is to keep the mind from wandering momentarily for one hour, and how certainly mistakes will occur when this is the case. The greater part of the errors arose in this manner.
2. Writing from dictation. From its greater speed this plan would often be adopted, and as in thus writing there was only *sound* to guide them, errors might easily occur on the part of the writer, or they might be caused by the reader.
3. Trusting too much to memory. This would be a great temptation, for speed's sake. This might occur whether writing from dictation, or otherwise.
4. Errors of interpolation would occur thus:—
  - (a). A copyist would sometimes miss a line, or part of a line, and having detected his error, insert it in the margin of his parchment in a smaller hand; and others, copying from this, would see the marginal correction, and re-insert it in the body of the text.
  - (b). Sometimes a copyist ventured to write on the margin, some expression, or comments, of his own; and another, mistaking it for a passage unintentionally omitted, would correct the supposed error by inserting it in the text. It is supposed that the doxology at the end of the Lord's prayer, and probably 1 John V, 7, and Acts VIII, 3, 7, were inserted in this way.
  - (c). If there are any intentional errors they are few, and do not call for remark.

Now as to how these errors can be corrected: it may be remarked that no original MSS. of the Apostles and Evangelists have been preserved to the present: when first issued they would naturally be eagerly read by the disciples, and passed from hand to hand so rapidly, as to be soon worn out. No books ever written were handled by

so many and so continuously: copies would be multiplied, and those having new ones would lay the old and soiled original ones aside. As a result, the originals soon disappeared, and are not mentioned by later writers whose works have come down to us.

But there are nearly 1200 MS. copies of the New Testament stored in the Libraries of Europe, and written between the fourth and fourteenth centuries: all have been compared with each other, word by word, and letter by letter, and it is found that they nearly all unite in condemning many readings in the copy from which the English translation was made.

It is clear, that, where all, or nearly all, agree on one certain word, the chances are 1000 to 1 that they are right. The disagreeing copy is corrected accordingly, and, it is morally certain, is brought into agreement thereby with the original. In many cases there is this agreement, or a near approach to it; and where MSS. are nearly equally divided on a given reading, preference is given to the older and more carefully written MSS. In this way, most unquestionable conclusions are obtained, as to all but a very small number of readings.

1. There are also many early translations of the New Testament into other languages which greatly help; *e. g.* the Syriac, and parts of one into Latin, each made about the middle of the second century, or within fifty years of the completion of the New Testament writings. A hundred years later, translations were made into dialects of Egypt, where Christianity prevailed early; then a hundred years later into Ethiopic, and Gothic, and another into Latin; and after this many versions were made into different tongues. All these represent, in their respective tongues, readings of Greek copies from which they were translated, and scholars, by translating back into Greek, can tell, with certainty in most instances, what was the wording of the Greek text. Taken together, they show the state of the Greek text during the first four or five centuries, and many readings, the correctness of which cannot be decided by MSS. alone, are settled at once, when the added testimony of translations is considered.
2. Another means by which the work of correction is aided, is the evidence, in the writings of persons who lived prior to the death of the Apostle John, and, subsequently, of numerous and copious quotations, and these quotations tell plainly how the passages quoted were worded at the time when made. All such quotations have been carefully culled from these authors by Lachmann and others, who made this their especial study, and by this means many conclusions, reached from other sources of evidence, have been confirmed, and some readings settled which other evidences left in doubt.
3. After exhausting these sources of evidence there remain a small number of readings the correctness of which

must be determined in some other way; e.g. such as that before referred to in Acts VII, 16, and in John XIX, 14,.

The above sources of evidence do not enable us to decide in these cases, but by the parallel passages Gen. XXXIII, 19, and Matt. XV, 25, supported by the facts of the history, we are enabled to arrive at certainty. It is therefore safe to conclude, that in these two, and a few similar cases, although we cannot trace the mistake to its origin, a mistake of the copyist has occurred in each of these places. By such means, it is clear we are able to decide with certainty the original leading of the New Testament MSS. in regard to almost every word. We are able also to put finger upon every word, concerning which certainty is not yet known; so that it can be said that all others but these, were written thus, and so, by the original writers. Not only can this be done; but it has been; and in the corrected Greek texts published by Tichendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and Green, we have this very result in our hands. It will now be apparent, that whilst during the first 1400 years, the books of the New Testament were constantly becoming more inaccurate as copies were multiplied, by the invention of printing, God has providentially arrested this deterioration, and during the last 300 years, the mistakes of the previous MOO have been undergoing detection and correction, until at last they have almost totally disappeared, and we have to day a more correct copy of the New Testament than has ever existed since the originals perished."

The position, then, at which we have arrived in the controversy is this:—

1. The continuity of Christianity has been traced up to the very period when it is said to have commenced, and for this the testimony of heathens and Christians is clear; and that prior to that time no trace of it can be found,
2. The identity of the doctrines of Christianity in the first century, with those contained in our New Testament, has been proved beyond dispute.
3. The genuineness of the four gospels has been proved, and no attempt has been made *to* disprove it, and
4. We have shown that we have positive evidence, that the text of the New Testament is so pure, that it is really and truly that which was written by the inspired Apostles and Evangelists.

Now, my friends, all I have asked you to admit concerning these gospels is that they are authentic history. I am not now attempting to prove their inspiration: I say there is not a work in the world, not a single writing, that has been handed down from hoary antiquity, that can produce one tithe of the evidence, as to its authenticity, that these books can. (Applause.)

MR. WALKER:

Really it is a test of our patience to listen to our friend's imputations against our side of the argument—namely, that there is no real or genuine evidence that there have been no interpolations; and we are yet waiting for proofs of his position. The only argument he attempted to bring forward was, that there were probably no more mistakes in the New Testament than have been discovered. Are these proofs, we ask him? Should these "chances" be brought to bear upon such an important matter as this? And this after 30,000 differences have been enumerated by our friend in quoting from Dr. John Mill? We admit these writings as histories of the opinions, ideas, and doings of these ancient men, just in the same manner as we admit the works of Homer as being the history of Greek ideas; and the writings of John, and Luke, and the others are of no greater authenticity, according to our friend's admission. If the writings of Homer be a fact, then why not accept one as well as the other? If one proves the divine origin of Christianity, then the writings of Homer prove the divine origin of the mythology of those days.

Now, let us again refer to the contradictions, to show that they are not yet reconciled by our friend. In the first place, he tells us that Matthew *may* give the genealogy of Mary, and the other of Joseph; and that, therefore, there are no contradictions! Does Matthew tell us that? Does Luke make mention of it. From what work does our friend get this information? We are not going to admit here as evidence of these books the "may-be's," or the mere suppositions of the nineteenth century, in defence of this book. We are not going to admit these suppositions, unless they are distinctly stated in the records themselves. Supposing Mary is traced through Joseph's ancestors from the line of David, and supposing Joseph is traced through the same ancestor, they were then brothers and sisters, and then there certainly could have been no legitimate marriage. Even if they could have been traced through different lines from Nathan and Solomon, it would not have decided the question at issue. Unless we had the statements that this is the genealogy of Mary, and this of Joseph, by one or the other, we cannot admit our friend's suppositions to be valid. (Applause.)

Then, in reference to these different names of the apostles, to which we made allusion. Our friend tells us that many had two or more names, and that one author called them by one name and another by a different one. This does not explain the matter, for did they not know both their names,—that there was Simon the Canaanite, and Simon Zelotes? When they were quoting these different names how do we know they alluded to the same individual? And is it even probable that they did so? for it must be admitted that there is a marked distinction in the names as stated. If this be so, then we assert there is a contradiction, and the record is invalidated.

Our friend did not allude to the historical evidence we gave from Josephus, that Zacharias, who was slain between the temple and the altar, was thus slain after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus; and therefore, that Jesus could not have said this. This is either a wilful lie or an unintentional one on the part of Matthew. But

whether it be wilfully or ignorantly told, it does not alter the case in the least; because the fact is the same. It tends to mislead us; and if we are to get at the divine origin of Christianity with such conflicting histories as our friend professes to rely on, how are we to decide without infallible judgment?

Our friend has told us that, after all, the interpolations may have been unintentional, and got into the manuscripts from which our gospels have been made either by mistakes in copying, by the inclusion of marginal notes, lapses of memory, or many other causes, but that God providentially prevented these errors spreading any further by the invention of the printing press!!! Now, will our opponent kindly satisfy this audience, on the next occasion he addresses them, as to the time when, and by what means, God providentially told him that He thus *providentially* interposed in this respect? Or, if not, will he kindly give us his reasons for telling what God does, or does not, in reference to man? Will he tell us how he gets the authority thus to become the high-priest of God's will and action in reference to His reign upon Earth? Our friend has shown to you most elaborately and eloquently the failings in the history, and the evidence, in instancing the numerous interpolations by man, &c., and he admits that he cannot go back to the original manuscripts. And here, again, because he cannot produce these, he says it *may be this, or it may be that*. But we are not going to admit presumptive evidence of any kind into the discussion, unless our friend can shew the why and the wherefore clearly. As to opinions and suppositions of this character, we cannot admit them as evidence. We challenged him last evening, and we challenge him again to-night—though by his silence he has admitted his inability to do so—to produce the original, written by Matthew in his own dialect. If we have now only *copies of copies*, what proof have we that the first copies from the original did not have marginal references? Or was there here *another* providential interposition? If these records were written through infallible inspiration, how were they not preserved through infallible interposition? Is the Bible that is now used in the Christian Churches free from those errors which our friend admits? Is the Bible, as we now have it, absolutely free from contamination? Does it contain the interpolations he has told you of? Certainly it does, and he and every minister in Christendom using that Bible are guilty of *misleading* their congregations until these errors and interpolations are eradicated. The least these men could do would be to place placards in conspicuous places in their churches, notifying these interpolations, and inform their congregations of these egregious falsehoods—thus allowing the uninformed, and unlettered, and those that are not versed in the Greek text, to know in reality that which is genuine and that which is spurious. We know full well that there are many who have based their beliefs on the very texts now pronounced spurious. There are those who rest their hope thereon, and who firmly believe in their very hearts and souls that these "revelations," including every verse contained in that book labelled "holy," came from God; and Christian ministers are allowing them *so* to believe still, and never refer to these all-important fabrications whilst they preach perhaps, an occasional sermon on some trifling doctrinal points of no

great interest, leaving these vital questions to take care of themselves. This indifference among Christian ministers in this enlightened "nineteenth century"—that sits at the feet of science and pours its voluminous literature in a constant stream to posterity,—when eloquence takes the flaming stars from their orbits and sends them dancing in fancy before the eye of the listener, until the very Universe floats before man's mental vision—when man's investigations are tending everywhere towards the spirit of scepticism which, while scorning such "revelations," is, nevertheless, illuminating the world on every hand with light and truth—we say this indifference now is deplorable indeed. And what are we to think of the preceding centuries—so dark—so gloomy—so dull? What are we to think of the time when, in the interests of the Church, historians and critics were silenced, and error was fostered and cherished—when to lie for the advancement of the Church was held to be highly commendable? Hundreds have gone to their congregations, feeling in their own hearts that these texts were proved,—that they were genuine, and imagining they were revealed by God! It has been left to men of genius and learning to expose these errors, and many men have been obliged to do it in spite of their profession. May we be permitted to say why these spurious texts are not expunged from the Bible. If they were, and the attention of the world was drawn to them, then the natural logical tendency of the minds of men would cause them to suspect that there were still more that was spurious that had not been pointed out to them, and grave doubts would arise in their minds in reference to other points.

Now, leaving this, let us return to our friend's answers. He has alluded to the lecture we have had the honor and pleasure to deliver in your city, and taken umbrage at our saying that John the Baptist being only six months older than Jesus when the massacre ordered by Herod took place, there was no necessity to Bend Jesus to Egypt to escape. Our friend says John was born among the hills of Judea, and therefore would naturally escape. Why, then, did they not send Jesus to keep John company? He would there have been equally safe. But the massacre was in all Judea, and \_\_\_\_\_

MR. GREEN. You are in error.—

MR. WALKER: I ask my friend to correct me if I am wrong.

MR. GREEN: My friend asks me to correct him. In Bethlehem, *not* in Judea.

MR. WALKER: Will our friend read the 2nd Matt., 16th verse?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coast thereof."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient for our point. "In Bethlehem, and *all the coast thereof*." It may be well to mention, also, on this point, that although Josephus records all, or most of, the cruelties of Herod, we defy our friend to find a single sentence in Josephus's works referring to this massacre; or even to point out a single historian in the Roman or Grecian world of that period that mentions such an occurrence. It is not mentioned by Mark, or Luke,

or John, and simply on the assertion of Matthew are we asked to accept this text. However, it matters little whether the event took place or not, as far as regards the proof as to the divine origin of Christianity. If Herod did destroy these children, that does not prove the divine origin of Christianity. As yet we have merely had opinions and assertions. We are still waiting for the single proof that our friend can produce to sustain his position. He has shown that the gospels and epistles are not of divine origin; and these constitute the New Testament, with the addition of a few other books. And thus, again we ask, if the basis be not of divine origin how can the superstructure be? Will he kindly, in his next address, give us something of *his* Christianity? We will grant all the contradictions, and rest satisfied with his references to the interpolations; for in these he has proved our case for us, and has now gone far towards establishing our position. It will please us if, in his next address, he will confine himself to the real object of the discussion—viz., the *divine origin of Christianity*. He has not yet told us what Christianity is—except that *his* opinion of it is to be taken *as* Christianity. He has not yet proved his position from the New Testament, which it was expected he would do to-night.

We will ask, if these gospels and epistles are simply matters of history, what do they relate that is reliable? The life of Jesus being unreliable, as we have shown, and this life of Jesus being our friend's definition of Christianity, how can he prove his case? If these gospels are contradictory on these points, then where is the consistency in showing that the Christianity of the New Testament is of divine origin? Has Providence—has Deity anything more to do with writing the New Testament than with writing the plays of Shakespeare, or of Homer's poetry, or of any other brilliant work of any age? Does not inspiration now universally, in every age and in every clime, and at all times; and are not men inspired to reveal some of the possibilities of mankind, the loftiest products of Nature? Was it not in this respect that Shakespeare was inspired? If not, will our friend show the difference between his inspiration and that of Mark, Luke, or John? Did not all the ancients ask the muse for inspiration? Even later, did not Milton, following the ancient custom, appeal to the heavenly mind to assist him in the work he was undertaking, and to guide him in the way of truth? How do we know that the inspiration of the New Testament was not of the same character? We acknowledge that there are truths and revelations of a noble character in the New Testament. We say there are many precepts of much benefit to the world—but what of this? Does it require "divine inspiration" to bring to light or to originate them? Have not new matters been brought into the world in various ages by the *writings of poets*? philosophers, and others? (Applause.)

### THIRD EVENING:

THURSDAY, 7th MARCH.

MR. GREEN, having been introduced by the Chairman in a few preliminary remarks, spoke as follows:

RESPECTED HEARERS: I may just say that I am very sorry that the fifth night cannot be had; but owing to Mr. Walker's desire not to go into the third week, it appears impossible for me to have it. I am sorry, because on the second proposition (which I regard as a very important one, and upon which I would have liked three nights at the very least) we shall be compelled to do with only two, which will not be doing justice at all to the proposition. However, in this matter I am in the hands of Mr. Walker, and as he does not see his way to a further arrangement I must be content to make the best of the time that is left at my disposal.

In regard to some statements made by Mr. Walker, I must confess I could not but feel some degree of sympathy for him, as he appeared to be rather in a fog. You remember, in connection with the matter as to the descent of Joseph and Mary, and the two genealogical tables, that when I stated that there was no difficulty in understanding how,—seeing that Joseph and Mary belonged to two different families,—they would descend, or that they had descended from two different sons of David, in his reply he appears to have been altogether confused. He said, if they were descended from sons of David, they must have been brother and sister, and that accordingly they could not have been married. How he made that out I cannot tell, seeing there were some thousand years between the time when Joseph and David lived. However, I leave that for him to explain. There also seemed to be a considerable jumbling together of Jerusalem and Bethlehem. There certainly was something wanting in my friend's memory, for in the lecture that was handed about the night before last he stated that John was six months older than Jesus. How he could make a slip from six months to six years I am at a loss to imagine. Then, again, when he was corrected concerning the locality, he laid such undue emphasis on the word "coast" that I presume he thought Bethlehem was a sea-coast town, forgetting that it was inland. In the same way, but more inexcusably, he blundered in regard to Zacharias, the son of Barachias. I would suggest, if my friend would allow me, that his guides are unsafe,—that it would be far better for him to depend upon his own researches than upon them. (Applause.)

In connection with that statement concerning Zacharias, son of Barachias, he wished you to believe that, although the Saviour had said that the Jews had killed him, the testimony of Josephus was that this person had not been killed until some years after the death of Christ. Now, had my friend taken the trouble to read these things he would have seen that Josephus contains nothing at all about this man Zacharias, the son of Barachias, but he speaks about Zacharias, the son of Baruch. He says nothing about Zacharias being killed



between the altar and the temple, but he speaks of this Zacharias the son of Baruch being slain in the midst of the temple itself, which is altogether a different place to that spoken of by the Saviour in the gospel. We find in the Chronicles, 24th chapter, a statement of a Zacharias who was killed in this very place, or rather, it is said that he was slain in the court of the temple; and as the altar was in the temple court there was the space named between this altar and the temple, and we might infer that he had been killed there; but then this Zachariah was the son of Jehoiada, and not the son of Barachias at all. In Zacharias I we have probably the very person spoken of by Jesus in the prophet Zacharias, the son of Barachias the son of Iddo, the prophet. We have no information in regard to the life or subsequent death of this Zachariah, the son of Barachias, further than what is given in the book itself. But I may state, what appears to be certainly a matter of the utmost probability, viz., that Zacharias, the prophet, the son of Barachias, was killed by the Jews in the place where the Saviour states, but of which there was no written record, which had been preserved, though it was well known to the Jews of that time; and therefore when he told them that upon them should come all the righteous blood shed upon the Earth, from the blood of righteous Abel down to the blood of Zacharias, the son of Barachias, whom they had slain between the temple and the altar," they knew to whom he referred; and as these persons who were persecuting him, and to whom he was then speaking, were representatives of all the previous persecutors, he said that this righteous blood should be required of them.

Some mistakes were made in reference to Simon the Canaanite and Thaddaeus. When, in the gospel by Mark, it says Simon the Canaanite, it indicates the place from which he came; and when it says Simon Zelotes, the reference is to the sect to which he belonged. In regard to Thaddaeus I may state that Matthew gives him the name of Lebbaeus, which was called Thaddeus. And in the statement in Luke's gospel the name Judas is simply another form of expressing by a slight change the name Thaddaeus, and such changes are common in all languages. You are aware that people often call ladies whose name happens to be Elizabeth by the shorter and familiar names Lizzie, or Betsy, or Bess, and in none of these abbreviations is there the slightest apparent likeness to the name Elizabeth.

We have had only one bit of science in our controversy, thus far. I must now refer to that little again—it will bear turning over once more. My friend said, in regard to my statement as to two individuals having been brought into being otherwise than in the ordinary course of Nature, that my cases were derived from the same source as this disputed one of the Saviour; and that I must first prove the one before I could infer from it that the other was probable. You remember that he asserted that there was no life without generation, and that all life is the result of generation. Well, I would simply say here that Darwin does not believe in this hypothesis of spontaneous generation, for he held that life was "originally breathed into a few forms, or into one;" and Professor Huxley has declared, that so far

as the result which has been shown by scientific tests is concerned, all the evidence is against the spontaneous generation of life.

However, leaving this, I must, in a spirit of pleasant mischief, return a piece of compliment which my friend has paid me. You remember I spoke of certain things as being providential, and my friend asked when (rod had revealed to me that he had done thus and so, and when I had been appointed his high-priest? He ought to know that Christians believe in Providence; and I may say that, although I am not a high-priest, it has been revealed to us by the great high-priest Jesus; that God regards us as so precious as to describe it in the words, "the very hair of your head are all numbered; and that he who cares even for the sparrows considers his children "are of much more value than many sparrows."

Now, in a spirit of pleasantry, such as I have no doubt my friend used when he asked that question, I would ask when, and by whom were you told that all life is the result of generation? I would ask was my friend there when life began? Or has God made known to him by revelation this fact, which he so oracularly declares? We can affirm that science has not yet shown the possibility of the spontaneous generation of life. Although life must have had a beginning, it is not true that all life is the result of generation. But, suppose I admit, for the sake of argument, that all life is the result of generation, will it prove the point my friend sought to establish? May I ask, is it a law, or part of the law of generation and embryology, that man should be produced from the ape? I would ask when has it been so? When have we seen the operations of this law of development, which he seemed to advocate? Suppose I admit that men and women have developed from the ape, or baboon, or from the inferior classes before them? Is that the same law of generation and embryology by which we have come into the world? If, by the production of those two first beings from the ape there was a deviation from that law, then I ask, may there not be a deviation now? Whether we take my friend's hypothesis of the origin of man, or the account in Genesis, to be correct, there have evidently been at least two deviations from the ordinary law of generation and embryology, and this being so, might there not have been another deviation if he who caused the first considered the next to be necessary? (Applause.)

There is only, one point further, and that is in regard to the statement made by my friend as to Joseph's genealogy. In reply to my statement of the reason why Joseph's genealogy was given (though Christ did not descend from him), my friend accused the Deity of deception—that is, of deceiving the people by conveying the idea that Jesus was descended from Joseph. Now, I would say that deception implies false representation, or that there is something in the statement made that is very likely to carry a false impression. Is my friend so ignorant of the New Testament as not to know what is written in the first chapter of Matthew, where the miraculous conception of Jesus is stated? Is he so ignorant as not to know what is contained in the 3rd chapter of Luke? "Being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph," clearly indicating that it was only by

repute that he was his father. Where is the need of all this effort to steal a march, and to win your sympathies by asking whether the Deity used deception to establish this principle in the world?

Now, let me just take up my affirmative argument and rapidly proceed. I have shown that Christianity began in the first century, and that it had no existence before that time, and that it has continued in an unbroken continuity from then till now, and that the Christians of the first century held the same doctrines as essential to Christianity as are found in the New Testament now.

I have shown that the two theories I have examined—the sun theory of Drummond, and the mythical theory of Strauss and Renan,—have no basis on which to rest; and, further, that the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are the genuine products of those men, which my friend has admitted. Further, that these writings of the new Testament are identically the same as written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Now, I would further ask you to observe that I have said nothing of the individual inspiration of these writers, and for this reason: that the proposition is not the inspiration of the Scriptures, but—"Is Christianity of divine origin?" I do not care to establish the inspiration of the Scriptures; that would not help my present purpose. I am simply seeking to establish that these gospels are, substantially and veritably, correct historical records given by reliable *men*. I do not care a straw, for the purpose of my argument, whether they were inspired or not—though, were that my proposition, I would bring enough evidence to show that they were inspired. Their inspiration has nothing to do with the subject I am determined to demonstrate, viz., that these records are simply narratives of facts, given by truthful and reliable men, and that through them the Christianity they teach, is proved to be of divine origin.

Now, just passing these matters, we come to the very heart of the question. I would state it in this form: How did Christianity originate? In regard to it, I may say that the only true answer which can be given *to* this question is, that it originated with God, and was made manifest *to* man in the way stated in the Scriptures. I would ask you to bear in mind that the Old Testament Scriptures were translated into Greek nearly 300 years before the coming of Christ, so that whatever testimony they may give in regard to these matters in the way of evidence, it is clear there could have been no collusion. As the Jews, who were opposed to Christ, have been the preservers of these Scriptures, it is evident that Christians cannot be charged with in any way tampering with them. Let me remind you that the Bible is a harmonious whole; that it has a unity of plan and purpose, though written at different times, and by different persons, over a period of fifteen hundred years, which can only be the result of the operation of an omniscient being through the persons by whom these various but harmonious communications were made. I have, therefore, having just promised this, to call your attention to one or two things in connection with prophecy as a point of evidence. We may say that several things were clearly predicted hundreds of years before they took place; and, further, that they can be shown to have oc-

curred. As no human being could predict these events hundreds of years, before they occurred, and bring about their fulfilment, there must have been a higher, and a divine agency at work in them. Let me now rapidly bring before you an outline of the whole scheme of Redemption, both in its preparatory stage, and in its complete manifestation. As soon as the fall took place we have the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. That promise was repeated to Abraham, that of his seed one should arise who was to bring blessing to the whole human race. It was said that that seed should come through Jacob, and, further, it was declared that it should be through the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David. That he was to be divine, and in proof of this you will doubtless remember the passage in the prophecy of Isaiah, "unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," &c. He was to be born of a virgin, in Bethlehem, in a poor and mean condition, and to come while the temple stood. The Messiah is declared by Moses, in Deuteronomy, not to be a warrior, but to be a prophet, and teacher. He was to be endowed with a peculiar kind of wisdom, and was to abolish the ceremonies of the Jewish law;—was to display wonderful works, to be rejected by the Jews, and to be betrayed by a professed friend for 30 pieces of silver, which silver was to buy a potter's field. He was to be afflicted, yet utter no complaint; vinegar was to be given to him in his sufferings; he was to be pierced, yet no bone of him was to be broken; lots were to be cast for his clothes; and in his death and burial he was to be associated with the wicked and rich. (Applause.)



MR. WALKER:

Our friend has commenced by reviewing our speech of last evening, and noticing a *lapsus linguæ* or two that we made; and asserted, or intimated that these were evidence of confusion, and probably detrimental to the argument we wished to adduce. Our friend certainly knew the words we intended to use, but, in the heat of the argument, we substituted Jerusalem for Egypt. The desire of our opponent to make capital out of the merest trifle would seem to be an admission that the cause which he advocates is feeble indeed. From our having made use of a wrong word, does he wish us to go over the argument again?

Now, if we failed to make ourselves distinctly understood, as we expect we did in reference to the genealogy from David through two distinct lines, we will endeavor to explain this evening, so that there can possibly be no misconception.

In the lines from David to Joseph, given by Matthew and Luke, there are only two names, David and Joseph, in each, and they both come to Joseph. Now, our friend, in order to reconcile the genealogies, supposes that one came down through Mary, although the record fails to assert which one that was. Let us suppose that it was Matthew, for the sake of argument. Now Matthew himself says that Joseph was the terminating descendant; therefore, if Mary came through that line, as

given by Matthew, and Joseph came through the same line, according to this testimony, he was then brother to Mary. Or, if you transfer it again to Luke, the same result is manifest. Now, what are our friend's grounds for representing Mary as a descendant of David, and in asserting that Joseph probably married Mary? Or, in other language, probably Joseph had his genealogy given simply to show that Jesus came through the line of David, as an argument to the Jews that he did so come. But will this view really explain how Jesus should be called the "son of David," and "the son of man," if he had not an earthly father? If, we say, in these statements there is an opposition to all these genealogical details, then what is the use of giving these details? It stands thus, to put it in a clear and unmistakable manner:—If Matthew describes the origin of Jesus from the house of David, and Luke attempts to do the same thing, and they disagree, then one or the other must be false. If one is describing the descent of Mary, and does not distinctly so state, but puts Joseph in the place of Mary, either he fails through ignorance to express what he means, or he wilfully tells a falsehood. And this error or falsehood, is given in support of the divine origin of Christianity!!! But, as we have shown, if Matthew gives the genealogy of Mary, then there is deception; but our opponent asserts it is no deception, because in the same chapters in which this is given we are told in reality how this happened—how Jesus came into existence by "immaculate conception!" Now, let us take this a little further. In the record where Jesus is described as disputing in the temple with the doctors and others, and his father and mother were searching for him, is it not stated very distinctly that Joseph was his father? And if Joseph was not his father, how could he ever be truly or justly called so? (Applause.)

Now, we will take this position: if Jesus, according to our friend's showing, was begotten in any other form than the generality of men, if he came into existence upon a superior plane and upon a basis distinctly removed from all the rest of humanity, then he was not a man; and, therefore, he can be no-example to man,—to beings on a different plane, who come into the world by the ordinary method of generation. If he came into existence, however, by a similar line of descent that any other man comes, then we assert he was simply a man, and no (rod).

Our friend has incorrectly stated that we accused the Deity of deception; whereas we only asked him, was it his opinion that God had introduced Christianity by deception, in the case of Joseph's genealogy being given, to prove the Davidical descent of Jesus; and, after this, its being declared that Joseph was *not* the father of Jesus. We now further ask, can the relations of these palpable contradictions be truthful and reliable men, as our friend has asserted; and can their inharmonious writings be of divine origin? As to our friend's elaborate remarks to prove that where prophecies have been fulfilled there is evidence of divine omniscience and power, he forgets that these remarks apply equally to the prophecies of Mother Shipton, Cazotte, Swedenborg, and others, which have also been fulfilled. Then, as to Jesus being "a divine being," and to his having raised the dead, &c, all this is related in the Buddhist sacred writings respecting their incarnated god;—but does this make Buddhism of divine origin?

Let us again refer to the arguments that our worthy opponent has adduced to annul the differences in the names of the disciples of

*Jems.* In enumerating them our friend says, that in all probability these are different names for the same people—something like the nick-names that are conferred on Christians in the 19th century. Does our friend know that in these instances there were *two* Thaddoeuses described?—that it was afterwards shown that Thaddoeus was called by another name? Now we would ask, is probability to be introduced as argument to account for this? We cannot count anything as probable in our estimation, unless supported by facts and arguments free from any bias. Do any of the gospels say these men had nick-names? Do the gospels say these are not the men they are represented to be, that they are so-and-so, *alias* so-and-so, just as we hear people referred to in the courts of justice in the 19th century? This must be certainly held as a rule: where the different names of the parties are distinctly known they must be given; and it is evidence of this nature that must be given in this instance. If the evidence given in support of such an important matter as the divine origin of Christianity is weaker than the evidence given in modern courts, then we say it cannot be admitted as conclusive in the least degree. Then our friend twits us with our lack of knowledge of Josephus. We quoted from him one passage in reference to the slaying, between the altar and the temple, of Zacharias the son of Baruch. Our friend has taken us back to when another individual is mentioned as being slain between the temple and the altar, or in the court of the temple, describing that the altar was then within the temple, and he says truly that Josephus describes the slaying of Zacharias the son of Baruch, in the temple, but does not mention the altar. Well, is the altar mentioned in the other? If our friend presumes in one case, *may it not be presumed in another and similar case?* Our friend has thrown us out of court because we did not mention the correct name, and then he brings in another Zacharias, of whom we know nothing, as he himself tells you, and says it is very probable that Jesus alluded to him. Now, are we again to admit these presumptions and probabilities as arguments? Are probabilities to be taken as facts? We want to deal with the record. Was that Zacharias, of whom we know nothing, slain between the temple and the altar? Does the record say this was the one? Either Jesus knew of him or he alluded to the other. We desire the record of the history itself, or the source from which our friend has ascertained which Zacharias is meant in this instance.

Our friend kindly, and with good feeling, for which we have to compliment him, asked us when we had revealed to us that life did not come into existence by any spontaneous method, and that it came into being, as all life does, as the result of generation! We did not claim to have this revealed to us by Providence, neither did we say that Providence in its wisdom saw fit to do so. You will remember *he* made the assertion that Providence saw fit to do so-and-so, and to operate in this manner, as though he was on perfectly familiar terms with God, and knew full well that Providence would do or had done so, or was capable of doing so-and-so. In our case we made no such claim, and therefore his returning the compliment is certainly out of place. We know that Adam could not have come into existence in the manner described, but by no revelation of Providence do we claim this knowledge. We are informed that Professor Tyndal, Huxley, and other physicists, who

have followed these experiments and the deductions of Bastian, in reference to the spontaneous generation of life, have shown that these experiments, where thoroughly tested under stringent conditions, refute the very position taken by the advocates of the theory of spontaneous generation, and therefore it is concluded, by some of the ablest scientific minds of the 19th century, that no spontaneous generation can take place. Now, in the case of Adam, what generation was there prior to him? Was his existence spontaneous, or was there something prior to bring it into being? Our opponent tells us in one instance that spontaneous generation is impossible; and yet in the next that it took place! We do not wish to follow our friend in his remarks about Darwinism and the theory of evolution, which describes all life in its complex forms as having been derived from some former and simpler basis. But, as we were saying, we do not want to follow this matter, because it is foreign to the discussion which is to decide, one way or the other, as to whether Christianity is of divine origin. Yet we will say that the theory of Darwin is more capable of demonstration: in fact the whole of the proof is on the side that life, in its growth of forms, has been gradual, though Darwin does not say that man sprang directly from monkeys, corresponding with those which inhabit the forests of Africa in the 19th century.

We feel that it is our duty again to refer to our friend's admissions of last evening, as to the contradictions and incongruities in the Bible. He told us that there were 30,000 errors in the manuscript, which had been detected by careful comparison of the originals. He told us of forgeries having found their way among the so-called sacred writings, and yet he comes forward this evening and tells us that, as a whole, this book is a model of perfection! We are correctly informed that the Old Testament was translated in Alexandria (we suppose he alludes—in fact he must do so—to the Septuagint version) and this he urges as an argument that the Jews who wrote the New Testament could have had no knowledge of these prophecies as they were written; and, therefore, when these prophecies were recorded as having been *fulfilled* they were so written without any previous knowledge of the Old Testament prophecies. Such we understand his argument to be. As an offset we challenged him to produce a single original gospel written in the Hebrew tongue; or to bring forward a single author who stated that he himself had seen the gospel of Matthew said to have been written in the dialect which these people spoke. We have asked him to produce the original copies to show us these, that we may judge of the language in which they were written. Is it not a fact, known to all students of history, that, as far as we are able to trace back the *originals*, *they are all* written in the Greek language? It is, therefore, not only possible but exceedingly probable that the writers of the gospels were Hellenist Jews, who had come in contact with the Greek translation of the Old Testament, in possession of the Neo Platonists, of the school of Alexandria, which had been founded by the Ptolemies, and where a variety of mystical doctrines originated. You perceive, then, the Bible was translated in Greek, and afterwards the fulfilment of the prophecies was also written in Greek. This is *prima facie* evidence, at all events, that there was knowledge, by those who wrote the later, of the former writings? Nay! the very;

writings themselves declare this, for when a prophecy is recorded as fulfilled you read "this was done that it *might* be fulfilled;" and, apparently, some are fulfilled for no other purpose! If then, this was done "that it might be fulfilled," certainly they knew of the prophecy, or otherwise how could they say it was fulfilled. Strange to say, the writers often evince an imperfect knowledge of the prophecies, for they prove decidedly too much at times. The case of the "virgin conceiving and bearing a son:" "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and be with child, and bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emanuel," is a case in point. Now, this is given in Isaiah "as a sign to Ahaz." In the next chapter this child is born, so that there is a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy in his own time. If it was to Christ—, to whom he was alluding, how comes it that it was to be a sign unto Ahaz? Let us show that the gospel of Matthew, which we shall quote upon these points, evinces this imperfection of knowledge. For instance, we there read that Jesus went into Egypt, and was brought out again, and this was done "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying out of Egypt have I called my son." "This was done that it might be fulfilled!" The prophets have said so-and-so; therefore, Jesus *must* do so-and-so. If it were not for the purpose of fulfilling the prophecies, in all probability these things would not have been done. Let us refer to Hosea XI chap., 1st verse. It says: "When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." "When Israel was a child!" Is Israel Jesus? "I called my son put of Egypt!" If he *had* been called, how could they prophecy of his being called? Now, there is an evident failure, or mistake, or forgery in the prophecy; and if this occurs in one prophecy what evidence have we that forgeries, mistakes, and failures do not occur in others? When he returned from Egypt we are informed that "he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, he shall be called a Nazarene." Now, where is the prophet who called Jesus a Nazarene? There is not a single one. If there is, let this prophecy be produced. (Applause.)



Mr. GREEN:

May I again say I cannot congratulate my friend on the perfection of his influences? Either that or his memory, has been detective. I never said anything about the Jews not knowing of these prophecies, for they did know of them. I said, distinctly and emphatically, that as the Old Testament was translated into Greek, nearly 300 years before Christ, there could have been no collusion. Collusion and Knowledge are not the same.

Just taking up that matter of science again, as our friend wants to get rid of it. I must remind my friend that I did not bring it in, but he. I did not charge him with speaking of spontaneous generation being impossible. I charged him, that upon his own *ipsi dixit*, he oracularly affirmed (for he gives no authority for it), that there was no life without generation. He did not affirm that there was spontaneous generation. His exact words were, "all life is the result



of generation," He says that I say there is no spontaneous generation, and he affirms that if Adam came into being in the same way that we have, there must have been generation. We have never said that Adam had no beginning; our friend tells us that he came from the baboon.

MR. WALKER: We must rise to order. We distinctly said that we did not trace man to the monkeys of the 19th century.

MR. GREEN: May I say that I was not aware till to-day that Adam lived in the 19th century. (Applause and confusion.) I understood him to be talking about how Adam came into being, at the time when he lived, and not in the 19th century. As he believes man came into being from the ape and lower organisations, therefore, I say he did say that Adam came from the ape. (Interruptions and confusion.)

However, the point I sought to make fairly and clearly is that all life is not the result of generation. There could not have been generation in the first place, therefore my friend must be wrong in his first statements. Whatever might have been the mode in which the first pair originated, they did not originate as all we who are here have done. Therefore, my friend's statements as to this universality of the law of generation and embryology falls to the ground. That is all I cared to prove.

My dear friends, let us just, look at the matter of Bible contradictions. Mr. Walker affirms positively that there are contradictions. Very well then, for these contradictions to be clear and unmistakable, it must be because they admit of no probable explanation, for if they admit of a probable explanation,—that is, if there is an explanation by which the apparent discrepancies can be reconciled, then it is plain, there is not any clear evidence of the contradictions, and we have a right to conclude, that if further information had been given to us, that even the apparent discrepancies would have been fully cleared up. I say it is Mr. W.'s duty to prove that there is a direct and irreconcilable contradiction. He must be able to show that there is no possibility of reconciliation, or his argument falls to the ground. Now, in reference to the prediction of a virgin bearing a son, he says that the prophecy was spoken in reference to Ahaz; and that the son of the prophetess was called Immanuel. The son of the prophetess was called nothing of the kind—he was called Maher-shalal-hash-baz. There is not much similarity between the two names. Let my friend use his sight and look at the book for himself, and he will find it as I have said. Now, if the text in the 7th chap, of Isaiah is noticed, it will be seen that the Lord tells Ahaz to ask a sign of him, and that he refuses, and because of this pretended humility of Ahaz, and as a rebuke to him, Isaiah turns to the people and not to Ahaz, and declares these words, "Hear ye now, O house of David," not "hear ye O, Ahaz," but "hear ye now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good; for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good the

land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." The land was not forsaken of her kings, when the prophet's son was born, but it was forsaken when Christ was born, in whom the prophecy is fulfilled.

Now, I would call your attention again to the 28 prophetic statements which I hurriedly ran over in my last, and which have had their actual fulfilment in Christ; and also to two others which are found in the book of Daniel. In the 2nd chapter, of Daniel we have an account of an image which appeared to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream, and which image portrayed certain changes in the dynastic arrangements of nations. This image is represented to have its head of gold, its arms and breasts of silver, its belly and thighs of brass, while its legs were of iron, and its feet part of iron and part of clay. Now, the interpretation of that dream is this: the head of the image represented Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian Empire; the arms and breast, the kingdom of Medo-Persia, by which the Babylonian was subjugated; the belly and thighs of brass, the Grecian kingdom under Alexander; and thus we have the Babylonian, Persian, and Grecian Empires, which followed each other in regular succession. Then we have the legs of iron, and the feet part of iron and part of clay; this represents the Roman Empire, which arose after the others. Let me now read you two other verses, which seem clearly to point out the republican character of Rome; and also what we know is taught in Roman history concerning the discordant elements in the empire, and which is clearly indicated by "the feet part of iron and part of clay." In the 2nd chapter of Daniel, v. 43, 44, we read: "And whereas thou, sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Thus, the kingdom to be set up by the God of Heaven is to be established in the days of the Roman Empire, or before the termination of the last of the four universal monarchies spoken of by Daniel, and if the kingdom was not then set up the prophecy is clearly falsified. We know that Christianity was established in the time of the Roman Empire, and in the days of Augustus Caesar. This prediction is, therefore, true, or nothing can be true at all. (Applause.)

In the 9th chapter of Daniel we have a most important prediction. It is one of the most clear and circumstantial that can possibly be, and I would ask my friend to give it his attention, and bring all his powers of argument to bear when replying to it. In the verses 25 to 27 we read, "Know therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment, to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three-score and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after three-score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war

desolations are determined. And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

Now, let me call your attention to the facts in connection with this case. You will see that the exact period in Daniel is stated to be 7 weeks, and 62 weeks, and one week, making in all 70 weeks. You will find the giving forth of this commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem in the 7th chap, of Ezra, 8th to 11th verses,—“And he came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king (Artaxerxes.) For upon the first day of the first month began he to go up from Babylon, and on the first day of the fifth month came he to Jerusalem, according to the good hand of his God upon him. For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.” Please mark what I have said, that the writers of these scriptures could have had no collusion with the Christians, as the Old Testament scriptures were translated into Greek nearly 300 years before the time of Christ, and these predictions were, therefore, well-known. This very book of Daniel existed in Hebrew, and was shown by the high priest to Alexander, the Emperor of Greece, when he came to Jerusalem with the intention of destroying it, and it was through this very circumstance, and others, named by Josephus, that he was led to give up his intention, and to regard the Jews with more complacency. Let us now make a calculation. From the giving this command in the 7th year of Artaxerxes, there were 457 years up to the year A.D. 1, at which time Jesus was 4 years old, thus leaving 26 years before the commencement of his ministry at 30. Now, if you add 26 to 457, you have 483, and if you divide that 483 by 7 you will see that we have exactly 69 weeks of years, to the time of Christ's coming to his special ministry and work. Thus it is seen that the very year of the coming of Christ is predicted, and that that prediction was literally accomplished. The time of his death is also predicted to be at the end of the 69th week,—in the midst of the 70th Christ was to be cut off. Now what do we find to be the actual fact? That Christ's ministry lasted from 3 to 4 years, as is generally admitted, and that he was then put to death. He was 30 years of age when he entered on his ministry, and he died when between 33 and 34, thus terminating his life in the midst of the 70th week spoken of by Daniel. If, then, as I have shown, that for 300 years before Christ came that prediction had been in existence, and that it had been fulfilled to the very year, as literally as though the prediction had been written after the event, is it not clear evidence that it must have been given by the influence of the divine being through the prophets, and that, therefore, the system which is predicted would be introduced by the Messiah, is of divine origin? (Applause.)

I ask my friend to examine this prophecy thoroughly. If there were not another statement in the whole book on which Christianity could rest as a basis, is not this a sufficient one, and one that will defy all the assaults of unbelievers in the world? We

have first, mark you, the prophecy existing hundreds of years before the time when Christ came; we have the exact period stated; and we have him appearing just at the very time, and fulfilling the things that are there spoken of. What evidence, then, can be desired more conclusive than this? We know, from many indications, that at the time when he appeared the end of the Jewish nation was drawing very near; the period of probation spoken of by the prophet was nearly ended. Jesus warned the people of their doom, and sought, by inducing them to repent, to enable them to escape from the terrible punishments which he knew must come upon them as a nation. But they rejected his loving offices, and hence his sad lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." The termination of Daniel's weeks had come, the time of their probation was ended, and hence there was no more probation for them. It was a fiat that could not be reversed that Jerusalem should be razed to the ground, and not one stone left upon another. Now, in examining the history of the New Testament, we find that all these predictions which I have cited from the Old Testament, were really fulfilled, and thus in these prophecies we have a body of proofs, uttered by different men, and at long intervals of time, so as to preclude the possibility of collusion, and preserved to us by those who are the opponents of Christianity, which it seems utterly impossible for any ingenuity to overturn. It appears to me that it must be something very strong and potent indeed to cause those who love Christianity to lay it aside, when they have such proofs as these to rest upon.

Let me just recapitulate a little. We find, in examining the gospels, which are the history of Christ's life, that these thirty predictions, with others, which could be cited, were actually verified. He came at the very time predicted by Daniel, 2nd and 9th chaps. The promise to Abraham is proved to have been fulfilled by the lineage which shows Christ to be of the family of David, and of the tribe of Judah by Mary his mother, as recorded by Luke, and thus he was descended from Abraham, through Isaac and Jacob. His birth of a virgin, the place of his birth, and his poor circumstances, as predicted, are seen fulfilled in Matt. I, 18-23; Luke I, and 2. Then Jesus had a forerunner, who heralded his coming, and who came, as predicted by the prophet, while the temple stood. If he had not come at the time he did, then the prophecy would have been proved to be false; but he did come, he came while the temple stood, and then within 40 years of his death, we find that temple destroyed, and though Julian tried to raise it again, and so falsify the prophecy, in reference to its rebuilding, he was never able to accomplish the work, for fire came from the foundations, and prevented his workmen from going on with their labor. (Applause.)

MR. WALKER:

Let us again turn our attention to our friend's allusion to science, and to the opinion he gave you when speaking of the origin of "the first pair:" or rather let us consider the assertion he made, basing it upon the book which is now being tried for its authenticity. He said that "the first pair" certainly had no generation; and, taking his assertion for it, they had not. Now, if we wished to maintain our position that they had, we could run back through all the geological strata, comparing all the different classes of life, and reading the lessons they convey, and ranging them in their line of progress, and thus our friend's position would be lost. But we do not desire to go into this question, because it is so very lengthy. Yet we would refer our friend to the lectures delivered by Professor Huxley, the discoveries made by Marsh in America, the writings of Sir Charles Lyell, Hegel, and others of the development school, so that he may fully understand the views of Darwin, before he makes assertions respecting them. (Applause.)

Let us leave this matter, therefore, and follow him into the prophecies. He has told you that we made sad and grievous mistakes in our remarks concerning the sign to Ahaz; that there was no fulfilment in the case of Isaiah's son; but that the prophecy was only fulfilled in the case of Jesus. And, as a proof of it, he said that Isaiah's son was not called Emanuel, but he omitted to mention that Jesus is not called Emanuel, except in this instance, where the prophecy is quoted as having been fulfilled. The prophecy in detail says:—"Butter and honey shall he eat." Now, did Jesus eat butter and honey? If he did not, there is no evidence that the prophecy applied to him. Will our friend tell us where it is stated that Jesus ate butter and honey?

"In those days," it is said, "the Lord shall shave with a razor." Did the Lord shave with a razor in those days? If he did not, the prophecy did not apply to him; and we must not overlook the fact that Dr. A. Clark, the distinguished commentator, held the view that this prophecy *was* fulfilled in the case of Isaiah's own son. Then, again, in reference to the other details and the other points, so very distinct and emphatic, to which we desired to pin our friend, and which he has once more evaded: thus, when mention was made of the calling of the "Son out of Egypt," we have shown that this referred to Israel, and not to Jesus. Then, in reference to dwelling in a city called Nazareth, our friend has yet to quote to us the prophet who foretold this in emphatic and distinct language!

There is shown too great a desire *to fulfil* prophecies, which the authors of the New Covenant either thought existed or that did exist (it matters not in whichever way we take it) for us to place implicit reliance upon their writings. Now, our friend has told us again that the original of the Old Testament, containing these prophecies was translated into the Greek 300 years before Christ; and we would ask again, in what language were the prophecies fulfilled? This is an important point. We have only very weak evidence to show that there was even one gospel written in the Hebrew language; and

this we have repeatedly challenged our friend to produce, or to quote from a single author who has seen it. If the prophecies were in Greek, the fulfilments were also recorded in Greek; and we think that here, at all events, is a possibility of collusion.

It is painful to have to notice the argument of "possibilities" and "probabilities" and "perhaps's" that our friend uses. He says that we must show that there is flat and positive contradiction that cannot be mistaken for, and cannot be reconciled by, *probabilities*. We maintain that our friend should go by the record; but when he introduces his 19th-century Christianity, and brings in other matters that are not stated in the record, then "probabilities" may reconcile contradictions. Let him take the accounts of the genealogy of Jesus, as they stand written by Matthew and Luke, and then reconcile them, We defy our friend to do it. (Applause.)

Now, let us follow him in the prophecies of Isaiah and Daniel, which are taken as a basis of his argument this evening. It must be admitted that these prophecies are written in such obscure and defective language that they might mean almost anything! If Christians had not interpreted these prophecies just as they have, but others had taken the work in hand to support their claims, they might have been interpreted to mean anything else to suit their whims! That these prophecies can be so misinterpreted is proved by the fact that they *have* been misinterpreted. Have not many predictions, based upon these prophecies, been proved to be erroneous? Such, for instance, as Jas. Miller's, Dr. Baxter's, Joe Smith's, and many others, not forgetting Dr. Cumming's predictions of "the end of the world," &c.

If, therefore, mistakes could have been made by Christians,—learned or otherwise,—may we not reasonably conclude that the prophecy might mean this, that, or the other, just as it is interpreted? Even granted that every prophecy our friend can quote was fulfilled in the time of Jesus, that would be no proof of the divine origin of Christianity. In the life of Swedenborg there are instances of his having prophesied. It is stated that whilst John Wesley was in Liverpool, England, Swedenborg wrote to him, and stated that he had been informed in the world of spirits that John Wesley had a desire to see him. Wesley said that such was the case, and that he would be glad to see Swedenborg when he returned from his four months tour, which he was then preparing for. Swedenborg replied: "That will he too late; by that time I shall be in the spirit-world for the last time." John Wesley took no notice, but had his attention again called to the information, by receiving the tidings of the occurrence of this event. Now, what does this in reality prove, according to our friend's reasoning? First, that the prophecy was fulfilled, and second, that Swedenborg and the New Church doctrines were undoubtedly and emphatically of divine origin! And this is not the only, nor the most striking, prophecy which Swedenborg gave, but it will serve our present purpose.

We have also the records of the wonderful prophecies of Cazotte, who foretold the French revolution, mentioned the principal parties who would be concerned in it, and described the kind of death nearly everyone present, at the time he made the prophecy, would come to.

Disinterested witnesses, as well as those who were indirectly implicated in the fulfilment of this remarkable prophecy, have given testimony to the accuracy of the prediction, and the occurrence of everything foretold down to the very details. The full particulars of this prophecy may be found in Professor Dr. Wm. Gregory's work on Animal Magnetism, where the authorities are given, and shown to be authentic. Does this prove that M. Cazotte and his doctrines or principles were of divine origin? Many instances could also be given of entranced persons prophesying events in the most wonderful manner; and, therefore, all these prove that Spiritualism is of divine origin! If our friend desires us to mention these cases in detail we shall be glad to do so. In reality, prophecy proves nothing in its fulfilment but that the prophecy was fulfilled.

How carefully our friend has avoided noticing the points we made in reference to Jesus being God or man. If he was God he was no *example* to man; if he was man, he certainly was *not* God. If he had his mother and his father, then he certainly was as all other men are,— "a man of sorrows," it may be; a man of morals, it may be; a man who worked for the reformation of his country and the world, and who did much good, but still a man; and the point to be decided is, supposing all the prophecies of the Old Testament were distinctly and emphatically fulfilled in the person and in the times of Jesus, does this prove Christianity to be of divine origin? We answer, without hesitation, certainly *not*, unless it can be proved that the gospels were of divine origin. (Applause.)

Now we have mentioned the fulfilment of prophecies, and given the instances where they were not mentioned in the Old Testament, but merely quoted for the purpose of having fulfillments, and then it is said, "this was done that it might be fulfilled!" Not because it was necessary to be done, but simply because it was thought to have been prophesied! To show what little reliance can be placed upon the Old Testament prophecies let us notice one of the prophecies said to have been made by "Jehovah" to Abraham, viz., that He would "give this land to him and his seed for ever." This is a promise which our friend will not deny as having been made. Now, did Abraham and his seed possess the land "for ever?" It will require a curious kind of logic to show that this prophecy has been fulfilled; and if even this *be* shown, we will drive the logic to its better end, and demonstrate that if these prophecies are claimed to be of divine origin, simply because of their fulfilment, then Mother Shipton's prophecies, and many others which we could instance, must be of divine origin also. (Applause.)

Our friend has virtually admitted that the prophecy regarding the destruction of Jerusalem was not fulfilled at the time predicted. To have been truly fulfilled, it should have occurred within seventy weeks from the time of the prophecy, which he admits it did not, but, priest-like, to suit his purpose, he has wilfully substituted seventy weeks of years for plain seventy weeks. Another may, in like manner, at some future time, substitute seventy days of years, to prove that the prophecy related to another event altogether. It is very convenient to make out the fulfillment of prophecy by substituting seventy weeks of years for seventy ordinary weeks of seven

days each, but the subterfuge is too apparent for the simplest to be duped thereby. Is this the kind of evidence our friend rests upon to prove the divine origin of Christianity? If so, it is, we maintain, as foolish on the part of our friend to rely upon it, as it is insulting to common sense to offer it as proof to reflective minds. But even the fulfillment of a prophecy does not prove the divine origin of the same, or of its results; it merely demonstrates the accuracy of the oracle, or the truth of the prophet, or soothsayer, through whom such prophecy was delivered. Prophecies are easy matters when they are couched in such language as Daniel uses. But, even as we have said before, if all the prophecies were to be fulfilled in the person, and life, and doings of Jesus, it would still fail to prove that Jesus and Christianity were of divine origin.

A fitting question which we might here ask would be: If Christianity was to save mankind, why was it delayed so long? Why not have established it at the time of "the flood," instead of drowning the world and saving only eight persons alive? To put the matter in plain language: "God" tries one method of reproofing his people; that fails, and he tries another; that also fails. Does not this argue weakness on the part of the Infinite? Oh! ye priests and parsons, who profess to know so much about the "providence of God," and to educate us how to be "saved," explain these matters, if you can! for, after all, this "coming of Christ" is a failure, and "God" still requires the assistance of thousands of "Reverend" and robe-protected orators to bring about the "salvation" of His creatures! Does this argue that Christianity was established by divinity, by the all-wise *God* of the Universe? It is almost, to us, a species of blasphemy: it is a matter that is, indeed, too serious to be dealt with in light terms. We may appear to speak offensively to those who adopt these views; but if we do so, it is only because we wish to put those same views in common-sense language.

Let us now describe in plain terms some parallel cases which we find in the old heathen mythology; but, before doing so, we must apologise to the Christians, and, at the same time, we must assure them that we are merely making use of their own ideas, and putting them in intelligible language. Thus, we have the story of Jupiter visiting Leda in the form of a swan, and her becoming thereby the mother of Castor and Pollux. We are told in the Greek Mythology how, in the form of a bull, he seduced Europe, and ruined virgins manifold. We could cite many instances where "the gods" are reputed to have cohabited with mortals, whilst here in the New Testament we have a virgin seduced by a ghost! You may have it a "Holy Ghost," if you like; *but its "holiness" is no extenuation* for the offence. This is what it is in reality, when the obscenity of the thing is placed in intelligible language. It is, however, invariably presented in such a manner that it cannot be understood by the vulgar, thereby preventing them from arriving at the kernel of truth that lies hidden, in the gauze of a false and priestly delicacy. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

You need not be alarmed for the fate of Christianity; we do not believe there is any obscenity in connection with the birth of Christ, but the most exceeding purity.

I would like to ask my friend to tell us when the records concerning these heathen deities were written? Let us have the time when they were written, and by whom, and perhaps we may be able then to show that very likely they have been copied from this book (the bible).

In regard to Swedenborg's prophecy, our friend has not stated what was the state of Swedenborg's health at the time he made the prediction, nor has he told us of Swedenborg's medical knowledge. The mere fact of his saying "I believe I shall be dead at a certain time," cannot be accepted as a prophecy. Then, as to the prediction about the war: why I have an author by me who predicted the Russian war as clearly as could be, but how? Simply because of the statements in the bible, which appeared to him clearly to predict it. My friend says he could mention prophecies quite as clear as these that are in the bible. I will tell you of *one*: A lady at Castlemaine told me that she was at a *seance*, at which it was predicted or stated that the Queen was dead: She said—"Mr. Green, I would have staked my all that she was dead, but I found it was not true, and it shook my faith in these predictions." The whole family, father, mother, and daughter, were mediums, but the father has been twice in a lunatic asylum through it. I may tell you that she told me that her husband was at one time possessed by a spirit which professed to be that of her father, and who told her that her father was dead. The supposed spirit of her father embraced her through her husband, and in the exuberance of her feelings, consequent on such a communication, she fell upon his neck and they wept together. Now, what was the actual truth? From the time when this communication was received, and up to a period of more than two years (the time I was at Castlemaine) she had been receiving letters from her still living father. (Applause.)

Let me ask my friend not to beat about the bush. My friend has refused me the fifth night, when he is not obliged to leave Melbourne. If he wants me to answer all his questions, give me time, and I will do it. He tells us that this very prophecy of Daniel has been misapplied. I deny it. I say Dr. Cumming's never misinterpreted it. He never applied it to the end of the world; there are, however, predictions as to the end of the world, which Dr. Cummings' has mistaken. I tell you these prophecies are declared of the Messiah and no one else, and all the Jews before Christ understood them to refer to the Messiah. Daniel says in the 9th chap, 24th verse. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy." And, then, in the 26th verse—"And after threescore and two weeks, shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself, and the people of

the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with man v for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Where is there any indistinctness here I may ask? Where is there any ambiguity? Let him take hold of the kernel of the matter; let him show the ambiguity, and not give his *ipsi dixit*; we have had too much of it; let us have proof.

I cannot delay more by dwelling on these points, but I must call your attention to the fact that not only did Christ come at the time predicted, when the Roman Empire existed, but also that all the predictions as to his rejection by the Jews, and the circumstances of his betrayal, death, burial, Ac, were all actually fulfilled, as the narrative of his life shows.

I would here introduce a very rational argument, of the nature of mathematical demonstration, showing the utter impossibility of so many predicted incidents ever meeting in any individual by chance, guess, or conjecture; in any other way, in brief, than in consequence of divine prescience or arrangement. It is extracted from a very valuable work published by Chilian C. Yerplank, Esq., and I may parenthetically remark that I take it from the Campbell and Owen debate, pages 337—338:—"Eousseau, in the eloquent and paradoxical confession of faith which he puts in the mouth of his Savoyard vicar in Emilius, has said that no fulfilment of prophecy could be of any weight with him to prove a divine interposition, unless it could be demonstrated that the agreement between the prophecy and the event could not possibly have been fortuitous. This proof is more than any fair objector has a right to claim, since it is a moral probability and not strict demonstration which we must act upon in the most momentous concerns of life, and as reasonable men we should rest on the same evidences in matters of faith. In both, the wise man will be governed by common sense, applied to the investigation of rational probability." You will easily see the force of this. Men invest the whole of their capital on the strength of probabilities, and we have to do the same in connection with religion. There can be no faith without probabilities: if it is an actual certainty we see before our eyes faith has no meaning, and it is nonsense to talk about it. We know that faith is essential in everyday life. A man must believe in the statements of his fellow men, or he can never live. In matters of religion we cannot have absolute certainty unless God works a miracle every day, or makes it a certainty to every individual man. But to continue the quotation, "In this case, however, we may accept the challenge of the sceptic. Where the points of fulfilment of a prediction are numerous, it may be literally demonstrated, that the probability of such accomplishment having occurred fortuitously is the most remote possible. This argument is put in a practical and striking point of view by Dr. Gregory, of the Military Academy at Warwick, well known for many respectable and useful works, especially on mathematics and scientific mechanics. Suppose, says he,

that instead of the spirit of prophecy breathing more or less in every book of Scripture, predicting events relative to a great variety of general topics, and delivering, besides, almost innumerable characteristics of the Messiah, all meeting in the person of Jesus, there had been only ten men in ancient times who pretended to be prophets, each of whom exhibited only five independent criteria as to place, government, concomitant events, doctrine taught, effects of doctrine character, sufferings, and death, the meeting of all which in one person should prove the reality of their calling as prophets, and of his mission in the character they have assigned him. Suppose, moreover, that all these events were left to chance merely, and we were to compute, from the principle employed by mathematicians in the investigation of such subjects, the probability of these fifty independent circumstances happening at all. Assume that there is, according to the technical phrase, an equal chance for the happening or the failure of any one of these specified particulars, then the probability against the occurrence of all the particulars in any way is that of the fiftieth power of two to unity; that is, the probability is greater than eleven hundred and twenty-five millions of millions to one, that all of these circumstances do not turn up even at distinct periods. This computation, however, is independent of the consideration of time. Let it be recollected, further, that if anyone of the specified circumstances happen, it may be the day after the delivery of the prophecy, or at any period from that time to the end of the world; this will so indefinitely augment the probability against the contemporaneous occurrence of merely these fifty circumstances, that it surpasses the power of numbers to express correctly the immense improbability of its taking place. It is hardly necessary to draw the inference which Dr. Gregory goes on to establish, that all probability, and even possibility of accidental fulfilment, as well as of fraud, must be excluded. The sole reasonable solution of the question is, that these predictions and their fulfilments can only be ascribed to the intention of a being, whose knowledge can foresee future events, unconnected with each other, depending on various contingencies, and the will and acts of free agents, or whose power is so omnipotent as to bend to the accomplishment of his own purpose the passions of multitudes, the ambition of princes, the studies of the wise, the craft of the wicked, the wars, the revolutions, and the varied destinies of nations." I would here ask any rational sceptic how he will dispose of the argument? How can he remove this stumbling block out of the way of his infidelity? By what logic can he dispose of this document? (Applause.) Now, I have shown what the views of mathematicians are, as to what these prophecies prove. My friend says, "suppose we admit that all these prophecies have been fulfilled, what then?" That is how he leaps over the difficulty, by admitting it, and then he asks, "but how does this prove the divine origin of Christianity?" We very clearly pointed out that it was predicted that this being was to be a divine person, as my friend will see if he turns to the ninth chap, of Isaiah. After he comes, he shows by the miracles he works, by the stupendous powers he exercises in his own name, and evidently by an inherent power, and by the resurrection of the dead, &c.; by all these, I say, he gives incontestable proof of a power which could only be wielded

by a divine being. What other conclusion, then, can we arrive at than that he was divine. And as he came at the place where, and at the time when, the prophets predicted, and himself declared his divinity, and gave evidence of it by his mighty miracles, that, therefore, the system which he instituted, was of divine origin. By his triumph over death, and the powers unseen, he demonstrated to man and to angels that he was the son of God.

These facts, and many others which could be named, in reference to the fulfilment of these predictions have never yet been overturned, and my friend has certainly not overturned any of them as yet. Now let me call your attention to Christ, as a teacher. The Jews might well say, "Never man spake like this man," for he came with characteristics peculiarly his own. He pointed out that the law was not to be destroyed, but fulfilled; that he had come as its fulfiller, and to produce moral and spiritual reformation. He broke down all barriers of peoples, and showed that all were equally precious in God's sight. He taught that no merely external worship can be acceptable; that the heart is the seat of virtue and vice; and that virtue consists in loving God with all the heart, and mind, and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves; and, in view of man's fallen condition, he pointed out the perfect way in which the fallen might again become virtuous and happy. As a teacher Christ was simply perfect. He taught with perfect plainness and simplicity, not in learned or technical language, but such as all could understand. He uttered no opinions, nor did he ever give advice, but taught in his own name, and without appealing to any authority but his own. Now, how can such a character be understood in such an age, and among such a people, except upon the principles stated in the Scriptures? Christ is unlike all other teachers who preceded him, and speaks as no other man ever did, either before or since. I freely admit that some of the principles he taught are just dimly shadowed forth in some of the ancient authors, though, on the authority of Josephus, we may affirm that Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle gained an immense amount of information from the Jews, and probably from their scriptures. In the writings of these men, there are some principles that are unmistakably presented in the teachings of Jesus. But we say he gives whole truths, they but half truths; he speaks with the voice of authority; they only with the hesitating fear of doubt; and the cry of the ancients was, we want an oracle—we want a teacher who will be authority. More than this, friends, Christ exemplified his teachings in his life, which none of these philosophers ever did, for even upon the otherwise fair escutcheon of Socrates we find the stain of Polytheism,—and, if I remember rightly, there is a story of his being willing to lend his wife which reflects upon his morality.

I would ask you to remember that Christ confirmed his teachings by his miracles—[time expired.] We shall have to refer to this ly-and-bye. (Applause.)

MR. WALKER:

We shall briefly allude to those points to which we have so often had to call our friend's attention, in order that we may show you that it is our friend *himself* who is guilty of that of which he accuses us,—viz. avoiding the point.

Let us again refer to what we have already pointed out to him, and which he has not yet answered; first of all, that Matthew and Luke contradict each other. Next, we pointed out that if, these events occurred as they are described, there was either a fraud at the establishment of Christianity, or else a lie is told. We have pointed out to our friend that there are discrepancies, inconsistencies, and inaccuracies in these records that were said to fulfil prophecies. These men are shown to be guilty, either in the original writings, or in the interpolations, of direct falsehood.

Now, as to the fulfillment of the prophecies. We have pointed out that the prophecy in the case of Abraham was not fulfilled. We have pointed out that the prophecy in reference to calling his son out of Egypt did not apply to Jesus, and also that no prophet called Jesus a "Nazarene," yet we have the fact recorded that he was so called "that it might be fulfilled" by the prophets! Our friend has contradicted his own argument on these points: he has not alluded to them in detail, and what is his reason for so doing? He said it was impossible for him to establish his affirmative case and take notice of every point we raised, because he had not time. Let us tell him that he cannot establish his affirmative case unless he clears the ground as he goes along. We assure him that if he will follow our points as we present them, and answer them in order, we will be responsible for asserting that we will prolong the discussion as long as he is willing.

Mr. GREEN: I accept the offer with pleasure.  
Mr. WALKER: We will, then refer him to the points he has left untouched. First: If Jesus was God, he was no example to man; if he was man he could not have been in any special sense "the Son of God." Then, are the gospels, as they stand, to be received,—seeing that Matthew and Luke are irreconcilable? You will kindly touch upon these points, and then expatiate upon the necessity for the divine origin of Christianity.

Now, when we quoted from the ancient authors, not giving their names, but stating a few facts that are well known to those who have made these writings their study,—such as the belief that "gods" could cohabit with mortals—our friend asks us to give him our authority. We will give the 1st chapter of Draper on the conflict between science and religion, where it states all that we wish to affirm, and where the authority will not be questioned:—

"Immaculate conceptions and celestial descents were so constantly received in those days that whoever had greatly distinguished himself in the affairs of men was thought to be of supernatural lineage. Even in Borne, centuries later, no one could with safety have denied that the city owed its founder, Romulus to an accidental meeting of the god Mars with the virgin Rhea Silvia, as she went with a pitcher for water to the spring. The Egyptian disciples of Plato would have looked: with anger on those who rejected the legend that Perictione,

the mother of that great philosopher, a pure virgin, had suffered an immaculate conception through the influence of Apollo, and that that god had declared to Ariston (to whom she was betrothed) the parentage of the child." Here is a parallel case precisely. If, in one instance, there is obscenity, indecency, and immorality, is it not so in the other case? If, in one instance, our friend rejects those cases we have quoted,—and many more which we could quote if time permitted,—if he rejects them, as being opposed to all his ideas of virtue and morality, how, we ask, can he accept the story of "the divinity of Christ" and "the immaculate conception" of "the virgin Mary." If our friend rejects the cases of Plato where he is described as being the offspring of Apollo, and of Alexander the Great, being declared "the son of Jupiter Ammon,"—if he rejects these legends (which are contained in the works from which Draper quotes) and also the numerous instances which are to be found in Gibbon and others, who, from the authority of ancient philosophers and historians, thus give these legends forth to the world, why does he not reject the same kind of story when found in the *New Testament*? What proof have we that this same story of the virgin was not a legend among the Jews? Especially when we find that Christianity had its principal foundation in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, and that these places were the early centres of its power—as we shall, if time permits, attempt to show in our future argument.

Now, as has been pointed out to you, the prophecies were translated in Greek; and also the fulfilments of those prophecies were in Greek; and thus, what proof have we that the writers were not acquainted with the original prophecies?—that they knew not of the necessity for the fulfilments of the prophecies? Our friend has shown to us that these were historical affairs; and we contend that if, in any one instance, they can be proved to be contradictory, it will be evidence that they are unreliable history;—and, also, we may conclude that, these particular prophecies, which more especially refer to our subject, must be received with considerable discount and distrust. We cannot, therefore, accept them as infallible truths. The mere fact of the assertion being made that such-and-such things are true does not settle the difficulty in the least. (Applause.)

Our friend has asked us the state of Swedenborg's mind and health at the time he made the prophecy about his death. We will ask, in return, what was the state of Daniel's mind, or health when he made his prophecies? The state of the mind or health has nothing to do with it. We have had instanced to us the case of a false prophecy made by a Spiritualist with whom our friend was acquainted. We, shall have occasion to show, in the proposition which we shall affirm in our next debate, that such failures in prediction, as well as contradictions, are paralleled by the contradictions and false prophecies recorded in the Bible; but, at present, it does not serve our purpose, nor does such a question come within our present argument. All the fulfilments of these prophecies seem to have been done in such and such a manner, in order "that it might be fulfilled." Just as we might expect the case of the virgin, the "immaculate conception," &c. did not take place because they were necessary, but simply "that

it might be fulfilled as spoken by the prophets!" Our friend has told us that we should exercise more "faith" in these things, and informed us that we were obliged to have faith in all matters of business—that the child should have confidence in its parent. We grant it; and this allusion of our friend brings us down to this point: *that there is a comparison, a similarity between the inculcation of these religious opinions and matters of business!* Our friend makes these important difficulties "matters of business," and asks us to indulge our credulity to an enormous extent in the matter, as though this would actually remove the difficulties! Now, let us see if "faith" is to reconcile these glaring contradictions. Suppose, for a moment, some scientist were to make an assertion concerning the condition of the Earth, as indeed, many have done, saying the globe was hollow and contained inhabitants in the interior—that there grew blooming and blushing flowers, and that orchards and vineyards waved their sweet and balmy sighs—that birds sang their joyous melodies, and where everything was as lovely as on the surface of this same Earth. We could not believe this on the mere strength of the assertion of the scientist. We should require proof. Why not have proof, then, on these important points? Is, then, the only argument our friend can bring in proof of his position, the consoling remark that "we must exercise our faith," the same as we do in matters of business? We would rather say that in this matter there should be left no room for doubt. When we are told of a case of the Infinite Ruler of the Universe coming into the contracted body of a six feet man at the largest, the story goes beyond our "faith," and we must have proof positive. There were many legends quite as wonderful as this current 18 centuries ago, and if we believe *one*, there is no reason why we should not believe *all*. Take the legends of the Gnostics, who taught that Christ had no parentage at all, but was simply a phantom. These are quite as worthy of belief and acceptance as the instances our friend has quoted from the New Testament. Look at all the legends and curious tales connected with St. Patrick. Observe how tradition informs us of the benefits he conferred on Ireland by ridding it of its crawling pests, &c. Who has not read the story of St. George and the Dragon, and the destruction of the monster by this noble hero? In those days of darkness, before printing was invented, and men had to trust to their weak and fallible memories,—even at the time when the Roman Empire was at its dizzy height of greatness,—there were impurities in the records of great men; and, consequently, in all the religious doctrines of these times. These impurities are shown, and yet these invented legends, which were circulated and believed in former times, we are to accept on the evidence of these fallible men,—original writers or not,—who insist on the promulgation of their principles. This, then, is the kind of evidence our friend gives in support of his position! (Applause.)

We have the intimation given that our opponent will take the following line of argument in our next proposition: "that because we contradict some other individual we are not reliable, or because some other individual contradicts us he is not reliable;" but when the opinions that are contradictory are only claimed to be human and not of divine origin, they are easily to be accounted for, as we shall endeavor to show. But

how can we believe that infallible and infinite thoughts emanate from finite human intelligence, of men like unto ourselves? When the sun of science had not blazed upon the world with its light of sturdy facts, as it now does; when philosophy was at a very low ebb indeed; when the energy of Greece was dying out; and when all the great statesmen and thinkers, and orators were but a dim memory of the past, in the minds of those then living, what are we to think of these gospels which emanated from such a time of ignorance and darkness, and which are *even now* accepted as infallible writings on such important matters as we have been describing?

Now, we have said that, supposing these prophecies were fulfilled, the mere fact of their fulfilment does not prove their divine origin. We have instanced cases where Swedenborg and others made prophecies which were fulfilled; but does this prove that Swedenborg, &c., were of divine origin? Is it not evident to you all that these matters are but the works of men, who expected the coming of "the Messiah," and who thus made the so-called Messiah conform to their ideas of the prophecies? If it is shown that the human mind cannot err—if it is shown that the human mind is always infallible, and incapable of dishonesty, and that there could not possibly have been any deception practised by these men, then our friend may establish the "divine origin" without a single obstacle; but, until he has made his records infallible, without a single lie or flaw, as well as the judgment that interprets them, so as to leave not a single doubt on that which he attempts to prove, there can be no exercising the "faith" which, we are told, is the equivalent of that exercised in business! As we do not desire to turn religion into "a matter of business" we cannot call upon our "faith" to believe that the records of the New Testament can be made infallible by the reasoning of fallible men.

If the records are true, then God made several mistakes. He attempted the reformation of mankind, first, by drowning all but eight of His children, and a most deplorable failure was the result; then he attempted, by omnipotence, or some other method, to reveal Himself to the world, had: His own son murdered for the accomplishment of the same object, and failed in that also!—as the evidence of to-day throughout Christendom only too clearly proves, if our friend's assertions were true. (Applause.)



## FOURTH EVENING:

TUESDAY, 12th MARCH.

MR. GREEN, having been introduced by the Chairman in a few appropriate remarks, spoke as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN and RESPECTED HEARERS: The subject of our debate is the proposition "Is Christianity of divine origin." Those of you who have been present during the preceding week of the debate will be acquainted with the arguments that have been brought forward in support of the proposition; and as my time is very precious, because of the amount of matter which I have to bring forward during to-night and to-morrow night, I cannot take up time just now in recapitulating any of the arguments that I have already presented.

In noticing what Mr. Walker said in his address, on the last evening of our debate, I have first to call attention to his statements as to Swedenborg and the predictions that were made *by* him. You will remember that I replied to the one in regard to his death, and stated that we had not been told what was the state of his health at the time the prediction was made, nor were we told what was the extent of his medical knowledge, which may have enabled him to form a true diagnosis of his case. In regard to the so-called prediction as to the burning city, the time when it would be burnt, and when the fire terminated I have just to say, in reference to that prophesy (and the others, of a similar nature,) that if Mr. Walker will produce a circumstantial account of the prophecies, and will give us a reliable record of their fulfilments, then we shall have some data on which to go, and will be able to examine fairly their claim to be considered prophecies at all.

In regard to those other predictions, of which Mr. Walker has spoken, I think I may say that it is unnecessary to waste time upon them, unless we have some statements before us which could be verified as to the utterance of the predictions and their actual fulfilments. So far as a man's own death is concerned, we know that a fulfilment of a prophecy of the kind is no evidence of prophetic power, such as that possessed by the writers of the Bible, because its fulfilment is to a large extent within his own power. Many persons, who lay no claim to prophetic power, have had premonitions in regard to the period of their death. We may not always be able to account for these things,

but to suppose that they are to be attributed to divine influence, simply because we are not able thoroughly to explain them, is not reasoning according to safe principles.

When speaking of the prophecy as to the virgin, and the subsequent statements made in the 7th chapter of Isaiah, my friend endeavored to make rather a witty point. He asked whether it was really true, that God would shave them with a razor. Now, I feel disposed to expose the character of the points which my friend makes in his examinations of Bible statements, and I would therefore read you two or three verses where the statement of shaving them with a razor is made, and you will see that my friend could have made no point but by a wilful perversion of one of the clearest statements that could be made by any writer at all. In the 7th chapter of Isaiah, 17th to 20th verses, we read—

17th verse—"The Lord shall bring upon thee and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria."

18th verse—"And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall hiss for the fly that is in the utmost part of the river of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria."

19th verse—"And they shall come and shall rest all of them in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and upon all thorns and upon all bushes."

20th verse—"In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, viz., by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard."

These words, "flies and bees," were representative of a people who were to come against them. Now, my friend might easily have known that there is in that statement simply a metaphor indicating the terrible scourge that would be brought upon the Israelites by means of the king of Assyria, and how with his warriors he would shave the Israelites—that is, take away their prosperity, &c.—as cleanly as a man's face is shaven by the instrument called a razor.

Now, passing by this I come to the statement as to the passage which my friend referred to about the Lord calling Christ out of Egypt. In his remarks upon that prophecy he said that it had no reference whatever to Christ, but to Isaiah. The words which occur in 11th Hosea, 1st verse, are, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Now, I say there is no reference in these words to Isaiah at all.

ME. WALKER here rose to a point of order, and said, "We did not raise the term 'Isaiah': Israel was the word we used.

MR. GREEN continued: I accept Mr. Walker's correction with pleasure: I understood him to say Isaiah, and I gladly accept his correction as given, for I do not wish to gain the slightest particle of Advantage over my friend, for I can gain nothing by false issues. We have the passage, "When Israel was a child I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Where, I would ask, is there any discrepancy between this statement, and that in the gospel of Matthew in regard

to the coming out of Egypt?"—"As it is written in the prophets, out of Egypt have I called my son." Now, all persons who understand the Bible at all, know that there is very much in it that is typical. In this passage from Hosea, we know that there is no reference to an individual. The term "Israel" is used simply to represent the people which as a nation was in its infancy, and was therefore referred to as a child. "When Israel (the nation) was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." When Christ was taken down into Egypt, and afterwards brought back, this statement in Hosea was regarded as a type thereof by the writer of the gospel, and that it was intended by the Divine Being to serve as such, few Christians will doubt. Then we have the statement, "He shall be called a Nazarene;" All these points are of the same small character. Now, I would ask you what are the declarations of the prophets in regard to Christ? In the 49th of Isaiah, 7th verse, we have very distinct statements in regard to his being despised: "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, *to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers*, kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee." In the 53rd chapter of the game book, 3rd verse, it is said, "He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not." We have in these two statements of the prophet Isaiah, and in the Psalms, and other portions, clear evidence that he who was to be the Messiah would come and be despised and contemned. You will remember that when Nathaniel was told that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, he exclaimed, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" and any person examining the history of Josephus or any record of that time, will find that the Nazarenes were regarded as an ignorant, low, and debased people, compared with the other persons in the land. So that a Nazarene was really synonymous with all that was low and mean and despicable. Now let me ask you to notice that in the gospel statement it does not say one special prophet says he shall be called a Nazarene, but, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets;" and all persons who read the gospel writings with care, understand that it was a fulfilment of the declarations of a number of prophets in different places: "He shall be called a Nazarene," in other words, he shall be despised, contemned, and abhorred. We say there was here a literal and exact confirmation of the words of the prophets as to his being a despised, person. Let Mr. Walker examine it fairly and I think he must see that there is an actual fulfilment of the predictions made.

My friend objects further that the land of Canaan was promised to Abraham, but that Abraham never possessed it. I am rather surprised at what I cannot but term quibbles like this. My friend ought to know that the Bible is really easily understood upon this matter, and I might add, upon most others also—if he will take the pains to examine with a small amount of attention. Now, in this prediction made to Abraham in regard to the land, it is clearly evident that he did not expect himself to be the possessor of the land, and when the prediction was repeated and re-iterated to Isaac and to Jacob, they

never understood that it was given to them to have in actual possession, but, as it were, as representing their descendants. The promise was first made to them, and its fulfilment was intended for their posterity in the time to come. Then, my friends, I wish you to bear in mind that all the promises of God are conditional, and that therefore, this promise of the land to the children of Israel is conditional likewise. We find in the 28th chapter of Deut., 15-21 verses "But it shall come to pass if thou wilt not hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command you this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." Then a list of the curses is given. Then, further, it is said in the 20th verse, "The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest, thy hand unto to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly, because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, *until he have consumed thee from off the land, whither thou goest to possess it.*" In the 26th chapter of Leviticus, and 44th verse, we find a statement bearing upon the same point. (I would ask you to read the whole of this 26th chapter, as well as the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, at your leisure): "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, *to destroy them utterly*, and to break my covenant with them, for I am the Lord their God." God has predicted all he will do in this chapter, and then, after exhorting them to repentance, he makes the promise that he will not cast them away utterly, &c. " But I will, for their sakes, remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God. I am the Lord." In the book of Jeremiah, also, we have a prediction, clear and explicit, in regard to this matter, 30th chapter, 10th verse: "Therefore, fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord, neither be dismayed, O Israel, for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity, and Jacob shall return and be in rest and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee, though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished."

Now notice, dear friends, the land was threatened to be taken from them if they did not act in obedience to the commands of God. The whole history proves they did not so act, and we know that the land was taken from them; but mark, God declared he would not make a full end of them, and hence we find them in the present day. Go into China, into Asia, into any of the parts of Europe, or into Africa, and you will find the Jew. I ask why? because God declared that although he would make an end of all nations whither he had scattered them, he would not make an end of them. Where are those ancient Babylonians, where are those Medes and Persians, and all the other nations mentioned in the ancient writings? They have been mingled with other races of the Earth, but the Jew remains distinct to this day, and with the blood of Abraham coursing through his veins, as a living demonstration of the veracity of the prophets who

have declared that God said "though I make an end of all nations, I will not make an end of thee." And, friends, though that people are not now in their own land, still you know very well that multitudes of Christians believe that this book declares they will yet have it again, and all European complications seem to point to that result. (Manifestations of dissent). We say that this very war which has just terminated (we hope) has paved the way more fully for their return. (Interruptions, cries of "order," "nonsense," &c.)

I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will allow to me the time wasted by this interruption, as I have no time to spare.

I would call my friend's attention to these predictions, which I have quoted from the prophet Daniel, and endeavor to show to him what it is his duty to prove. We have the statements that these predictions were made by persons who lived hundreds of years before the time of Christ. My friend's duty is to show that those persons did not live before the time of Christ, who are said to have predicted these events. That these scriptures, in which the predictions occur, are not to be found before the time of Christ. And then he has to show that these predictions are vague, and he must show that it was possible for the apostles to dovetail the transactions recorded in the gospels with those in the prophecies. This is a task to which I hope he will now give his earnest attention. (Applause.)



Mr. WALKER:

We have no time to waste; but let us, before we proceed with a review of the arguments which our friend has advanced this evening, call attention to the fact that he did not follow us in our last evening's remarks upon the genealogies and other contradictions, and reconcile these as we expected he would, and as he promised to do; yet it cannot be denied that this is one of the most important points at issue; for, if it be demonstrated that Matthew or Luke falsifies, and that these are the individuals who record the fulfillment of these prophecies, then we say we can place little or no reliance upon that which is afterwards reported as fulfilled; for, if either one or the other of these individuals can fabricate a genealogy—if either one or the other can tell lies as to the descendants of David up to the time of Joseph—if they can do this, then one or the other can fabricate respecting all of the prophecies. This point must be made clear during our friend's next address, if we are to proceed with our debate.

However, let us now go back to the prophecy of Swedenborg, whom we mentioned in our last evening's debate. We gave him the title of the work in which these prophecies were mentioned, viz., "Noble's Appeal." It is to be found in the chapter devoted to the life of Swedenborg. Now, we mentioned also the prophecy of Cazotte, which is related by Dr. William Gregory, author of, "Organic Chemistry" &c, but our friend has not attended to this. We might mention other prophecies, one of which clearly foretold the introduction of the railway, steam navigation, &c., by one Evans, of America. We might

quote the prophecy of Shakespeare, for it is as much entitled to be called a prophecy as any made by Daniel, Ezeiel, or Isaiah, where he predicts the electric telegraph, by making one of his characters to say he would "put a girdle round about the Earth in 40 minutes." Then, there are Mother Shipton's, and a host of similar prophecies. These are quietly ignored by our opponent, though they are certainly as clear and decisive as any of those mentioned by Daniel, and certainly are couched in more plain and definite language.

Now, let us go back to the prophecy related in Isaiah VII, in reference to "the virgin conceiving and bearing a son," which our friend says is a perfect prophecy, and he rebukes our ignorance, or rather accuses us of wilful perversion, when we take these matters literally throughout. Yet, he himself does this, until such passages as "the Lord hissing for flies and borrowing *a razor to shave with*, &c. (though no evidence is there to show that the writer uses these passages in a different sense to the preceding; for they are just as distinctly and emphatically asserted and written and, to every appearance, in the same spirit, as the rest:) then they become figurative, and are written in metaphor according to our friend! Will he oblige us by pointing out where is the distinguishing feature between the literal and metaphorical in this instance? If these passages are metaphorical because they are absurd, or derogatory to our conceptions of Deity, may not the whole prophecy, on the same grounds, be metaphorical.

Now, as a preliminary to the consideration of the Biblical prophecies, let us state to you what Hull has said on the point, and with which we agree, viz., a "prophecy must have something definite, *and have its points*; else it cannot be known when it is fulfilled. If it affirms something in definite outline, or something having a spiritual significance, not plain in literal terms, or something of a typical nature, then we may interpret it as we please, and it really is no prophecy at all." To illustrate: supposing we were to prophesy that twelve months from to-day it would rain, but did not state where. There would be no risk in such a prophecy, because we should certainly find some spot on the Earth's surface where rain would fall at the time indicated. But, suppose we said, twelve months from this time it would rain in Holland, and at a certain place in Holland. This would be a definite prophecy, and its true fulfilment could easily be tested. Then we might extend the prophecy in its details, and say it would rain at one o' clock in the afternoon. Here would be another point in which the prophecy would have to be fulfilled. It must be fulfilled in every particular; it must have no loop-holes, or, otherwise, the prophecy fails in fulfilment. It must be a definite fulfilment in every point. Asking your indulgence for this digression, let us now apply this rule to the Biblical prophecies, remembering that if they are not fulfilled in all *their points*, they fail, as they are thus shown to be unreliable when we come to particulars. Last evening the prophecy of Daniel was referred to, where it is said to have been foretold that in seventy weeks "the Messiah" should come; which our friend has shown to have been written a few *hundred years* before the supposed "Messiah" came. Now, by what authority does he extend seventy weeks into hundreds of years? He, no doubt, will say that these were "prophetic weeks of prophetic signification!" Was there,

then, some *special revelation* to him to grant him this authority? That he has no such authority we shall find, by turning to the 12th chap. of Ezekiel, 21st to 25th verses, which bears directly on this point. Will the Chairman kindly read it as rapidly as possible?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

21st v.—"And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying:

22nd v.—"Son of Man, what is that proverb, that ye have in the land of Israel saying, the *days are prolonged*, and every vision faileth?

23rd v.—"Tell them therefore, thus saith the Lord God, I will make this proverb to cease and they shall no more use it as a proverb in Israel, but say unto them the days are at hand, and the effect of every vision.

24th v.—"For there shall be no more any vain vision nor flattering divination within the house of Israel.

25th v.—"For I am the Lord, I will speak, and the word that I shall speak shall come to pass, it shall be *no more prolonged*, for in your days oh rebellious house will I say the word, and will perform it, saith the Lord God."

MR. WALKER: There we have a distinct enunciation by the prophet that the time should be no more extended. Yet our friend asserts it was extended from 70 weeks to 300 years! Thus, this prophecy failed in fulfillment.

Let us now refer to the prophecy in the 1st chapter of Daniel, of the man with the "golden head, breasts, and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, and his feet part of iron and part of potter's clay." Now, this is supposed to be emblematical, and to foretell the introduction of Christianity; but how does it do so? Is it because it states that "God" would establish his kingdom, and destroy all other kingdoms? Let us, for the sake of argument, grant that the upper parts of this man were symbolical of the Medo-Persian, Babylonian, or any other empires, and that the feet represented the Soman empire, in the midst of which "God" was to establish His kingdom, and we will grant also, for the present, that Christianity was the "kingdom." What then? Was Jesus a king, and has that "kingdom" destroyed all other kingdoms? Is it not evident that this prophecy fails in a literal fulfillment? for it is apparent that the whole tenor of it is towards a literal interpretation. The illustration of the potter's clay and the iron might just as well allude to any other nation as to the Roman. It is just as applicable to the Anglo-Saxon empire of the present day. The difficulty and ambiguity of this passage, and the admission our friend has had to make, that he has to interpret some matters metaphorically and some literally, prompts the question: how can we know that they are interpreted correctly? Drs. Baxter and Cumming thought there was no difficulty as to what these prophecies meant. They based their predictions, as to the destruction of the world on them, and made many other predictions which never came to pass. When these men fell into mistakes, scholars) as they were, sincerely believing in the predictions, no matter how good or well-intentioned they may have been, still the fact remains that they have been mistaken in interpreting these passages, and thus we are caused to ask: What proof have we that there have been no mis-

takes in the others? If we had no means of testing these prophecies of Drs. Baxter and Gunning, in all probability they would have been believed in, just as sincerely as any of the others.

Now, when such methods have to be adopted in interpreting these prophecies, by taking one part (when it suits the purpose) in a literal, and another in an allegorical sense, it argues a very weak cause for our opponents. We must use our own judgment; and our friend must admit that he has no authority beyond his own judgment; and surely he will also admit that he is fallible; and when he tells us *this* is to be interpreted literally, and *that* metaphorically, how are we to know that what he tells us is certainly true? He is only using his fallible judgment on these matters, and, as *our* judgment tells us otherwise, we must, with all due deference to him, receive all his assertions with doubt. (Hear. Hear.)

To refer again to Israel being called out of Egypt, as found in the text quoted from Hosea: Matthew gives us to understand that this prophecy was distinctly made to foretell, and fulfilled *in*, the journey to, and return of Jesus from, Egypt. We are now told it was simply *typical*! Who shall we believe our worthy opponent or Matthew, who says it was written by the prophets? You have observed how the text, which says he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, "he shall be called a Nazarene," has been disposed of. Now, surely, Father Matthew knew the interpretation and use of language just as well as our erudite opponent: if so, why did he emphatically use these words as a quotation when no original, to take the quotation from, existed? Our friend cannot give us the passage; but he quotes another, and says it all means the same thing! "He was despised, a man afflicted with sorrows," &c. So was Socrates despised by the majority of men; therefore Socrates, on the same principle, was called a Nazarene! Bruno was a man of sorrows, and despised, therefore he was called a Nazarene! Many men are "despised" in our own day; are they to be called Nazarenes? So that, if we had called any one of these "the Messiah," by this method of interpretation, the prophecy would certainly have been "fulfilled" in each individual case. Were not many despised in the time of Jesus? Wherein was he remarkable on this account? We would like to draw your attention to this matter. Matthew has made use of an expression, and given it as the *words of the prophet*. The very words of the prophecy are quoted, as though they actually existed, and we should certainly have been obliged to consider this either a wilful or an ignorant fabrication, had it not been for the astonishing manner our friend has this evening revealed to us what Matthew meant, as though he could not do so himself, and thus have saved an enormous amount of contention and trouble! We have shown that Matthew was dishonest in this matter, and made Jesus fulfil a prophecy which never was written; then how shall we trust him in after-dealings, concerning statements regarding other prophecies? (Hear. Hear.)

Then, there is another point which we must enter upon. If Jesus fulfilled the prophecies which are applied to then he was the son of Joseph, and from the line of David; and if he was the son of David, he was not "the son of God." These are the two horns



of a dilemma, and our friend can accept whichever he pleases. If Jesus fulfilled these prophecies, which were supposed to relate to him, then he was the son of Joseph in the line of David; in which case Joseph was his *only* father; and, therefore, no immaculate conception" could have taken place. On the other hand, if he was "the son of God" these prophecies could not possibly relate to him. One or the other must be false; and whichever case is true our friend's position will be damaged. For, once more, if the prophecies were fulfilled, he was the son of man, and was a man like unto us; and, therefore, the Christianity which he established, certainly cannot, by any reasoning or system of logic, be called of divine origin. On the other hand, if he was conceived in the manner described, not one of the prophecies was fulfilled; and thus, for the proof of the divine origin of Christianity, we are thrown upon the evidence of the gospels,—which we have shown to be unreliable. That prophecy which our friend quoted on the last occasion, where it is said: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," is written in the past tense. How, then, can this possibly refer to Jesus? The child was *already* born—"the son was *already* given." He also quoted another prophecy about a Ruler "sitting on the throne of David." Now, Jesus did not sit on the throne of David; so this prophecy was not fulfilled. We have also had quoted passages supposed to apply to Jesus, where it is said he would be called "the Everlasting Father" and "Prince of Peace." There is no solitary instance in the gospels where he is either called "the Prince of Peace," or "the Everlasting Father," and we challenge our friend to produce a single passage where he is so called. Then, how was this prophecy fulfilled? If these prophecies fail in one particular, it is evident that those who quoted them as literally fulfilled were guilty either of ignorance or of wilful deception in so doing. (Applause.)

The Hebrews, it will be admitted, ought to be the best able to understand these prophecies, for they are written in their own tongue, with the peculiar idioms of their native language. Do they say these prophecies applied to Christ? Certainly not; *for learned Jews laugh at the idea of these prophecies being fulfilled in the person of Jesus.* They were expecting, as the prophecies led them to expect, a *material* "Messiah," "a King," who would come and restore their kingdom. This has not yet taken place; and, therefore, they justly say these prophecies are not yet fulfilled. The Jewish scribes, whose duty it was to understand their own scriptures, have placed them before us as having a literal significance; and which is most natural—that the Jews should understand best their own language, or the Christians, who are mostly ignorant of it? Why should Christians, who know little or nothing of the matter, say that the Jews did not understand what they were talking about, when they spoke in their own language, and reasoned from their own scriptures?

There is yet another point which we would wish to mention before we close, and that is, the fact that *the Bible itself shows the unreliability of the prophets.* We will ask our Chairman to read the 9th chapter' of Hosea, 7th verse.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"The days of visitation are come, the days of recompense are come, Israel shall know it, *the prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad*, for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred."

We have here the character of the prophets as described by Hosea, upon the strength of whose predictions our friend so confidently asserts the divine origin of Christianity. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

As my friend exceeded his time by a minute or two, I have no doubt our very impartial Chairman will kindly allow me to do the same in this speech.

I am very glad my friend requested the Chairman to read the passage from Hosea, as it shows how very careful, these people in the olden times were that false prophets should not have their predictions preserved. We have in the fact of their carefulness in guarding against false prophets one of the clearest evidences that these prophecies which they did preserve were reliable. And I may tell my friend that all the Jewish writers previous to Christ, and many of them since, considered these seventy weeks of Daniel as seventy weeks of years. Now what my friend said in regard to the prophets I can only regard as an evidence of his want of information. He talked as though the statement that a prophet had said a thing was equivalent to a prophet predicting a thing. Now, if my friend had only what I may term a school-boy knowledge of Christianity, or the same amount of knowledge which an ordinary Christian has who studies his Bible—(ironical cheers and interruptions.) I think if our friends are not afraid of their principles they need not trouble to interrupt; there is no implication to the detriment of my friend in the statement I made: I say if he had what I may term the school-boy information of a Christian he would have known that the utterance of a prophet is not necessarily a prophecy. Every person who knows what Christianity teaches and what the meaning of the word prophet is, would be able to tell him that a prophet is simply a person who speaks by the impulse of the spirit of God. That he may, however, teach in regard to things that have happened in the past, or things that are happening in the present, or he may teach of things that he is divinely inspired to predict will take place in the future; that the predictions of a prophet are only one part of his proper work, and therefore our friend's eloquence in regard to this passage in Matthew is altogether lost. You will notice, too, that he said I contradicted Matthew, as Matthew said it was a prophecy. Now Matthew says nothing of the sort. Matthew knew that it was not a prophecy, but simply said that the prophets had spoken, and there is a great difference between a prophet speaking it and its being a prophecy. We asserted it was not a prophecy but simply a statement in regard to Israel being loved when in his infancy, and as to the nation's being called out of Egypt. That being the statement of the prophets, Matthew says, "that it might be ful-

filled which was spoken by the prophet, &c." Now, my friend saw it was a prophecy: I say it was a type. Which is correct? Do we not know that the prophets recorded events which were types of other events which would transpire in subsequent days? (interruptions). [May I ask your protection, Mr. Chairman, against these continued interruptions?] (Great disorder.) I am very happy to see that the point is felt, and that there is some force in it, otherwise there would not be these continued interruptions. I say the language of the prophets is clear: it is not a prediction, and so my friend's point, in seeking to show that Matthew stated what was not true, is utterly lost. Matthew clearly states that it was spoken by the prophet, and there he leaves the matter; and notwithstanding the ingenuity displayed, more can not be gathered from the words "which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son.'" These were not spoken by the prophet as prediction, and therefore my friend's eloquence in endeavoring to show that they were has been entirely wasted. (Applause.)

In regard to the statement in the 7th chapter of Isaiah, I have only just time to refer to that point he called for, and which I may state was next in order on my paper; but I cannot give all points and answers at once, for I can only say one word at a time, not two, remember. I will just call your attention to this fact: there are expressions which are used to indicate literal facts, and there are expressions which in their very nature are metaphorical. We are using them every day, and every man and every woman in this assemblage, if they will but just scan over their own remarks during one day, will see that in connection with the most material things they use metaphorical expressions. Now, we say metaphorical expressions are used in connection with material facts, and no persons misunderstand them. This statement of the prophet is a declaration in regard to the certain destruction which would come upon the Jews. In regard to the flies and the bees, my friend need not have troubled so much, for just as flies and bees are the scourge of peoples, so these Assyrians are represented as being scourges. So, as the bees are represented as resting upon every rock, thorn, or bush, the teaching is conveyed that there would be such a clean sweep of the land, as to take away all provisions from the people of Israel. There is nothing, my friend's, in such statements as these to at all wonder at, because they are simply the same kind of statements that you and I make every day of our lives.

Now, as to this matter of the genealogies that has been called for, I am surprised that my friend is so anxious upon that point. It is evidently a trump card with him, for he appears to attach great importance to it. But, before noticing it, I will just speak in regard to another matter. He asks, will the prophecy apply to Jesus if he had no father? I reply that if he had an earthly father, the prophecies would have been falsified, because in the 7th of Isaiah there is a prediction as to his birth of a virgin; and in the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, 22nd verse, God declares that he will accomplish a wonder in the Earth: "a woman shall compass a man," and the time when this will be done is clearly indicated by the reference in the chapter to the

new Covenant which God would make with the people, evidently referring to the covenant made in Christ. Now, taking the statement of my friend previously alluded to, he asks: If Joseph was not his father, why were these genealogies given? Now, let me again emphasize the statement that my friend cannot find the slightest contradiction in these genealogies. That one in Matthew is clearly the genealogy of Joseph, and the one in Luke is clearly the genealogy of Mary; Joseph being taken as the son of her father, in order that his name might be kept up in Israel, and the legal requirements be met. My friend asks, "if Joseph was not his father, why were these genealogies given?" If my friend would use his judgment, he would see that there were several reasons why. One reason might be because the Jews were very particular in regard to their genealogies, as you may see from the apocryphal books. When a person was writing anything to which he wished to give weight he would first establish his ancestry, thereby showing that some importance was to be attached to any statement he might make. There was, therefore, a propriety in Joseph's genealogy being stated, even though, according to my friend's statement, it had nothing to do with the matter. Then another reason might have been that there was a coincidence in the fact that not only was Mary descended from David, by Nathan his son, but even the reputed father of Jesus was likewise descended from David, only through Solomon. I cannot help being highly amused at my friend's powers of argument, when he considers himself able to prove that Joseph and Mary, because of both having descended from David, one through Nathan and the other through Solomon, and more than a thousand years intervening between Solomon and Nathan, and Mary and Joseph; I am amused, I say, at the logic by which he proves that Joseph and Mary were brother and sister, and, therefore, ought not to have been married. Apart from that, however, I may say that the coincidence may have been another reason why this genealogy was given. But there was another reason why this genealogy of Joseph's may have been given. Sometimes, in argument, we for the moment grant the point which our opponent may be seeking to make, in order that he may show that the main point we are trying to establish is not affected by it. Now, there may have been hundreds of Jews who opposed altogether this matter of the miraculous conception and birth of Christ, and who denied that such a thing was necessary in connection with the birth of the Messiah—thus ignoring the prophecies. Very well, now, the inspired narrators might say. We will, for the moment take it for granted that this birth of Christ was not as we declare it was. Yet notwithstanding, we prove conclusively upon your own grounds, and from the genealogical tables, which you know are in your own archives, and which you can go and examine, that Jesus is the son of Joseph, and the lineal descendant of David, and that, therefore, the prophecies are fulfilled in him. I can see very great reason and potency in the genealogy being given from this point of view. The *exact reason why* it was given I confess I do not know, because it is not stated. I know the genealogy is there, and for this many cogent reasons can be assigned. My friend's only point is that it is contradicted by the genealogy in Luke, which fact he has not yet been able to establish. Let me note again the fact that this objection was

never raised during the first four centuries against Christianity; and why? Because Matthew did not manufacture the genealogy, nor did Luke; they simply copied them from the records of the Jews, and these genealogical tables were known to be correct, and the plan on which they were found was well understood, so that they were never called in question by the Jews. When I called my friend's attention to this point, he said: "I suppose there were other important points which the Jews considered, and overlooked this one." Yet my friend considers it such an important one that he actually gave utterance to a threat, that if I did not explain it the debate would terminate to-night. You heard the threat; but let me tell him the debate will not end to-night. Let me ask you to bear in mind the fact that this question of the genealogies was never brought up by those early opposers of Christianity, who ransacked sea and land, to use a metaphorical expression, to find objections against Christianity. I affirm, beyond the possibility of successful contradiction, that had the Jews been able to pick a flaw in these genealogies, depend upon it they would have shot holes through them in every possible direction, until not a particle of them would have been left behind; and the fact that they never attempted to touch them is proof that there was no possibility of injuring Christianity on this ground. (Applause.)

My friend stated that if Jesus was not the son of Joseph, then he could not have been the son of man, nor could he have been an example to men. My friend becomes hypercritical sometimes. I suppose he had forgotten that woman is included in the generic term "man," and that, therefore, if woman belongs to mankind, certainly whatever descends from woman must partake of man. Now, if this term be really equivalent to the term humanity, Christ was the son of woman, and hence the son of man in the true, legitimate, and proper sense, according to every scholar who would write upon such a theme. I say my friend shows that he is just descending to what I will merely term hypercriticism, when he descends to such points as these. He says, how can he be an example to men if he is not a proper man? Must an example be on all fours with those for whom it is intended? Suppose we had some little chickens on this platform, and the hen with them, and suppose an eagle was soaring aloft, and about to swoop down upon the little ones, would not the hen gather them under her wings for protection? Should we not look upon that hen in her care for her brood as an example, to mothers in the care of their children? Must we say that the hen must become a woman before she can be an example to us? When the simple sparrow goes out and gathers the worms and other food for its little ones, must we say it is not an example for us parents to provide for our children because it is not human? The thing is simply preposterous. You will see that Christ is an example to us, in all human conditions. That he did not come to be an example to us in divine attributes, but simply in the human characteristics. He came in the human form, and so was a perfect example as to how men ought to live. And he tells us that if we take his example, and follow it, he and his father will give to all such participation in divine power as will enable us to perform all the duties which appertain to us in life. I hope my friend will see that his points are so thoroughly

riddled that they will not hold one drop of water. My friend asked for mathematical demonstration. I am sorry my time is now so nearly at an end, for this point is one that I must emphasise a little, and so will reserve it for another speech. I would just ask your attention to his statement that the prophecies were written in Greek, and, therefore, because the fulfilment was written in the same language as the predictions, there must have been collusion. May I say that all the gospels were not written in Greek. As far as we have any information, the gospel of Matthew was written in the ordinary dialect of Judea at the time. In regard to these demands that are made, I may say that this charge, to have any point at all, must have underlying it the supposition, that the fulfillments *in fact* did not really take place. My friend, to make this point at all, must affirm that these apostles manufactured all the gospel facts. It is no point unless he does this. Shall we, then, say that Christ never lived, was not born in the reign of Augustus Caesar, nor put to death under Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberias? Is it not true that he was said to have wrought miracles, taught in an unparalleled manner, and to have been of a most exemplary life? Is it not true that he was crucified between thieves, his side pierced, and vinegar in his extremity given him to drink? If these things did not take place, then how do you account for the statements in Tacitus, Lucian, Martial, Pliny, Celsus, and others?—heathens, all of whom admit the facts, and simply try to escape from the conclusion. If these facts did take place, the apostles certainly could not have manufactured them, and the prophecies are therefore literally fulfilled. Is there a way of escape from this conclusion? (Applause.)



Mr. WALKER:

We will resume our argument where we had to leave it in our last address when our time was exhausted, first reviewing the points our friend has attempted to answer; but, instead of answering, he merely contented himself with twitting us upon our ignorance of the matters with which we are dealing.

To return, then, to the prophecy supposed to relate to the journey of Jesus to the land of Egypt. While we would not endeavor to raise outside issues, it is scarcely foreign to the point to remark that no evangelist mentions it, excepting Matthew, and that Luke, in the second chapter, if he does not distinctly tell us in so many words, gives us to understand that Jesus did not go down into Egypt at all, but stayed in Nazareth, and yearly went with his parents to Jerusalem. However, our friend has said there was a typical prophecy relating to this, and Matthew says he went to Egypt for the express purpose of fulfilling that prophecy. Where does our friend make the difference between an actual prophecy and a typical prophecy? If this was not a prophecy it was not fulfilled; and yet Matthew says this was done for the simple reason "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying 'out of Egypt have I called

my son." If this prophecy was fulfilled, then Israel, and not Jesus, was called out of Egypt, then Matthew, when he leads us to imagine there was a literal fulfillment in the case of Jesus (although our friend kindly informs us to the contrary), is either guilty of gross ignorance or wilful deception in recording it as having a literal fulfillment. Give any intelligent Christian, with "a school-boy Christian education," the Bible, and let him read this passage for the first time, and he can draw no other possible meaning from it, than that there had been a distinct and not a typical prophecy made, of which this recorded the fulfillment. The very fact that our friend has to go back to Hosea to show that Matthew was wrong, indicates clearly and unmistakably that Matthew was quoting erroneously; and if we had not the passage in the first instance, we should all be misled. Our friend forebore to mention the very words we used, in reference to Jesus being called a Nazarene; but he quoted the words relating to the prophet's sign instead. Here is certainly dishonesty.

However, to clear away the difficulties connected with the passage in Hosea, let us suppose for the present that the passage is intended as a prophetic type of Jesus. In the eleventh chapter of Hosea, and first verse, we read:—

"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son.  
out of Egypt."

Now, will we have read the following:

The CHAIRMAN read accordingly:—

"As they called them, so they went from them, they sacrificed  
unto Balaam, and burned incense to graven images."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now let us see: this is supposed to be a type of Jesus. He burned incense to graven images, and sacrificed to Balaam! Did he do this? Certainly not. Then this is not even a type of Jesus. It simply is a record of the doings of the children of Israel on their return from Egypt, but when the whole context is applied to Jesus it is absurd to the last degree; for Jesus did not do these things, and Israel did. Therefore, not even as a type can this text from Matthew be quoted. Why, in the name of Reason, could not Matthew use plain language? Could he not have said that the prophecy was only as a type, and that he was only recording the fulfillment of the type, and not of an actual, distinct, and literal prophecy?

We cannot allow this last method of reasoning to go past. Here is a plain statement, in plain language; and, in order to refute that statement, or throw it aside, our friend says there can be no telling what this text means, until some one is employed versed in the depths and heights of prophecy! He tells us—who are without a "school-boy education"—that this is a type!

Now, when our opponent has quoted to you a text from the Old Testament, which says, "He shall be called a Nazarene," then he will have proved to us that Matthew did not fabricate that portion. He will have proved to you that Matthew was quoting something that the prophet said; though we should still have to ask him whether he really meant us to understand that it was a prophecy, strictly so speaking, or whether it only was "*spoken by the prophet.*" When we quoted that passage from Hosea, in reference to the spiritual man

being "mad," and the prophet a "fool," he said this was very good evidence that the false prophecies were not preserved, and that they took special care to preserve the true prophecies, whilst the others were rejected. Then what shall we say when the Bible even convicts "the Lord God" of actually deceiving the people by Himself giving false prophecies? Will our friend refer to the 14th chapter of Ezekiel, 9th verse?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"And if a prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel."

MR. WALKER: Will you now turn to 1st Kings, 22nd chapter, 19—23 verses?

The CHAIRMAN reads:—

(19) "And he said, Hear thou, therefore, the word of the Lord. I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand, and on His left."

(20.) "And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner."

(21.) "And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said I will persuade him."

(22.) "And the Lord said unto him wherewith? And he said I will go forth and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth and do so."

(23.) "Now, therefore, behold, *the Lord hath put a lying spirit* in the mouth of all these thy prophets, *and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.*"

MR. WALKER: Now, will our friend read 2nd chapter of 2nd Thessalonians, 11th verse?

MR. GREEN: May I ask that the connection be read also, for the fairness of the argument?

ONE OF THE COMMITTEE stated it was Mr. Green's place to show the connection.

Quotation and connection read:

11th v.—"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie.

12th v.—"That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

MR. GREEN: Hear hear,—you have read too much.

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. All we wanted to show was that "the Lord" would send them "strong delusion," and when the "strong delusion" cometh, *it is "the Lord" who sends it!!!* So we poor individuals cannot be blamed for it. (Hear! hear!)

We have shown the character of these prophecies—we have shown that there are false prophecies; we have shown to you that Matthew was quite incorrect when he alluded to that which was spoken of "the Lord" by the prophets. So far, then, so good. (Applause.)



As briefly as possible we must yet refer to the answers our friend makes to our argument of the discrepancies in the genealogies as given by Matthew and Luke. He says it is clearly seen that Matthew gives the genealogy of Mary, and Luke, of Joseph. But we say, how is it clear? Does Matthew say so? If Matthew says what he means, he gives us the genealogy of Joseph, and Luke describes the same; then how is it clear? Why give us the genealogy of Joseph if Mary was meant? Our friend says it was in order that the Jews, (who attach great importance to these matters) might be satisfied with the descent of Jesus, as to his condition and position in society! Then let us suppose we were listening to Matthew, and Luke, as we might imagine them consulting about the matter. They would say: "there is no use our talking to the Jews who know their own prophecies about the "virgin conceiving" and bearing a son! It is no use our telling them that: we must make something else up: we must have Jesus, on *his father's side*, descended from the house of David, and so make it a matter of fulfilling prophecy and history." Would such a deception be sanctified in any modern instance? Then why should we place confidence in such grave fabrications *because they are eighteen hundred years old*? We are asked to believe these statements and sayings made by men who were guilty of *forging* prophecies purporting to be collected from sayings of the old prophets; but which in reality were never uttered. These men cannot, or will not of themselves give us the distinct meaning of that which they tell us; but it is left to our friend to tell us that the prophecies are typical, and the genealogies equally so! Again, does the Bible say they are typical? Does the Bible give our friend authority for saying that the lineage was, as he describes, to be understood in a typical sense? He may easily reconcile the greatest contradictions by supposing ever so much. We could prove anything by "supposing" everything. We might prove that a cow is a man if it were only granted that it had *every* appearance of a man. Our friend says that the early opponents of Christianity would most decidedly have used these arguments if they had thought there were any contradictions in the genealogies. Now, that is "supposing" the case again. We are not "supposing" that all the early opponents of Christianity were as sarcastic, or as clear-witted and shrewd as Voltaire and others were in later times. But the mere fact of many not having mentioned them is no proof that the contradictions were not there. But that these contradictions were there is proved by the fact that many of the early "fathers" tried to reconcile them. However, we defy our friend to reconcile them by the records themselves, and before he can prove that there are no contradictions, and maintain his present position, he must alter the writings of Matthew, and Luke, or declare them to be forgeries. Now, if the records themselves be true, they blaspheme the Infinite, and accuse "the Holy Ghost" of the most revolting of crimes. Will the Chairman refer to the 22nd chapter Deuteronomy, 22nd to 24th verses? The CHAIRMAN read accordingly:

- (22) "If a man be found lying with a woman married to a husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman and the woman, so shalt thou put away evil from Israel.

- (23) If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed to a husband and a man find her in the city and lie with her.
- (24) Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of the city and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel because she cried not, being in the city, and the man because he has humbled his neighbor's wife, so thou shalt put away evil from among you."

There is a declaration in distinct and emphatic language, imposing on the Jews a certain law, with penalties for its violation. Now, who is found breaking the law? *Blasphemy* is the first to say God himself!!! We say, never! In the time of "the Messiah" was there not then a necessity for putting away evil? When Deity is guilty of breaking His own laws, then how is He justifiable in punishing his children, when following His example? It is stated that "God" drowned the world to save it from sin; and yet if our friend's arguments are correct, the object was not accomplished; but, to be so, necessitated the violation of chastity on the part of *God!!!*—an act which, if committed by fallible man, entailed death by stoning not only of him, but of the virgin also. It is a position which should shock the fine feelings of every sensitive man that is versed in the decency of every-day life. The argument we advanced, that if Jesus was God he was no example to man, and if a man he certainly was not God, our friend has still failed to answer, although he says that it is not necessary to be a man to set an example to man, and "he illustrates what he means" by supposing a hen spreading out her wings over her young ones to protect them, and by inference implies that this is an example for men to imitate. Now, have men got wings? A man does not imitate a hen, or the hen the man, when they protect their offspring; and a man would protect his, even if the hen had never existed.

How can it, therefore, be said that the protection of the brood of the hen is an example to man? For a man to follow exactly the example of the hen (as is expected in the case of Jesus, already pointed out by us) he must have wings. So our friend's illustration falls very wide of the mark. Is not the protection of the young an instinct of all life, and possessed by man, in common with the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fowls of the farm-yard. We do not, then, imitate these, but use that instinct which they have in common with us, when we care for, or protect our progeny. And thus it will be perceived that when Deity comes as a God, and an exact example for us to imitate in his doings and sayings, then we say we cannot be blamed for not coming up to His standard, for He is on a different platform to ourselves, He being Deity, and we but His creatures, humble, erring mortals. Suppose we give an illustration: Two individuals are about to swim across a river, and one of the swimmers takes belts and all the requisites for supporting himself and making himself buoyant in the water; the other has not these aids, and he has to cross the river without the supporting apparatus. Which will have the best chance? Would you blame the latter, because he could not swim so far, nor so well as the former?

If Jesus was without sin, and did all that is recorded of him, and was verily Deity, then, comparatively speaking, his works were trifling

for Deity to do, and certainly not more than we would expect of a God. Why blame man, who is so inferior to Deity, because he cannot, forsooth, do that which Deity—ininitely his superior—has, done?

Our friend says, if Jesus was born of man, these prophecies would be falsified; and he goes back to the text in Isaiah about "the virgin conceiving," to prove this. Now, we may point out that the word translated "virgin" can, with equal correctness, be rendered by the words "marriageable woman." It is applied to Ruth and others in the Old Testament. If this may mean "marriageable woman," where is the force of the word "virgin" in the text? Imagine this unnatural act of conception being reported as taking place in the present day, instead of eighteen centuries ago, and ask yourselves in what light you would receive such a report! Verily, in this instance, "distance lends enchantment to the view" with a vengeance! Can that which would have been wrong on the part of fallible man be right on the part of infallible Deity? Perhaps our friend will kindly oblige us by attempting to reconcile this monstrous position in which he places that Wondrous Power that filleth all space. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

I had intended, but for my friend's last address, to have noticed one of the points which was just mentioned in my previous speech, and which was brought up by him, viz., the request for mathematical demonstration. But as my friend has touched again upon a point on which he became quite melodramatic last Thursday night, viz., the statements in regard to mythology. I shall now give it attention.

You will remember he spoke of the God-head being found in a six-foot man, thereby showing a determination to wound the feelings of Christians, or, if not, then at any rate evidencing an ignorance of their views. He also spoke of obscenity in connection with the conception of the Saviour, and certainly if we take his reference to it, and the language he has used to-night, we might be compelled to admit there was something of obscenity in the narrative. Certainly there is something peculiar in his state of mind. We know that "to the pure all things are pure." This narrative, which is in itself pure as the driven snow, will not suggest impure thoughts to pure minds. I may say that it is my conviction that the mind which can see obscenity and impurity in the gospel narratives of the birth of Christ, has lost moral perception. (Interruption.) I again affirm that the man who can see obscenity in the record by Matthew and Luke has lost moral sense.

Last Thursday my friend referred to the statement by Draper; and the statements he gave so oracularly he said were to be found in the 8th verse of chapter I. Now, there are no verses in Draper, but simply paragraphs.

MR. WALKER: Will our friend allow me to correct him. I said it was on page 8.

MR. GREEN: He said chapter I, verse 8; those are his own words.

[MR. WALKER here made a few remarks, which the noise in the hall prevented the reporter hearing.]

MR. GREEN continued: Of course I am glad he has corrected himself; I will use that correction as an argument by-and-by. Now, when speaking of mathematical demonstrations, he quoted certain matters as to the heathen mythology; he gave us statements about Rhea Silvia, Romulus and Remus, and others, and told us that in the olden times it was a common thing to speak of immaculate conceptions and births that might be called miraculous; indeed these were so common that it is evident that the one in the gospel narrative was of the same kind, and not worth our credence and attention.

Now, I have just to make a statement to you to-night, and for that statement I will give you proofs that will put rather a different complexion on my friend's affirmation as to the teaching of the ancient mythologies. For the sake of perspicuity I have reduced these remarks to waiting, so that I may lose no time, and that no mistake may be made as to the point I seek to establish.

Now, in regard to this representation of the teaching of the Greek poets, who beyond doubt wrote at a period from 8 to 11 centuries before Christ, there are two schools of interpretation, and it will depend upon which school we incline to, as to whether we believe that the Greek poets did write such fabulous and nonsensical stories or not. We may take as representing these respective schools of thought, the names of Mr. Grote, and Professor Max Muller, one of the greatest philologists and mythologists of the present day. Mr. Grote contends for a literal interpretation of the ancient poets; and there can be no doubt that, interpreting them literally, and according to our modern ideas of the use of words, the position that the Greek poets do contain these fabled myths would be amply sustained. But it needs to be considered that there is such a thing as poetic license, which prevents us even now from taking the language of poetry as we would sober prose writing. We know this is so in regard both to Milton and Shakespeare, and it may be said the rule will apply generally to all poetry.

There is also to be taken into account the nature of all languages in their infancy, and that from the very nature of the words at command, and the habits of mind of the people, all their ideas, whether in poetry, or, even to a large extent, in ordinary conversation, will be couched in highly figurative and metaphorical language.

These things certainly do militate against a literal interpretation of the poets. Professor Max Muller, in opposition to the school which Mr. Grote represents, urges that the poets ought not to be literally interpreted. He points out the marked distinction between the ideas contained in the poets when literally interpreted, and the ordinary language of the time. His words are, "Although later poets may have given these fables a charm of beauty, and led us to accept them as imaginative compositions, it is impossible to conceal the tact that, taken by themselves, and in their literal meaning, most of these ancient myths are absurd and irrational, and frequently

opposed to the principles of thought, religion, and morality which guided the Greeks as soon as they appear to us in the twilight of traditional history." As illustrations of this opposition between a literal interpretation of the poets, and the ordinary principles of thought, religion, and morals, Muller says, "When the swine-herd Eumaeos, unacquainted, perhaps, with the intricate system of the Olympian mythology, speaks of the deity, he speaks like one of ourselves. 'Eat,' he says to Odysseus, 'and enjoy what is here, for God will grant one thing, but another he will refuse, whatever he will in his mind; for he can do all things.'" "This," he adds, "we may suppose was the language of the common people in the days of Homer, and it is simple and sublime, if compared with one of the supposed grandest conceptions of Greek mythology, where Zeno, in order to assert his omnipotence, tells the gods that if they took a rope, and all the gods and goddesses pulled on one side, they could not draw him down from the heavens to the Earth; while, if he chose, he could pull them all up, and suspend the earth and the sea from the summit of Olympus." "What is more ridiculous," he asks, "than the mythological account of the creation of the human race by Deucalion and Pyrrha throwing stones behind them,—a myth which owes its origin to a pun on the words *Chaos* and *Chaas*."

On the notions among the Greeks of the god-head, expressed by the story of Uranos, maimed by Kronos—of Kronos eating his children, swallowing a stone, and vomiting out alive his whole progeny, Muller says, "Among the lowest tribes of Africa and America, we hardly find anything more hideous and revolting. We find frequent indications in ancient history that the Greeks themselves were shocked by the stories told of their gods. As their ideas of the God-head became purer, they felt that the idea of perfection involved in the idea of a divine being excluded the very possibility of immoral gods."

In noting the origin of these myths, and examining Mr. Grote's theory, that they were purely creations of the imagination, and never had any basis in fact, he says, "It is shutting our eyes to the difficulties which stare us in the face, if we say, like Mr. Grote, that this mythology was 'a past which never was present,' and it seems blasphemy to consider these fables of the heathen world, as corrupted or misinterpreted fragments of a divine revelation once granted to the whole race of mankind."

In explaining the origin of these myths, Professor Muller affirms that they arose from a use of their simple forms of concrete language, hard to be understood by moderns, whose speech is largely made up of abstract terms; that their concrete terms, when taken as moderns use them, convey an altogether different meaning to what the ancients intended. He illustrates this by saying, "Where we speak of the sun following the dawn, the ancient poets could only think and speak of the sun loving and embracing the dawn. What is with us a sunset, was to them the sun growing old, decaying, or dying. Our sunrise was to them the night giving birth to a brilliant child, and in the Spring, they really saw the sun and the sky embracing the Earth with a warm embrace, and showering treasures into the lap of Nature."

When we remember that in the infancy of language, they had only concrete nouns, and that everyone of these, together with collective words, such as sky and earth, dew and rain, even to rivers and mountains, had necessarily terminations *expressive of gender*, and that this naturally produced in the mind the corresponding idea of sex, so that these names received, not only an individual, but a sexual character—that there was no substantive which was not either masculine or feminine. We have a key which unlocks the secret as to the origin of these poetic representations, and it will be seen that they were never intended to convey the ideas, which, upon a literal interpretation of them, they would convey; but that they were simply poetical, and highly figurative descriptions, which, when literalized, convey ideas never intended by the original writer or composer."

Then, again, "In mythical language all due allowance must be made. For example, there are many myths in Hesiod of late origin, where, from the absence of merely auxiliary words, every noun or verb had still its full power during the mythical ages. Words were heavy and unwieldy; they said more than they ought to say; and hence much of the strangeness of the mythological language, which we can only understand by watching the natural growth of speech." As an illustration of these myths in Hesiod, which are of late origin, Muller says, there are many of them "where we have only to replace a full verb by an auxiliary, in order to change the mythical into logical language. Hesiod calls Nux (night), the mother of Moros (fate), and the dark Ker (destruction) of Thanatos (death) Hypnos (sleep), and the tribe of the Oneiroi (dreams); and thus her progeny is said to be born without a father. Again, she is called the mother of Momos (blame), and of the woeful Oizys (woe), and of the Hesperides (evening stars), who guard the beautiful golden apples on the other side of the far-famed Okeanos, and the trees that bear fruit. She also bore Nemesis (vengeance), and Apato (fraud), and Philotes (lust), and Geras (old age), and the strong-minded Eris (strife). Now, let us use our modern expressions such as "the stars are seen as the night approaches; we sleep; we dream; we die; we run danger during the night; nightly revels lead to strife, angry discussion, and woe; many nights bring old age, and at last death; an evil deed, concealed at first by the darkness of night, will at last be revealed by the day. Night herself will be revenged on the criminal;" and we have translated the language of Hesiod,—a language to a great extent understood by the people whom he addressed,—into our modern form of speech.

"All this is hardly mythological language, but rather a poetical and proverbial kind of expression, known to all poets, whether modern or ancient, and frequently to be found in the language of the common people." Professor Muller affirms that the mistake has been made by regarding (as does Mr. Grote) the Greek Uranos, Nyx, Hypnos, and Oneiros, (heaven, night, sleep, dream), as persons, just as much as Zeno and Apollo. It will therefore be seen, that upon the authority of Professor Max Muller—and there is no greater authority in Europe than he—we are justified in saying, that there are no such representations of immaculate conceptions and miraculous births in the ancient Greek poets as my friend has affirmed, that such

a representation of them rests altogether upon a misconception of the nature of the language used. Where, then, is the argument Mr. Walker sought to base upon these myths? His argument was that in the Greek mythology there are cases of immaculate conceptions and miraculous births, but that no sane man would consider them as sober statements of fact; that in the New Testament we have an account of an immaculate conception and birth, and that, therefore, the New Testament statement of such case cannot be a statement of fact. Now, as we have entirely taken away his premises, what becomes of his conclusion? May we not say, in the language of a modern poet, that it has vanished like the "baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind." Nor will my friend's case be mended by resorting to the mythological histories of other peoples; for, as Professor Muller remarks, "We must say at once they are identical in form and character, whether we find them on Indian, Persian, Greek, Italian, Slavonian, or Teutonic soil." But, as much has been made, by some Spiritualists in this city, of the Hindu and kindred mythologies, I would just give this point a passing notice. As I stated in my last address on the previous evening of debate, those of the Hindu writings upon which reliance is placed in order to show the existence of myths of the kind we have been discussing, are really of comparatively modern date,—dating, according to Mr. Thomson, the translator of the *Bhagavat-Gita*, certainly not earlier than the first century before Christ, and may be so late as the end of the third century after Christ. Some of the Indian writings, such as the *Veda*, with its four divisions—the *Rig Veda*, *Yagur Veda*, *Sama Veda*, and *Athana Veda*—are certainly very ancient, dating from the eighth to the tenth century before Christ; but we unhesitatingly affirm, upon the authority of Professor Muller—who is the translator of the *Veda*,—that there is not the slightest vestige in them of the stories of divine conceptions and births such as are supposed to be found in the Greek poets, and in the later Hindu writings. The value of the *Veda* is great, because it is the oldest known writing of the Aryan race, but as to the composition and subject-matter, Muller declares that were it not for its antiquity and its connection with all the Indo-European races, it would have no value at all; and as a literary composition as compared with the Bible, that no comparison is possible, so infinitely superior is the Bible to the *Veda*.

In speaking of the Persian writers, such as the *Zendavesta*, *Bundehesh*, and *Minokhirea*, Professor Muller says, "Sir Wm. Jones pronounced it (the *Zend*) to be a dialect of *Chaidaic*. Spiegel, however, who is now publishing the texts of these translations, has established the fact, that the language is truly Aryan, neither Semitic, nor barbarous, but Persian in roots and grammar. He accounts for the large infusion of foreign terms by pointing to the mixed elements in the intellectual and religious life of Persia during and before that period. There was the Semitic influence of *Babylonia* clearly discerned even in the characters of the *Achaemenian* inscriptions; there was the slow infiltration of Jewish ideas, customs, and expressions, working sometimes in the palaces of Persian kings (as we see in the book of *Esther*), and always in the bazaars of Persian cities, on high roads, and in villages; there was the irresistible power of the

Greek genius, which, even under its rude Macedonian garb, emboldened Oriental thinkers to a flight into regions undreamed of in their philosophy; there were the academies, the works of art of the Seleucidae; there was Edessa on the Euphrates, a city where Plato and Aristotle were studied, where Christian, Jewish, and Buddhist tenets were discussed, where Ephraim Syrus taught, and Syrian translations were circulated, which have preserved to us the lost originals of Greek and Christian writers. [Time expired.] (Applause.)



ME. WALKER:

Before we attempt to go over the ground that our friend has left untouched, we must compliment him on the ability he has displayed—a compliment he has paid ourselves on former occasions,—in avoiding the real points at issue by going off into an elaborate dissertation on Muller, and Grote, and Thompson's works, and the Vedas, Ac; but he has, designedly or otherwise, left untouched those points to which we specially called his attention. As it is, he has advanced nothing to reply to, as we could admit all that he has brought forward in reference to the poetical construction of the ancient languages, and how people expressed their ideas by referring to the phenomena of Nature, as though they were endowed with personality and individuality, and, if necessary, even thus strengthen our arguments, such as we possess; but why, in Reason's name, does he not apply the same rule to the records in the book we are discussing? When these expressions occur in the ancient Greek and other writings, they refer to phenomena of Nature; but when such events are described in Isaiah, as a "virgin conceiving," and Jesus Christ being born by "immaculate conception," they are divine truths, to be understood as literal without the aid of poetry! The story of Rhea Silvia is fabulous, and cannot be accepted as literally true by sensible men; but a similar story told by Isaiah or Matthew is a divine truth!!! (Hear. Hear.)

Now, although our friend has pretended to answer the objections raised by Draper, whom we quoted, he has not, in reality, touched upon them. He has gone back to the times beyond Draper, when language was so poetical that all the phenomena and forces of Nature had to be expressed as individualities, and thus these expressions are now to be understood in a poetic sense. But we are referring to the times described by Draper, when Alexander went down to the cave of Jupiter Ammon. *It was then* that the Oracle proclaimed him to be "the son of Jupiter Ammon," who, in the form of a serpent, had beguiled his mother.

These events were currently received in those days, when whoever greatly distinguished himself in the affairs of life was supposed to be of supernatural lineage. Even in Rome, centuries later than these days of Alexander's greatness, and when language had arrived at such a state of perfection that Tacitus, and Pliny, and Suetonius used it for the narration of great events, and when philosophers and moralists, orators and poets, had given precision to its meaning, no one could with safety have denied that the State of Rome owed its founder



to the meeting of the God Mars and the virgin Rhea Silvia. Plato's disciples would have then looked with anger on any one who rejected the legend, that the mother of the great philosopher had suffered "immaculate conception" through the influence of Apollo.

Our friend has taken you back to those days of antiquity, when man would not call night by its proper name, but personified it in Nux, and from these he attributed all the absurdities found in the early writings to poetical license. Yet those stories told so long ago are as plausible as those found in the Bible, and if we reject them we must reject the others on the same grounds. Here are these events described. Let our friend, on the next occasion, if possible, refer to that paragraph in Draper, and show if that author in this respect is falsified. The very authorities that have been quoted illustrate most clearly the absurdities of these ancient fables. When language could not express ideas so literally as now, nor speak of things as they actually were, then it was quite natural that the real meaning of those people of antiquity should be hidden behind the poetic terms that gave the origin to multitudes of fables. And so, if we find similar stories related of different heroes, we have the obvious explanatory and even so great an authority as Max Muller himself institutes comparisons between Christians and Christianity.

It is said by T. L. Harris in his work called the "Morning Land," that the principal doctrines of Christianity, such as "the resurrection," and "crucifixion," are the same as those current in those very poetical days, and were long before the Christian Epochs believed in the land of Egypt. Did not AEsculapius raise the dead? Did not he heal the sick? Did not Hypolitus, among the Greeks, do the same? Did not, also, Appolonius, of Tyana, do the same—if we are to trust "profane" history? Are these records in "profane" history poetic and untrue, and those in the (so-called) gospels literal and true? The ideas are exactly the same. Why reject one as a fabulous legend in poetic language when it is exactly parallel with this case which we are told to look upon as divine? (Applause.)

Now, in our concluding remarks, let us show what our friend has still to do in order that the debate may be profitable to all concerned: He has to show that Matthew did not fabricate these statements, about the prophecies being foretold, that they "might be fulfilled." He has still to reconcile these difficulties, to which he did not even allude in his last speech: He has yet to show that God was man and still an example for man's imitation: He has also to show, that if Jesus was the *son of man*—in the sense of coming from Joseph as described—he was also "*the son of God*:" He has to show that we are wrong in reasoning that if he did not come from the house of David: he was *not* the expected "Messiah;" for, if he did not sit upon the throne of his father David, how could he be "the Messiah" that was expected? (Hear! Hear!)

Our friend says, if we reject *some* of the accounts given by Matthew and Luke we do away with the individuality of Jesus, arguing that if we do not believe all we should believe none. What nonsense this is! Because St. Patrick has something wonderful related of him (which we do not accept) we must not believe that St. Patrick lived. Because some one tells us something marvelous

about John Smith which we cannot believe, therefore John Smith does not live! In reply to our argument, that if "the immaculate conception" took place then God was immoral, we have introduced to us a new system of morality. We are reminded that "to the pure all things are pure," and told that no one who had not lost all moral sense could see anything obscene or impure in the Bible records! Let us take you to the police court, where some individual is being charged with using language of the most foul and filthy description. The judge or magistrate examines him, and informs him that he is charged with using, obscene language, and asks him if he has any excuse or defence to make to such a charge. We will suppose the culprit blandly looks at the judge and merely replies, "to the pure all things are pure!" Would the judge discharge him on such an excuse we rather think not?

Because we see something immoral in the Bible stories our friend accuses us of having lost all moral sentiment! Well, we would rather be guilty, or supposed to be guilty, by our friend, of judging wrongly than receive such statements as divine truths! But is it not in the very opposite way we ought to look at it; for it requires the finest moral education to detect the immoral, when hidden in poetic figures, and typical imagery? Surely the Bible stories, if not immoral, will bear being told in language that may be understood! Must they always be written in the typical and metaphorical garb which renders it so difficult to reach the meaning which our friend has given to you? Are we always to be under the necessity of consulting our friend whether the literal or spiritual meaning is to be taken? Who is to be the judge of the true meaning which the authors intended to convey?

He has admitted that these records are but histories, written by fallible men; he has admitted that all related in the gospels is not inspired, and that there *are* forgeries in the New Testament.

MR. GREEN: I have not admitted it; I have not admitted that there are forgeries in the New Testament: I said there were interpolations, which are very different things to forgeries.

MR. WALKER: Well, we will place the matter another way. Our friend admitted that the text in reference to "the three heavenly witnesses" was placed among the writings of John, *when he was not the real author*. Does not this amount to a *forgery*? But, though, our friend wishes it to be interpreted by some other method than this which Providence figures in, at all events he will grant that it is an interpolation. This being the case, who is to decide which are the interpolations, and which the result of inspiration? Are we to take our friend's judgment? He told us we were not debating the inspiration of the scriptures; but we re-affirm that if the New Testament is not of divine origin, then the superstructure, which is built upon it, cannot be of divine origin. Does our friend know when and by whom the gospels were received as canonical? They were chosen, as he must admit, from other writings *by fallible men*. What proof have we, then, that by their ballot-voting as to what should constitute "the word of God" they did not, after all, make some mistake? Our friend says we must use our reason. Very good: But from whose stand-point shall we reason? And to those who

cannot reason, whose reasoning must we give them? Our friend's! Is *his* reason infallible? Shall we place ourselves in his hands, and accept his interpretation of "divine revelation," when it is of such great consequence "that he who believeth shall be saved, and he who believeth not shall be damned?" Not unless he can first prove that his reason is infallible!

Our friend has told us that one of "the gospels" was written. in the original Hebrew tongue: viz., "the gospel of Matthew." Now, we have repeatedly called upon him, and he has failed to produce it, and he moreover cannot quote from a single individual who has seen the original document. In one of his prior speeches our friend told us that the "fathers" *valued* the New Testament scriptures so much, that if all the gospels were destroyed they could be replaced by passages from the early fathers! and yet they were so *careless of the value* to be attached to the original manuscript of Matthew that they have allowed it to perish! So much for their inconsistency through which we are now bound to accept merely Greek accounts of the fulfillments of the prophecies. Surely if these writings were divinely inspired the originals would have been divinely preserved, so as to thereby test the accuracy of all copies in succeeding ages. Again, we are told that they are not prophecies at all, but simply types, and have nothing to do with the matter under dispute. If so, Matthew is thrown out of court,—he is found guilty of misleading; for, indeed, no one "with an ordinary school-boy Christian education" could fail to detect the absurdities and contradictions he is guilty of. Our friend has failed to show (and he has still that labor to accomplish) that the gospels do not on some occasions tell lies: for instance, in the case of Judas, one account says he went and hanged himself; and then, in the 1st chapt. Acts, 18th verse, we are told that, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Which are we to believe? Again, Matthew says the priest "took the pieces of money and bought with them the potter's field, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet Ac." Now, first there is no "Jeremy the prophet" mentioned in the Bible, and the nearest approach to it is Jeremiah the prophet; and, secondly, even Jeremiah says nothing about the matter! What evidence have we to show that these writings have a better claim to have been specially inspired by God than the writings of Homer, or Hesiod? If these predictions were made by men, let them be judged as other writings are; when found guilty of error, let them be put out of court. Another point before we conclude, and one which we particularly want our friend to notice, is that he will advance his proofs as far as possible to show that Jesus was God, or that he manifested himself, in any special sense, to be "the son of God" *by his own life*. Strange to say, we find Jesus himself guilty of prophesying incorrectly. He said, when describing his second coming to man, that "the stars would fall from Heaven, the Sun would be darkened, and the Moon would not give her light, and the powers of Heaven would be shaken;" and he also said, "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled!" Now, that generation *has* passed away, and *those things have not yet been fulfilled!* Jesus, therefore, did not prophesy correctly; and, therefore, he is a false

prophet; and if he is a false prophet he cannot be God. If the enlightened world were to set to work now to write a new Bible they would produce one more consistent in all its parts than is this one, of *professedly* "divine origin" is. We are blamed for insulting Christians; but, once for all, let us apologise if we used language which, in your ears, sounded strong, perhaps, because it was heard for the first time, by you, applied to that which you look upon reverentially and because it may have gone against your present convictions. The best reasons we can give for using such terms is that we wish you to see these matters in their clearest light. We used such language, not for the we of wounding your feelings: far from it; but in order that we might place our arguments before you in as clear a manner as possible, that you might understand that which was spoken, and then draw logical conclusions from the principles laid down. (Applause.)

*FIFTH EVENING:*

WEDNESDAY, 13th March.

MR. GREEN, having been duly introduced by the Chairman, in a few prefatory remarks, spoke as follows:

RESPECTED FRIENDS: When my time expired, I was just drawing towards the conclusion of a connected argument, which, had I been able to finish, would have obviated the necessity of my friend giving us the very eloquent, and (judging by the applause), very telling speech with which he concluded the debate last night. Because I was not able to make the point which I was endeavoring to do, in consequence of the expiration of time, there can be no doubt that my friend gained an apparent victory. However, it was legitimate under the circumstances according to the ordinary rules of debate, and I have nothing to complain of. It is, however, possible, that by a little patient attention, we may find the victory requires to change sides.

You will remember that last evening, in my address, I was pointing out, just when time expired, that the Zend-Avesta, and other writings, had been burnt by Alexander the Great, and had only been held in the *memory* from that time until two centuries after Christ. Professor Muller was pointing out, in the quotation I was reading, the various influences which were at work in connection with the re-committing to writing of the Zend-Avesta, and other works, and he was also showing how Semitic ideas, as well as Christian and other ideas, were all mingled together. As the debate is to be published, I need not repeat my remarks, and as I shall have other matters of very considerable importance, which will fully occupy my time, I shall commence the quotation where I left off. Professor Muller continues: "While this intellectual stream, principally flowing through Semitic channels, was irrigating and inundating the west of Asia, the Persian language had been left without literary cultivation. Need we wonder, then, that the men who, at the rising of a new National Dynasty (A.D. 226, at which period the Avesta was committed to writing as the Parsis, of Bombay, and Yezd now have it), became the reformers, teachers, and prophets of Persia, should have formed their language and the whole train of their ideas on a Semitic model? We may consider the Huzvaresh of the translations of the Avesta, as the language of the Sassanian court and hierarchy. Works, also, like the Bundelesh and Minokhirea, belong by language

and thought to the same period of mystic incubation (viz., A.D. 226) when India and Egypt, Babylonia, and Greece, were sitting together and gossiping like crazy old women, chattering with toothless gums, and silly brains, about the dreams and joys of their youth, yet unable to recall one single thought or feeling with that vigor which once gave it life and truth. It was a period of religious and metaphysical delirium—when everything became everything; when Maya and Sophia, Mitra and Christ, Viraf and Isaiah, Belus, Zarvan, and Kronos were mixed up in one jumbled system of inane speculation; from which, at last, the East was delivered by the positive doctrine of Mohammed, and the west by the pure Christianity of the Teutonic nations."

In regard to the relative value of the old religions and Christianity, Professor Muller says, that by a comparative study of them "we shall learn to appreciate better than ever what we have in our own religion. No one who has not examined, patiently and honestly, the other religions of the world, can know what Christianity really is, or can join with such truth or sincerity in the words of St. Paul, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.'" Again, he says, "Many are the advantages to be derived from a careful study of other religions, but the greatest of all is, that it teaches us to appreciate more highly what we possess in our own. Let us see what other nations have had, and still have, in the place of religion. Let us examine the prayers, the worship, the theology, even, of the most highly civilized races, the Greeks, the Romans, the Hindus, the Persians, and we shall then understand more thoroughly what blessings are vouchsafed to us in being allowed to breathe from the first breath of life, the pure air of a land of Christian light and knowledge. We have done so little to gain our religion, we have suffered so little in the cause of truth, that, however highly we prize our Christianity, we never prize it highly enough, until we have compared it with the religions of the rest of the world."

These remarks of the Professor are certainly very weighty, and they are from one capable of judging. All persons who have read any of the works of Professor Muller know that he is speaking of matters that he has thoroughly examined; and he is not writing as a minister of religion—for he is not one,—but he is writing simply and purely as a scientific man, and speaking of matters of which he has knowledge. Now, as I pointed out briefly the other evening, my friend's arguments from mythology are altogether gone. He evidently felt this, as last night he very freely admitted that he was ready to acquiesce in all that I stated as from Muller; doubtless, because he saw the proofs were so overwhelming, and could not be questioned. He has, therefore, admitted that the argument which I have adduced in reference to these mythological stories is a true argument, and based on real facts. I need not detain you further upon this. (Applause.)

Then he has advanced the case of Alexander the Great, and affirmed that these myths we have noticed refer to historical times, and are really on a par with the events of the gospel narrative. Now, let me just say, on this matter, that Dr. William Smith, in his history of Greece, states that Alexander "consulted the Oracle in secret, and is said never to have disclosed the answer which he received; though

that it was an answer that-contented him appeared from the magnificence of the offerings which he made to the god. Some say that Ammon saluted him as the son of Jove." It cannot, then, be affirmed that the Oracle stated that he was the son of Jove, nor that Alexander ever made such a statement. In connection with this I would also ask you to observe that his mother would often say that "she wished that Alexander would cease from incessantly embroiling her with the wife of Jupiter Ammon," evidently showing that she regarded it as a huge joke. Now, what are the facts of the case? We find that Alexander was a young man of about 32 years of age, and that, inflated by his unparalleled successes, and the adulation and flattery he received, he began actually to imagine that he was descended from the Deity. But how is it that this statement in regard to Alexander has not found credence, as did the statements in connection with Achilles, Ajax, Hercules, and others of those Grecian heroes, the accounts of whom have been handed down to us, and which accounts have really been regarded by many to have a solid basis of truth? The reason why all persons laugh at the assumption of this title by Alexander is, because it happened in historical times, and because the light of history, shining on the whole details in connection with it, proves that it was simply the conceit of an egotistical and very successful warrior, who, because of his unparalleled successes, thought that there must have been something in connection with his birth different from that, of ordinary men; but no one in those times regarded the idea as having any truth in it whatever.

My friend asks the question, "if these mythological stories are not to be taken literally,—if they are to be taken in accordance with the rules usually applicable to poetry, how is it that these same rules should not be applied to the case of the virgin, as prophesied by Isaiah?" I answer, for this simple reason: As it was utterly impossible for Alexander to impose upon the people in reference to his own descent, because he lived in historical times; so, we say, the prediction was made by Isaiah in historical times, and the culture of the Hebrews, the development of their language, their care in preserving their historical records,—all prevent any such application of principles as must be made in connection with these myths that are recorded in Homer and Hesiod, and those other works of the ancient Greek authors. Now, my friend tried to make a point in connection with the word "virgin;" although I must do him the credit to say he advanced it with a degree of caution, inasmuch as he said he could not positively affirm it. It was that the word used for "virgin" meant a "young married woman." Now, let me just say, upon this point—for I must hurry on—that the word "virgin" (in Hebrew, *Galmah*, and rendered in the Septuagint *Parthenos*, which means in the Greek a *virgin*, a *maid*), is found only seven times in the whole of the Old Testament. In two places it is translated *virgin*; in two others it is rendered *virgins*, plural; in two instances it is translated *maid*; and in the 7th instance, *damsel*; showing that all through the Old Testament the idea is really conveyed of an unmarried person. And, moreover, the Jews who translated Isaiah into the Greek language, rendered it by the Greek word

Parthenos which ever means a *virgin* or *maid*; showing, first, that they understood the Hebrew word to mean a '*virgin*,' and, secondly, that *they believed it was a real prediction as to the virgin conceiving and bearing a son.*

Well, now in regard to these prophecies that are found in the book of Daniel. I wish, again, to call your attention to them. I have to ask my friend carefully to notice and examine them, for they are deserving of attention. A point that brought him the applause of his friends last night was a remark which he made in connection with them, to the effect, that upon my own simple statement I thought fit to understand Daniel's 70 weeks as 70 weeks of days. Well, now, friends, I have tried—I may have failed sometimes, though I am not conscious of it—I have tried to give you proof, as far as reason could demand, for all the assertions I have yet made. On this point I am also happy to be able to present you with, as I think, absolute proof to every impartial person who will just think of it. We know that in the Old Testament scriptures there is a statement made in two places, first in the 14th of Numbers, and then in the fourth chapter of Ezekiel, in regard to the prophetic year—the day being in certain instances counted as a year. But then, how are we to know, in any special prophecy, when this day is to be taken as a year, or to be taken literally? In the first place, we find a statement clearly indicating that the day is to be taken for a year in the prophecy; when this is the case there is no difficulty. There may be other cases where the prophecy is so clear in its detailing of circumstances, that although no particular statement is made, it is absolutely patent to every observer, that either the literal day arrangement is to be understood, or the day-for-the-year arrangement. Now, in connection with this prophecy of Daniel, I wish you to notice carefully one point. We affirm that the whole prophecy proves that it *must* be taken upon the day-for-a-year principle. Now, in this ninth chapter of Daniel, we have it clearly stated that seventy weeks are determined upon the Jews; and during these seventy weeks we not only find that certain things are to be accomplished in connection with the moral history of the Jewish people, but also the restoring and re-building of Jerusalem was to take place, and, mind you, it says, "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be *seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks*, the street shall be built again, and the wall, *even in troublous times.*" Now, Jerusalem is to be re-built, its walls are to be erected, and yet, during the progress of the erection of these walls, there are to be "troublous times," which would doubtless detain the works. And, noticing the statements in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, we find that troublous times did come. Now what period of time, counting by years in the ordinary sense of the term, will seventy weeks make? We have fifty-two weeks in one year; if we subtract fifty-two from seventy we have eighteen left, which gives us a year and four months and a half, for the re-building of Jerusalem, and the accomplishment of the other particulars enumerated, which was simply impossible. So that we see the day-for-a-year principle is transparent upon the very surface of the prophecy, and no Jew in those times misunderstood it, and no person can misunderstand it now. When you take into account



the fact, my friends, that to the very year, according to the day-for-a-year principle of interpretation, all these predictions saw their fulfilment, and all these transactions their completion, does it not amount, I ask, to an absolute demonstration, that it is on the day-for-a-year principle that this prophecy is to be understood? (Applause.)

Now, one word, before my time expires, in connection with Matthew again. This point, which my friend is so continually taking up, seems to be a very essential matter with him, and he seems to have a conviction, that although the Jews *may* have known more about genealogies than Voltaire and Paine, &c, yet they had not the *shrewdness* of Voltaire and Paine to detect the imposition! I think all that we know of these men would go to prove that they were quite as shrewd and as capable of detecting a fraud as Voltaire or Paine ever were. He asks how can Jesus claim the throne of David if he is not the son of Joseph? Now, let me point out that in the narrative by Luke, Jesus is proved to have descended from David through his mother Mary, and, consequently, *by blood did really belong to the house of David*. We find that Joseph, the husband of Mary, could claim the throne *by lineal descent*, for we actually find he is traced by Matthew from Solomon downwards, through a royal line of kings, until these kings disappear with the scattered nation; and as Joseph married Mary before Christ was born, we know what that involves so far as his legitimate heirship to David's throne was concerned. It is thus clear, that it was absolutely necessary that Joseph's genealogy should be given, in order to prove the inalienable right of Jesus to the throne of David as the heir of Joseph, the legitimate heir to the throne of his father David. (Applause.)



MR. WALKER:

We now have to retrace and review almost the same ground we went over last evening, and to again assert, and afterwards give proof, that our friend has entirely avoided the point we wished to make when alluding to those heathen mythologies. He says that by admitting what Max Muller says is true, we virtually come to his conclusion, and admit the validity of the arguments he presents to us. This is by no means the case; although we may admit the premises and facts that our friend has thus collected, still we can most assuredly deny the conclusions he has drawn from them. (Hear, hear.)

Now, let us go back to the case of Alexander. Our friend tells us that because this warrior was ambitious he claimed to be the son of God, or, in other words, to have descended from Apollo. Any man who claimed this, or asserted it, or if not asserting it himself allowed others to assert it for him, to gratify and fan his ambition, would not be believed in by the general populace in our day; nor was Alexander believed by the free-thinking Greeks, who understood his motive in this (viz., that of producing subjection in the conquered countries); and, above all, his mother requested Alexander, in derision, to cease from embroiling her with the wife of Jupiter Ammon. This illustration, so clear and *apropos*, which we have in the case of

Alexander, cannot be accepted because it occurred in historical times, argues our opponent; but this does not explain the case of Plato, or that of Romulus, nor does it set aside the force of the illustration in this special instance. So we have still the explanation to be favored with from our friend, as to how these myths could have been believed in, by anybody, *at any time*. If they could be believed, either by one or two individuals, or by a nation in pre-historic times, or in the early dawn of historic record, or even in later periods—if these beliefs could be accepted as facts, then what is there to prevent the same phenomena occurring among the Jews, in parallel times, and corresponding stages of intellectual development? If the Greeks made gods of heroes, why could not the Jews, with the same poetic freedom, say that Jesus was the son of God, or God himself? But especially among the Romans, where, according to many of the ablest historians, such as Gibbon, Moshem, and Draper, the first disciples of Jesus, before their conversion, were pagans, and where this idea of his being God, or the son of God, had its fullest development (as will be found on reviewing the early histories of the Christian Church), we cannot wonder, then, that such poetic conceptions of his nature should find almost universal credence. Our friend suggested that the Grecian mythologies were copied from the Biblical accounts regarding the "immaculate conception" of Jesus: will he kindly explain how that which existed hundreds of years before the latter was conceived of could have been copied therefrom? It has been truly remarked that there is no more heathenish doctrine than that of miraculous birth of Jesus.

Upon a former occasion we instanced the ideas of the *Gnostics*, who lived at the commencement of the Christian era, and who entirely repudiated the idea of Christ having earthly parentage at all. Bearing this in mind the force of the application will be apparent as we proceed. Then the ideas of the Nazarenes,—who believed that Jesus had no "supernatural" lineage, but that he was simply a man, human, as we are, with all the parts and passions that we possess,—illustrate the fact that even then those who were not accustomed to place belief in "supernatural" descents could not recognise the special favor of Jesus in this direction. Thus, these very differences, and these numerous controversies at so early a period of Christian history will go far to prove our point, viz., that during the first century such wild ideas could, and did exist; and that those ideas were just as wild, and equally absurd, as that of Alexander being considered a god. Why, even in the days of Constantino, the first Christian emperor, did not many of his subjects believe that he was God? Or, at all events, did he not, according to the same Draper, proclaim himself to be a god? Thus, we have, three or four centuries later than the advent of Christianity, this same belief in an emperor being a god!

As a further proof that the Christians, in making Jesus God, were but doing the same as the heathens, did not Tertullian, in his apology in addressing the magistrate of Rome, say that they were only doing the same as the Greeks had done before them? Did not Arnobius so reason? Did not the "early fathers" say that this Christian faith had crept into the heathen mind by the inspiration of

devils? who had foreseen and become acquainted with the prophecies, and had thus anticipated Christianity in establishing the forms of Christian worship in heathen countries before the time of Christ, and thus the devils had prepared an argument against Christianity by giving its principal dogma to the heathen!

These are some of the ideas that we recognise as poetic when found in Hindu or Grecian history; but in the Jewish mind they are considered facts!—superstitions in the one case, and of "divine origin" in the other!

As We have said before, when these extraordinary events occurred in the Grecian or Roman records, they were either poetical or nonsensical and fabulous legends; but the story of a similar event recorded in the Bible is a divine truth! (Hear, Hear.)

Now, in reference to Smith contradicting Draper, it is only a case of "doctors differing." Draper says this actually occurred; that the Oracle proclaimed Alexander to be the son of Jupiter Ammon. In the other case, it is said it was never revealed what the Oracle said. It matters not: the ideas are exactly the same.

Whether this proclamation of Alexander was the result of ambition or not matters little, as it is certain he did assert that he was descended from a god. It is certain, moreover, and beyond dispute, that in those days, heroes, warriors, men of genius, and talent, and men possessing powers of an exceptional character, were credited with "super natural" descent. And when the idea of Jesus being a reformer causing changes,—and giving dictation in the affairs of men,—came upon minds that had been moulded in the old forms, who could expect that they would accept Jesus, if he were presented as a mere man? When, by their past beliefs and education, their emperors had been credited with the position of gods, and their heroes had "ascended into Heaven" as veritable deities, is it likely they would accept a leader of *less* renown than their heroes and emperors? Whether it was the result of poetry, or the result of that which they believed were facts, matters not—the ideas and the results are the very same. For what is the difference? If the history of Alexander pronounces him to be mistaken; if the age in which he lived rejected these pretensions to Deity, and entirely discarded such superstitions, why should not our time, more enlightened and more highly civilized, scorn and discard an exactly parallel superstition? Why should we admit such stories into the dictionary of our beliefs? If some in those darkened ages had sufficient light to judge correctly and clearly upon such an absurd subject,—had the knowledge to reject such a foolish idea, and the common sense to throw it entirely aside, why should we (we repeat it), with more knowledge, clearer intellect, and shrewder judgment, admit just the same case, simply because it happens to come from a different source? What other reason can we give for the acceptance of it, save that it happens to have come to us through the Christian world, or because it has been transmitted to us from our forefathers, and imbibed in infancy, while partaking of the lacteal nourishment at the maternal breasts? Because revered and venerable ancestors gave the ideas to us, we are asked to receive them upon their evidence, or that of the church in

which they were trained, or upon the evidence of the books in which these ideas are supposed to be found!

But are these, in all candour we ask, all sufficient reasons to enable us consistently to accept these views, and reject exactly parallel ones in other records? Look at Alexander's own mother, did she not reject and ridicule her son's story? Look at those, also, who came to a different conclusion, in reference to the origin of Borne from Romulus, who was the son of a god and a virgin! Why cannot we come to the same conclusion that they did, when an exactly similar case is presented to us? How do we know that the Christians have not endowed Jesus with powers which, in all probability, he never claimed for himself?

Our friend has again alluded to the differences in the genealogies, as contained in Matthew and Luke. We were amused to find that he credited Mary with being descended from David; whereas, last evening, he said that Matthew clearly stated that Joseph descended from that king of Israel.

Mr. GREEN denied this.

Mr. WALKER: Now, as our friend has so diligently corrected *lapus lingue* that were made by us, it was his duty not to fall into similar mistakes himself. However, it matters little, as in either case it distinctly and emphatically proves the contradictions, or, at all events, discrepancies; and our friend has clearly not set that matter aside. On what authority does he claim Matthew as the correct delineator of the descent of Mary from David, whilst in her genealogy (if it be her's) he interposes Joseph's name? As we have asked repeatedly before, where does the Bible inform us of this? How are we to know this, except it be in the case of the line of kings mentioned, which is a pure supposition, and cannot be supported by the records themselves. Our friend says that the early Jews did not object to these genealogies. We are not discussing what the early Jews thought on these matters. The principal opponents of Christianity, in the first few centuries, were the Romans and the Greeks. The lack of Jewish mention of these difficulties, then, proves nothing. (Hear, hear.)

We must again refer to those gospels which were rejected. Our friend has not yet told us *why* they were rejected; what *method* was employed in their rejection, or in what *way* they were proved inferior to the ones we now possess. As we know of all the different opinions concerning Jesus and his life, which were held by the Jews of his time, we cannot come to the conclusion just at present, that they would be engaged in merely discussing his genealogy. The differences that existed clearly show they had a lack of correct data on which to work. The opinions and creeds were then in too confused a state, and it is not until the time of the Roman and Greek churches that we find the ideas, which are now current in Christendom, became at all settled. The principal topics of discussion should now be the vital doctrines that were then preached as to the divine origin of Jesus, and as to his works and labors upon the earth. However, the very fact that "the early fathers" attempted to reconcile these genealogies shows that they were troubled in their minds on the matter. Although the Christian "father's" did attempt to reconcile

these differences, their attempts at reconciliation are not in the least superior to that which our friend has advanced. The duty of reconciliation still remains with him. We have at present only his assertion that one is the genealogy of Mary, and the other of Joseph. Now, did Matthew wish to lie? Did he want to tell a falsehood? If he did, could he have done it more plausibly? He tells you that Joseph was the father of Jesus, the last of the line, and yet he means Mary; whilst Luke, coming to the same point, means Joseph! Our friend, befogged, perhaps, by educational prejudice, says that the bible is self-interpreting!" Now, where is there a text in scripture that will explain these differences in the genealogies, or give any one a clear solution of these contradictions? As the matter now stands, nothing can reconcile them, unless it be merely the opinion of our friend, and others of a sentimental turn of mind; but opinions cannot be introduced as argument. There is no clearness or certainty about the matter; for, if Luke or Matthew wished to tell a falsehood, they could not have done so more glaringly; and what shall we say of the individual who commences his history by telling a falsehood? Why do they not make allusion to Mary, (*as the bible was written for Christians*) even though the Jews did not give the genealogies of women? The women were considered of little account by the Jews, and were very seldom noticed; but a man was considered of vast and great importance, as from him were engrafted the different rights, and authorities upon the offspring; but this difficulty would not be encountered by Christians, *and so there can be no excuse for the omission.* (Applause.)

So in this instance we have falsehood most clearly and emphatically shown. We have falsehood and deception in the accounts, which describe the history and life of the Christian's Deity!!! Can we accept a matter so contrary to all reason? When our friend finds similar instances in Heathen Mythology, he at once accounts for them by referring to the poetic nature of the writers who invented the stories; but when it is related in Christian literature, it becomes absolute, positive fact! Why this is so he has not yet told us. In his next address will he kindly enlighten us upon this point?

As our time is limited, we shall have as briefly as possible to refer to the prophecy mentioned in Daniel with reference to the seventy weeks. We are given to understand that this is to be taken on the day for a year principle; and we have had quoted a passage from Ezra, to show that one day meant a year! Now, did not we mention last evening a case where Ezekiel says, "the days shall be *no longer prolonged?*" When it had become a proverb in Israel, that the days had been prolonged, did not "the Lord" say he would cause this proverb to cease? But if we are to take stray texts to support the extension of days to years, then why not equally believe these words, "a thousand years are as a day with the Lord?" We have just as much right to take this text and apply it to the days of Daniel, as our friend has to take the isolated case he has cited; and if Christ did not come for thousands and thousands of years, from the time the prophecy was made, this very text might have been taken to silence our objection to the non-fulfillment of the prophecy. (Applause.) Our friend would only have to change his tactics, and instead of

making a day *one* year make it a thousand! And the Jews might have been right after all, but for our friend's assurance that the events decided the time. Now, could Daniel speak plain Hebrew? Could he say that which he meant to say? Could he write *years* as well as he could write weeks? If he could, as we must suppose, then why leave his prophecy in such an ambiguous form? It reminds us of the stories of the Gipsy fortune-teller and the maiden: "it will all come true in the end." If Daniel could speak Hebrew, he is blameable in not writing what he meant to convey clearly and distinctly; for he is guilty of misleading those who read his prophecies, if our friend's version of them is correct. [Applause.]



MR. GREEN:

If my friend had just spared a little of the time that he has taken up with this genealogy again, and which I think, if he thought he had established the contradiction which he affirms there is in it, he might well leave, and had given a part of the time to show the ambiguity he says there is in the prophecy in Daniel, and not given his mere statement of this ambiguity, it would have been better. Mere statements will not do; Christians will not accept them. Let him *show* wherein the ambiguity consists, and it shall then have the attention it requires. My friend deals largely in vague assertions and probabilities, and in his last speech we had too much of this kind of argument, "if so-and-so be so-and-so, then must so-and-so be so-and-so." We want him to give the proof of his positions, and not be content with simple assertions. Then he speaks about those apocryphal gospels again. I tell him to produce them, or let him impress his friends to produce them, and when they are produced we will notice them, and not till then.

Now, let me point out some errors—not *lapsus lingua*—which my friend gives as an explanation of some mistakes he has made—but slips of memory. To-night he made a very glaring mistake. He asserted that one of these genealogies was that of Mary, and the other of Luke. Well, now, seeing that he is guided by his spirit-friends, I think these mistakes should not be so frequent. Then, again, he speaks of "that prophecy in Isaiah about the seventy weeks." My friend is again mistaken; it is in Daniel, and not in Isaiah. Let me again say further that Dr. Smith, the writer of the history of Greece, and Mr. Draper, the author of this work, which I hold in my hand, are not contradictory. It is my friend's guides that are again in error. Dr. Smith and Mr. Draper are perfectly agreed, as my friend will see if he will just accept the loan of the book for the Chairman to read. I will not read it now, as my time is quite short enough for all I have to say. They do not, however, contradict each other; Draper *does not* say that Alexander affirmed that the Oracle said he was the son of Jupiter.

I will now proceed to the consideration of the divine nature of Christ, this being one of the points Mr. Walker has called for. The statements of the Old Testament, as to the divinity of Christ, clearly

show that the Messiah must be a person of divine nature. In the 40th chapter of Isaiah, 10th verse, we have a statement which is very clear upon the matter, where it speaks of good tidings being brought; and the prophet is told to say unto the cities of Judah, "Behold your God." "Behold the Lord God *will come* with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him, behold his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." This is purely Messianic. Speaking of the child to be born, and the son given, the prophet says his name was to be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," &c., showing that some superhuman being is clearly represented, who is to come and fulfil these conditions. I may just here parenthetically observe, in reply to the remark made in the last speech, that these prophecies were partially understood before the events; Daniel's prophecies were so understood before the events, and these prophecies had excited anticipations as to the coming of some great personage. If my friend will read some of the testimonies that are given by the historians, he will find in Suetonius and others, that there was expressed a general expectation all over the East, at the very time when Christ came, of some one being born among the Jews who should have universal dominion.

But to return to the question of the divinity of Christ's nature, we affirm that there is the clearest teaching in the New Testament scriptures upon this matter, and also the words of Christ himself in support of the same. We have the words of Peter in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew: "Thou art the Christ, the son of the loving God." I would ask you to observe that if "the son of the living God," is simply "*son*" in the sense in which some of the opposers of this doctrine insist, then there can be no point in the statement of Peter, and less in the statement of Christ, that "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven." In the 5th chapter of John, 17th to 29th verses, we have Christ speaking of his oneness with the Father in work, and also in the power of quickening to life, and which power is said to reside in himself; and, as a consequence, the Jews charged him directly with making himself *equal with God*. Then, again, in the 6th chapter, we have his statement that he *came from heaven*, and that he would go to heaven again. He also affirms that he and his Father were one, and when the Jews took up stones to stone him, he adduces his works, and asks them to believe him because of his works, not because of his own statement. In the 17th John, verses 1 to 5, we have a statement as to the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and to which he desires again to return. In the first chapter of the same gospel, the Evangelist speaks of the *eternal "word" that was made flesh*, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." Now, we say these predictions and statements are clear as to what he claimed to be. He gave proofs of the justness of his claim in raising Jairus' daughter, the son of the widow of Nain, and Lazarus, from the dead; in feeding the five thousand with bread, in stilling the tempestuous

waves on the sea of Galilee; in giving sight to the blind, speech to the dumb, and hearing to the deaf, and in cleansing the lepers,—in doing all these things he gave clear demonstration of his claim to be *the son* of God. His prediction as to the destruction of Jerusalem has been referred to. Let me inform my friend that if we will look at the thirty-third and thirty-fourth verses of the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and compare them with the third and thirtieth verses, he will see that all those things that are to be fulfilled during that generation are the things in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, and that they are to precede the near coming of the Lord, for which they are given as signs. And these things did take place during that generation; and it is clear there was omniscience manifested in the prophecy; and though some cavillers have even said that the prophecy was made, not before, but after, the destruction of Jerusalem, the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. Not only did the Saviour predict the destruction of Jerusalem, but the destruction of his own body, the temple of his spirit, and its rising in three days. This brings me to the resurrection, and the statements in the scriptures in regard thereto, and I may here venture the statement that the resurrection, at it is found in the word of God, is *the grand demonstration of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

I have not time to give you in detail the particulars recorded in the New Testament as to the resurrection. You can all read them for yourselves; but I will just mention the earthquake which the soldiers said took place, the Angel of the Lord coming and rolling away the stone from the sepulchre, and Christ's rising therefrom. Now the resurrection was ever proclaimed by the Apostles, as the grand point in connection with the demonstration of Christianity. It is to overturn this one fact that all the artillery of opposers is brought. If it can be undermined, I will admit that then Christianity loses considerably in its supports, and in its hold on the minds of men. Let me call your attention to the fact that this resurrection was predicted by Christ. In order to prevent that which they knew he had predicted, the Jews asked that Pilate would set a watch. That watch was set, and the stone was sealed for security. We have the Bible account, which you will find in the 28th of Matthew. If that account is carefully scrutinised it will be seen that there can be only one of two explanations which we must take: First, either the disciples stole the body, or, second, that Jesus rose from the dead.

Now, it is impossible to suppose the rulers stole him; for, had they done so, they would have convicted his disciples of lying, by producing his body when they declared his resurrection. In order to see the improbability of the disciples stealing the body of Christ you have only to remember their opinions and prejudices, that they expected not a spiritual, but a material and temporal kingdom. Then consider their characters. They were not brave men. They all forsook him and fled, and Peter denied him. It is impossible to conceive them undertaking such a perilous exploit as stealing the body of Christ. They doubted even after his resurrection, and would not believe without the clearest evidence. Thomas refused to believe unless he saw the print of the nails and the mark of the spear. Then



observe, further, their state of mind prior to, and after, his death and resurrection. We find, that during his life they were looking for political advantage; and when he had died they were bereft of all hope, utterly disconsolate, and despondent. Then as to their circumstances,—they were very poor; what could they have done if they had stolen the body of Christ, the corpse could have done them no good. J Supposing they did steal the body, I say what could have been their object in the theft? Reason would say, if they stole him it would be to represent him as alive with them and leading them in an effort to free the Jews from the yoke of Rome. But no? they have no such object; their foe is mightier than Borne, it is sin,—rebellion against God. Their object is to introduce a reign of righteousness and peace.

Let us return to the priests and ask, did they believe the statements of the soldiers? You know that statement is about the earthquake, and the Angel rolling away the atone. Now, to answer this let me ask another question or two. Is it likely the soldiers would concoct such a story as that found in the gospels? No! their concoction would have been of overpowering numbers, a hard fight, some of their comrades wounded, or slain, and they utterly defeated, So their story being so unlike what soldiers would concoct is an evidence of its truth. The priests evidently believed it, and hence their subterfuge. "Say ye his disciples came while we slept, and stole him away." Now, how improbable this story is. How could they testify to what happened while they were asleep? How did they know that he was stolen, if they were wrapped in the arms of slumber? If he was stolen, how could they know who stole him? they were asleep! If they were asleep, how could that ponderous stone be rolled away without their being awakened? Are not these witnesses altogether out of court? Would this testimony be received in any court of justice in the world?

But suppose the priests did not believe the soldiers' version, and really did believe his disciples stole him, would they have acted as they did? For, remember, for a Roman soldier to sleep on duty, was certain death. If these men had been asleep, they were doomed men. Would the priests not have had them seized, and tried for neglect? Would this not have been the most effective way of checkmating the disciples, if they had stolen the body? Would they not also have seized the disciples themselves, and put them upon their trial? But no! they are not molested, but allowed to go away, clearly evidencing the fact that the priests *did believe* the story of the soldiers. To have seized the soldiers would have been to blazon forth the truth to all, for the soldiers, in rebutting the charge of sleep, would have detailed, in open court, the fact of the angel's coming, and their own terror at the sight. But this was just what the priests did not want: they dreaded the exposure, as we learn from Matthew 27th, 63rd verse; hence they bribed them to say they were asleep, and promised to protect them in the event of trouble.

Now what positive evidence had the Apostles of the resurrection of Christ? Let me ask you to note their fitness as witnesses. They were fishermen, and their practised eyes would be of the very keenest possible. They knew him well, for they had had three years close intercourse with him. If any men on Earth could identify him, they

were the men. In these very respects they had numerous opportunities as witnesses. They saw him on several occasions. They saw him eat, and ate with him; they also had the ocular demonstration of their own eyes, as to the actual marks upon his body, of the nails, and the spear. The Apostle Paul, in the 15th chapter 1st Corinthians, and 6th verse, declares that he was seen, after his resurrection, by about five hundred brethren at once, of whom the *greater part* remained to that very time when the Apostle wrote, but some had fallen asleep. Now would Paul have dared to make this assertion *to* the Corinthian people, that those persons who had seen Christ were then living if it were not true? Over 250 people, who had seen Christ, were living at the time Paul wrote this epistle to the Corinthians. *and were producible?* Could more convincing testimony be desired? (Applause.)

Then, how do we account for that singular phenomenon on the day of Pentecost if Christ were not divine, and if he had not risen and ascended to heaven? How came those three thousand devout and intelligent Jews to be convinced on that day, and how came it that four thousand more were convinced immediately after, and how came it that multitudes became obedient to the faith,—not in some obscure part of the country, nor in some of the distant parts, of the world but in Judea and Jerusalem, the very places where Christ was known and crucified? Thousands of persons, convinced by the evidences of divine power which this man gave to his Apostles, were led to accept Christ as the promised Messiah, who had accomplished, all that the prophets had predicted in regard to him. Now, I ask my friend's attention to these cogent arguments. They are not the species of argument which my friend uses—"if this be so, then *may* this be so." They are positive arguments that will bear battling with, and I invite him to the onset.

Further, I again invite him to show us that the statements in Daniel are ambiguous. Let him take the book,—I will lend him my Bible—then we shall have proof. I say my friend's simple statement is not proof. Until we have proof, we are justified by all the rules of logic and debate to refuse to accept his mere *ipsi dixit*, (Applause.)



MR. WALKER:

Has our friend got Draper in his possession this evening? If so, will the Chairman kindly read the concluding paragraph on the 7th page?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

" Before returning into the plains of Mesopotamia, for the final struggle, Alexander, to secure his rear and preserve his communications with the sea, marched southward to the Mediterranean coast, reducing the cities on his way. In his speech before the council of war, after Issus, he told his generals that they must not pursue Darius, with Tyre unsubdued, and Persia in possession of Egypt and Cyprus, for, if Persia should regain her sea-ports, she would

transfer the war into Greece, and it was absolutely necessary for him to be sovereign at sea. With Cyprus and Egypt in his possession, he felt no solicitude about Greece. The siege of Tyre cost him more than half a year. In revenge for this delay, he crucified, it is said, two thousand of his prisoners. Jerusalem voluntarily surrendered, and therefore was treated leniently; but the passage of the Macedonian army into Egypt being obstructed at Gaza (the Persian Governor of which, Betis, made a most obstinate defence) that place, after a siege of two months, was carried by assault; ten thousand of its men were massacred, and the rest, with their wives and children, sold into slavery. Betis himself was dragged alive round the city at the chariot-wheels of the conqueror. There was now no further obstacle. The Egyptians, who detested the Persian rule, received their invader with open arms. He organised the country in his own interest, entrusting all its military commands to Macedonian officers, and leaving the civil government in the hands of the native Egyptians. While preparations for the final campaign were being made, he undertook a journey to the temple of Jupiter Ammon, which was situated in an oasis of the Libyan desert, at a distance of two hundred miles. The Oracle declared him to be the son of that God who, under the form of a serpent, had beguiled Olympias, his mother." MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now will he kindly refer to the ninth chapter of Isaiah, 6th verse?

The CHAIRMAN again read:—

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

MR. WALKER: Now mark the tense: "Unto us a *son is given*, unto us a child *is born*. Now, his name was to be "called *the Everlasting Father*, Counsellor, the Prince of Peace," and he was to have "the government upon his shoulders;" and will our friend, in that connection, now just read the next verse?

The CHAIRMAN read:—

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Again, mark you, the government has to be upon *the throne of David!* Now, where in Jesus was this fulfilled? Can our friend quote a single passage where Jesus was called "the Everlasting Father?" He has just shown you that he was the "*son*." By what reasoning, then, can he be made the "father" also? When Jesus himself said, "I came not to bring peace into the world, but a sword," could the Christianity he established have been an "everlasting kingdom of peace?" Shall we allude to the massacres of St. Bartholomew and the Covenanters, to the

wars called "Holy," to the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition? Were all these things done in the interests of the kingdom of the "*Prince of Peace*?" Where was Jesus called "Counsellor," "the Mighty God?" Not one of these titles had been given to him, and yet we are asked to believe that this prophecy was fulfilled in him! Then, in reference to Darnel, is there no ambiguity in taking a *year* for a *day*? Could language be more ambiguous? Could not Daniel emphatically say that a day meant a year? Why could he not speak plain Hebrew, and give words their plain, distinct, and emphatic meaning? Is there no ambiguity in assuming a day to be a year, and thus requiring arithmetical calculations in order to get at the meaning of the prophecy? If there is no ambiguity in that, there is no ambiguity in anything that ever was spoken.

We will leave this point just for the present. These prophecies are distinctly shown not to refer to Jesus. Our friend has said that the Jews were expecting a *material* "Messiah" and *kingdom*, thereby showing that they understood their prophecies too well to accept any individual who claimed to be the "Messiah" who was not a conqueror and ruler. To those who understood the prophecies, Jesus was never the "Messiah;" but to those who understood them not, Jesus fulfils them all!—even prophecies, as we have pointed out, which had no existence.

Now, our friend has again brought us to the case of the prophecy of—[The reporter, in this instance, as well as in many others, has failed to follow the speaker, and, consequently, this is lost.]—We showed last night that prophecies, even though they were made by "the Lord" at the time, were false; as instance the deception of Ahab, of Jonah, of Abraham, &c. We also showed that "the Lord" himself admitted it, as, for instance, "The Lord shall send them strong delusion." "If a prophet be deceived when he has spoken a thing, I, the Lord, have deceived that prophet." "I will put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets."

With reference to Abraham not "*possessing the land for ever and ever*," our friend says all prophecies are conditional! Or, if not all, at least some of them? Or, in other words, "the Lord" makes a promise, and if we do not do that which is right (*though this provision is not stated at the time*) the prophecy, or promise, is not fulfilled! What should we say if a mortal prophesied, the prophecy failed, and he made such a miserable excuse? If "God" could foresee that Abraham

and his seed would not obey Him, why did He make the prophecy? But, what about Jonah? Was he not sent to the Ninevites to prophesy that "in forty days Nineveh should be destroyed?" Jonah desires not to prophesy such a sad destruction, and flees to Tarshish. A strange fatality persues him, he is thrown from the ship on his way thither during a storm, and a great fish,, which "the Lord" had prepared, swallowed him. For three days within this monster of the deep was he punished, and at the end of that time, in answer to the prayers of Jonah, "the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land!" A second time he is sent, and, arriving at Nineveh, he shouts "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." In the meantime "God *repented of the evil* that he said he would do unto them: and *he did it not*" Well might it displease Jonah exceedingly,

and make him very angry, when, having told "the Lord" this in his own country, he still had been *compelled to prophesy falsely!* And kindred prophecies *to* these are quoted as proofs of the divine origin of Christianity! Now, just see how many loopholes there are to get out by! First of ail, probably "the Lord has repented. In the next place, *you have not done something* which you ought to have done, though probably, at the time, you did not understand sufficiently that the fulfillment of the prophecy *depended* on your doing a certain thing. Lastly, if the prophecy is not literally fulfilled you must understand it to be, if not conditional, *metaphorical*, (Applause.)

If all conditions are complied with, the prophecy will be fulfilled, and *then* you will correctly understand the time, and all about it! Is there anything definite in that? The prophecies of Cazotte, and Swedenborg, Mother Shipton, and others, if only found in the Bible, would be more conclusive evidence of the divine origin of Christianity than the ambiguous prophecies referred *to*.

Our friend has brought us back to the life of Jesus, without referring to these contradictions. He says the works Jesus did, and the miracles he performed attested to the fullest extent that his claims to divinity were well founded. We are dealing now with facts, and we would like to take our friend back to a point we wished to touch upon on a previous occasion. That point was—why, if Christianity was to save mankind, and free them from death, it did not come at the time of "the flood," or just after the death of Adam, and have saved all the race of sinners *then*, with their successors now, from perishing? Let us briefly review the life of Jesus, and see if it was unmistakably a life such as we would expect from Deity. As he is the central figure of the apocryphal gospels, we must mention the records of his life, as found in them. Our friend has asked us to produce these gospels. Though we have not produced them, we say that our friend cannot deny their existence. He does not deny their existence, therefore he knows full well that they exist. And there are evidences of their existence,—to the number that we have previously asserted—which no scholar would attempt to deny. Though it is not our place to do so, we could show that they are even equal to the received gospels. As we have already said, it is not our duty to show that they are of divine origin, more than it is our duty to show that the gospels we have are of divine origin. We repudiate the claims of both, and it is the duty of our friend to show now the apocryphal gospels came to be placed on one side, and those that we have, taken in their place. It is his *duty* to show this, else how are we to accept any matter, simply because it is written in the Bible, if that part of it which we have, cannot be shown to be superior to that which we have rejected? It may be, and it is implied, that the apocryphal gospels are rejected, because, if we accepted them, we would have to give credence to many strange assertions in the life of Jesus. For instance, we should have to believe, on the evidence of these gospels, that a man was changed into a mule, and then transformed back again into a human being; that when Jesus was born he cried to his mother, "Mary, I am the son of God;" that making birds of clay he caused them to fly; that assisting his father, the work being wrongly done, the dimensions of a wooden framework

were miraculously increased; that he studied and practised magic, but it would occupy too much of our time to specify all the miraculous things in these books which, if our friend's test has to be applied, we are *called* upon to believe, because they have not been contradicted. But, we ask again, are we to believe the statements in any book because they have never been formally contradicted? So much, then, for the life of Jesus, as contained in these gospels apocryphal; and let it be remembered that these apocryphal gospels contain many accounts *that are also recorded* in the gospels which are accepted as "canonical." The "canonical gospels," in quoting from the apocryphal ones, virtually admit their truth. Why—we are constrained to repeat the question—should we accept one class and reject the other? Let us go back and review the life of Jesus, now as contained in the "canonical gospels," in order that we may show how he demonstrated himself to be God. First of all, after he was born he was circumcised. Just imagine!!! The Infinite God of the Universe *circumcised!!!* His birth involved the uncleanness of his mother, *for she had to purify herself* as was the custom according to the Jewish law. On one occasion he cursed a fig-tree, because it had not fruit *out of its season!* Was that an act of wisdom, such as one might imagine would emanate from Deity? On another occasion he cast into a herd of swine a "legion of devils," which he had exorcised from a Judean unfortunate, and caused the terrified pigs to commit suicide! And we may almost venture on the assertion that *there were no swine* in that part of the country; for the Jews regarded them as unclean animals, so that it is not very probable they would keep a herd of them for no purpose whatsoever, and against the pride and custom of the Jews. But, granted they were there, and he drowned them, did he pay the owner for them? What had the poor pigs done, that they should be drowned? Then he went into the temple and overturned the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of those that sold doves, &c. Why, if anyone were to attempt such an exploit in modern days, he would be arrested, and, probably, receive three months' imprisonment; but when done by a "god," it is an act to be applauded! Listen to his speech addressed to the Pharisees, calling them hypocrites; "whited sepulchres that appeared pure on the outside, but were in reality full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness, men who made clean the outside of the cup and platter, but inwardly were full of extortion and excess." Such language coming from "the Prince of Peace," we must say, was faulty, to say the least of it. But, we venture to say, the Christianity of Jesus, on the whole, was worthy of imitation by every honest and candid man; for even with these untrustworthy gospels for our guides, we can make allowance for these few failings he possessed, when we regard him as a man; but they become inexplicable, contradictory, and inexcusable, if we are to presume that he was really God. To assist us in our view, we have his own testimony in the 19th chapter of Matthew, 17th verse, where he is reported to say:

"Why callest thou *me* good? there is none good but *one*, that is God."

To offset our view, though, we have had quoted the passage where Jesus said:

" I and my father are one;"

But we think other texts of a very similar nature can be found which will help to explain this. Does not Paul say:

" There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, for we are *all one* in Christ Jesus?"

Does not John himself say in the 14th chapter, 20th verse?

"At the day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you?"

Does not John in the 17th chapter, 21st and 22nd verses, say:

21st v.—"That they all may be *one*, as thou. Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us.

22nd v.—"And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be *one* even as we are *one*?"

Now, do not these passages show, or do they not simply mean, that if we can be one as Jesus and God are, we can be born with the same intentions, motives, and desires—made one in the same spirit—all with the same duties to perform, and that, therefore, as a community we can be called one? When we have thus all the same interests, all the same duties to perform, all the same laws to submit to, we can work altogether, in a manner, as though there was but one individual. Thus these texts will interpret each other.

Let us now, in conclusion, make a few remarks in reference to the "miracles." One of the assertions of the Evangelists is, "neither did his brethren believe in him;" and we are also told by Matthew, "That he could do no mighty works there, *became of their unbelief.*" Now, *was God to be trammled by belief or unbelief of his subjects?* Could he not overcome these obstacles if he was Deity? Can it be consistently said that God was thus to be limited by the incredulity or unbelief of his creatures? Why could he not work miracles in defiance of this obstacle of their unbelief? One would imagine he would first of all convince his brethren, and then go out into the world and convince others. (Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

As my friend believes that Jesus was no more than a great and good man (and I am sure the cases he has just cited will never convince any Christians that he was a bad one) still, as he himself has given the refutation to his own statements, I need not further trouble about this point.

In regard to those apocryphal gospels, you remember that my friend gave a partial promise to produce them. Now, what I have to prove is that the four gospels we have are genuine and authentic, and I think I have done it.

[An explanation was here tendered by Mr. Walker's Chairman that the partial promise was conditional.]

After much interruption and disorder,

MR. GREEN resumed: I simply stated that there was a partial promise, which is the fact. These apocryphal gospels can be seen by

anyone in the Public Library. Pray read them, and you will then not need my friend or myself to argue with reference to their authenticity or otherwise. They carry in themselves their own condemnation.

Now my friend has really done me a very great kindness in calling upon the Chairman to read those paragraphs from Draper's work. If he would only just consider this matter, he would see that it is but one of those cases of verbal discrepancy, but not of actual contradiction, such as we see are in the gospels, and which are a proof of their genuineness. Now does Draper say that Alexander told them what Jupiter Ammon said? Of course he does not. Mr. Smith, in his history of Greece, gives these words: He says, "he consulted the Oracle in secret, but is said *never to have disclosed the answer he received*. Some say that the Oracle saluted him as the son of Jove." Now you see Draper simply says that the Oracle declared him to be the son of the God, not that Alexander said so. You will observe, therefore, that my statement is correct, and that there is no contradiction, but a simple verbal discrepancy. The true nature of this verbal discrepancy is simply this:—Draper gives the latter part of Smith's statement, that some affirmed that Jupiter Ammon said that Alexander was his son; but Draper leaves out altogether the statement made by Smith, that Alexander consulted the Oracle "but refused to state the Oracle's reply." In this there is no contradiction, and my friend's statement, that Alexander said the Oracle declared him to be the son of Jupiter Ammon is, therefore, not correct.

I must now proceed with my argument, as this is the last speech in which I can introduce new matter. My friend asked last evening what Christianity was for: was it to patch up something that had failed? and, also, why it was not introduced into the world sooner, so that all the misery and crime, with which the world has been afflicted, might have been saved? In reply, I may say that Christianity was not sent to patch up anything that had failed. The Jewish dispensation had served its purpose as the foundation intended for Christianity, and when the set time came, the superstructure was reared. Christ was not sent until the *set time*, because God saw that objections (like those my friend has raised) would arise; he, therefore, laid the foundations so deep, and sure, and along the ages, as to give objectors no excuse, and to satisfy the just needs of the truth-seeking in their reasonable desire to have proof that the system they received was really from God. My friend asks what Christianity was for; I will tell him. He cannot deny that moral evil, which we call *sin*, exists in the world. He admits—if I understand him rightly, as do all Spiritualists—that men are continually doing wrong and injuring each other. He believes that every man, by the inevitable and irreversible operation of law, must suffer, hereafter, the penalty of his earthly wrong-doing, and must, even though it take cycles of ages to do it, undo the wrongs he may have done to individuals on Earth, so as to place them in the same position, advantageous to progression, which they would have been in had those wrongs not been done. It will easily be seen what a terrible position my friend's theory places all men in. There is not one of us, but what has, intentionally or unintentionally, done some *person* or *persons* wrong, and if we cannot



be happy in the future state, nor rise to Elysian heights, until we have set all these wrongs right. What an awful amount of penal suffering, of intense and harrowing anguish, must we have to suffer in those unseen abodes, to which my friend believes we are going? But if this be the case with the ordinarily moral person, then, into what a place of intense, agonizing, and indescribable suffering, must those go who have been deliberately immoral! What will be the position of the seducer, the fornicator, the adulterer, and the Sodomite, and all defrauders who have wronged the weak, the widow, and the fatherless? What is the position of the dishonest tradesman, the deceiver, the man of giant frauds, the murderer, and infamous persons? It is too horrible to contemplate! In the Christian view of the after punishment, there is this mitigation—that not one there needed to have suffered: escape was offered them, but they refused it. But from the hell of the Spiritists there is no escape. (Interruptions and cries of "No, no.") [I do hope, Mr. Chairman, you will allow me my time for these interruptions.]—I say, from the hell of the Spiritist there is no escape! Now, I may inform you I have here a work by my esteemed friend H. J. Browne—for I speak of him as such, notwithstanding that we differ greatly in these matters,—who is one of my present respected hearers. Let me read to you from Mr. Browne's book "Holy Truth," pages 158 and 159, where he speaks of this hell. I have only time just to give one brief quotation. It is supposed to be a spirit who says:—

"I was in a hell inconceivably worse than the orthodox lake of fire and brimstone. The goadings of remorse that stung me as I looked upon one after another of my numerous victims, and experienced the agonies which they had suffered, multiplied ten-fold, can never be described."

Now, here is a hell *inconceivably worse* than the orthodox hell, however bad that may be. The theory of my friend is, that whatever wrong may have been done by any individual, must be set right by that individual in the spirit-world, if it has not already been rectified in the Earth-life. That actual and positive suffering will be the result of wrong-doing; and this spirit here declares that the agony which his victims had suffered, and which was multiplied to him ten-fold, can never be described. From this suffering, intense and agonizing in its nature, Spiritism provides no means of deliverance until the allotted portion has been endured, and the injuries inflicted during the Earth-life so effectually remedied, as that the injured one is placed in the position advantageous to progress, in which he would have been had the injury never been done.

In the *Harbinger of Light*, 1st February, 1875, page 774, you will find almost a similar statement from another spirit, who describes, in somewhat the same words, that the orthodox hell is not to be compared with the hell he has suffered. The terrible consequences of my friend's theory will be seen from these reflections and extracts, and certainly those consequences are simply terrible.

Now, I agree with my friend that if there is nothing but the blind operation of law, which, when not obeyed, must inflict its penalty, and if there be no merciful Law-giver, behind the law, who looks upon the human race as his offspring, then he is right. But in

that case, we would say that it would have been ten thousand times better that we had *never*, NEVER, been born; and we might reasonably, with Job, call for a curse on the day of our birth! But it is just here that my friend and Christians part company. Christianity admits that by the operation of law merely, man is the subject of death and misery, but he who put the law into operation is merciful, and has no pleasure in the death even of the most wicked, and, therefore, his desire was that man should be saved from the misery consequent upon his acts. But still it must be so done, as that the restraints of law, shall not be weakened, and also in such a manner as that whilst the sinner is saved from the consequences of his wrong-doing, he may be so impressed with the evil of his wrong-doing—with the enormity of his crime, and a principle of gratitude to his deliverer and judge be so firmly implanted in his heart,—as that he would be led to avoid further violations of the law as he would the plague.

Is this not reasonable? Does not man's sad case, under the operation of mere law, show that he needs a deliverer? And does not that law, at the same time, demand that punishment shall be inflicted for the wrong done? Now, how can these two things be provided? Clearly not by the punishment of the wrong-doer, for then he would not be delivered; and further, as the wrong of the one sinner has merited all the suffering he has been called upon to endure, it is clear that those sufferings cannot partake of a vicarious nature on behalf of others; and that, consequently, each individual must suffer on account of his own sin; and thus, utter darkness and gloom still stand before the wrong-doer, even though his wrong may be chiefly unintentional. Now, it is here that reason suggests that atonement is needed, and that by no other means can escape be had from the operation of the law. But who is to make atonement? Clearly not man, for every man's life is forfeited because of his own sin! It must come from outside of man; it must come from the Law-giver Himself. If the Law-giver does not vindicate his own law, and at the same time grant deliverance to man, his case is hopeless indeed. It is just here—in man's dire extremity—that the gospels declare that "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." The eternal word was incarnated and born of the virgin, that he might vindicate God's law by obeying it, and that he might, in man's form, and on man's behalf (and as one who had not forfeited his life by wrong-doing,) die, that man might hereafter live. This is the reason why Christianity was given; and its delay was caused, so that those preliminary steps might be taken by means of a preparatory system—by types and by prophecy,—so that, when it did come, none need reject it for want of proof of its divine origin. Christianity is in harmony with the philosophy of our nature, and meets its deepest needs. If Christianity be not true—I say again, if the Spiritualist's hell (from which there is no escape) be a fact,—then, with all the energy of my nature, I declare I would rather ten thousand times ten thousand that I had never been born than to have to Buffer for all the wrongs (intentional and unintentional) I may have done; and yet (humanly speaking) my life may not have

been worse than some of the best of those who are here to-night. (Applause.)

My friend asks me if I desire that he should take the statements of interested Church writers, in regard to these matters. This was a question put on a previous evening. Now, I am not asking him to take Church writers in the ordinary meaning of that term, but only the statements of the apostles; and were they interested? Yes: we must admit they were, and that most vitally! But it was not interest of pocket, but of soul; they were vitally interested for time, and for eternity, and to secure their interest they were terribly in earnest. But that these men were neither deceivers, nor deceived, is capable of the clearest proof: that they were not deceived, is evidenced from the facts as to their fitness as witnesses, their companionship with Jesus, and the ample opportunities they had of obtaining correct information. That they were not deceivers is evident, because they were utterly incapable, from their previous history and ideas, of concocting such a story; and had they been impostors, they would have concocted a story more in harmony with the expectations of the people, which my friend has clearly stated to you, were those of a material and temporal kingdom. And then, further, if Christianity be a concoction, they had nothing to gain by such concoction, but everything to lose. They suffered the loss of all that men hold dear. Though, since their day, religion has been made merchandise of, and although we admit that men have apparently founded a kingdom of the clergy, against whom such a charge might be made; it is not true of the apostles and first Evangelists, but absolutely false. They suffered the loss of all things, as you will find, if you just take the pains to read the narratives found in the letters to the Philippians and Corinthians.

They gave the highest possible evidence of their sincerity. Whilst suffering does not prove the truth of Christianity, it does prove the sincerity of its proclaimers; and if they can be shown to have had means of obtaining positive information, then the truth of Christianity is shown thereby. These men gave proof of their *sincerity*, for they suffered the loss of all things, even life itself, and they had opportunities of *knowing*, and therefore, of *testifying* what they *knew*. The conclusion is easily arrived at. If Christianity was a concoction, its concoctors must have been bad men and liars. How, then, can we account for their apparent disinterestedness, and the pure and elevated morality of their teachings? Can a bad tree bring forth good fruit, &c.? Then, further, how is it that none of the disciples ever turned informers and betrayed the plot? They had every inducement to do so that self-interest could suggest. They were cajoled and threatened; they were scourged and tortured; yet, *not one ever contradicted the other, or exposed the plot*, if plot there had been! How do you account for this, if their story was not true? So true to each other were they, that neither *bribery* nor *torture* could lead them to expose each other; and yet, so false to the world, that they had conspired together to impose a vast fraud upon it; and they did all this, and suffered in doing it, the loss of all that men ordinarily hold dear! *If Christianity be a fraud, then it has no parallel in*

*the history of men, and is, in itself, with the actions of these men, the most stupendous miracle of which the mind can conceive.* (Applause.)

That these books do not contain a concocted narrative; that, in fact, it is morally impossible that such can be the case, we see, because of their character and simplicity. They bear upon them the impress of *naked and unadorned* truth. Also, because of the apparent discrepancies in them, of a nature such as I have shown to exist between Mr. Draper and Dr. Smith, whose veracity none will doubt. Had men concocted them, each gospel would have been brought into at least seeming harmony with the others. The apparent discrepancies are just such as would be found in the independent testimony of truthful men. We might illustrate this by cases in courts of justice, where we often find two witnesses saying things, which, taken alone, would contradict each other; but, taken together, and in conjunction with other circumstances, they serve to form a connected and harmonious whole.

The harmony of the facts, also, with the history of the times, render it utterly impossible that the narrative could have been concocted. (Applause.) [Time expired.]



MR. WALKER:

Will the Chairman rapidly read from Draper, continuing from where he left off on the last occasion of his reading from that Author?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"Immaculate conceptions and celestial descents were so currently received in those days that whoever had greatly distinguished himself in the affairs of men was thought to be of supernatural lineage. Even in Rome, centuries later, no one could with safety have denied that the city owed its founder Romulus, to an accidental meeting of the god Mars with the virgin Rhea Silvia as she went with her pitcher for water to the spring. The Egyptian disciples of Plato would have looked with anger on those who rejected the legend that Perictione, the mother of that great philosopher, a pure virgin, had suffered an immaculate conception through the influences; of Apollo, and that the god had declared to Ariston, to whom she was betrothed, the parentage of the child. When Alexander *issued his letters, orders and decrees* styling himself king Alexander the son of Jupiter Ammon, they came to the inhabitants of Egypt and Syria with an authority that now can hardly be realised."

My friend quotes Smith, where it is said that Alexander never did this; but Draper is most emphatic and clear in saying that the Oracle proclaimed him to be—and afterwards Alexander issued his decree declaring himself to be—"The son of Jupiter," or, the son

of God." Can anything be more distinctly or more clearly stated than that? Hear, hear.

Leaving this point, then, we must be very rapid in reviewing the arguments advanced to prove that Jesus was God.

Now, let us take the matter in its proper light: Was Jesus God, or was he not God? If he *was* God, then was that God six feet high? And how much of the Great Universal God of the Universe was there present in him? If the whole Deity was in him, then we hesitate not to say, Deity was only six feet high at the most! On the other hand if the greater part of Deity was outside of this individual how could he possibly be God. If he was God where was he when he was dead? Was there then a *Dead God*—a *dead Deity*?—killed by his creatures? Can our friend, or anyone else, get out of this difficulty?

"Well might the Sun in darkness hide,  
And veil his glories in,  
When God, the mighty maker, died  
For man, the creature's sin!"

It does not answer the difficulty by saying that there had to be preliminary steps taken—such preliminary steps, for instance, as sending a flood, and the prophecies. Let us once more look at this argument as we have presented it to you before: Deity determined, on account of the weaknesses of men, to destroy all flesh: Consequently he sent the flood. Noah and his sons were saved, because they were supposed to be "righteous." And after the flood, and dryland was found, what was the first thing Noah did? "Plant a vineyard," make wine, and get drunk! No wonder, then, that men became once more corrupt, and that another course of action had to be taken by this eccentric "God" in order to "redeem" them! How was this done? by sending "God's only-begotten son," who was murdered on "the cross" by those whom He *had Himself created*! What! could Deity be satisfied by no other means than by the shedding of blood? Why could not He have taken some other method, and not sacrifice his own son to spare the whole world? His charity, mercy, and justice, would have been just as great if he had spared the sacrifice, and exercised his mercy without it. Moreover, is it not a fact that men are not "saved" even now? Is there less sin now in the world than when Jesus came? Is not sin on every hand—immorality everywhere? Have you not been shown this by our worthy opponent? And from these sins how are we to be "saved?" By believing these monstrous stories; under the conditions "that unless we believe them we cannot be saved!" Now, some men are so constructed by the *laws of God* that they *cannot believe* in the evidence presented. Accordingly, they are to be "damned",—condemned to eternal suffering! Is this God's mercy? Would; any natural or Earthly father punish his son for the sake of creating authentic evidence, as Christ was punished to show that

the evidence of the prophecies was authentic? Man, copying the laws of Nature, punishes that he may correct; Is God less merciful in *His* actions than men? An Earthly father corrects his children when he finds it necessary, to do so that he may improve them; and is it not rational to suppose that God would do the same? Is it not that we, may

be corrected and grow better, that God punishes? but, as our friend puts it, a man may swing "from the gallows to glory," after he has committed crimes of every description, and if he be only "baptised and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ," he can go to heaven from the hangman's rope!!! Notwithstanding all his wickedness and awful crimes, yet, by reason of his *gaol*-repentance, though not fit to live on Earth he becomes a welcome denizen of heaven, and qualified to sit on the right hand of God the Father!!! (Applause.)

Now, our friend says he bases the testimony of the divine origin of Christianity, to a great extent, on the "resurrection." Let us examine the evidence that is given in reference to that "resurrection." We have very varied accounts of it in the gospels, as we have also varied accounts of the crucifixion. Touching the crucifixion, where giving the details of the events, Mark says they gave Jesus "*wine* mingled with myrrh:" Matthew says, "vinegar and gall:" John, "vinegar put upon hyssop." Who is correct? These are contradictions which must invalidate their evidence. Then, upon the cross these were the inscriptions given by—

Matthew: "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews."

Mark: "The King of the Jews."

Luke: This is the King of the Jews."

John: Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews.

Who, in this instance, is correct? for if one be correct, the other three are wrong! Now, this is the evidence given to support the divine origin of Christianity! We are told that the writers of the gospels depended upon memory in reporting these matters. Then how do we know that they are reporting correctly. In the report of what took place after the "resurrection" Matthew says: "The angel of the Lord descended, and rolled away the stone from the sepulchre and sat *upon it*." Thus, you perceive, the angel was *outside* the grave sitting on the stone. Mark says, "When they came to this place they found the stone rolled away. They entered and found a man (or angel) sitting there." The angel, in this case, was sitting *inside*. Luke says, "When they entered, they found *two* men *standing* beside them in shining garments." Observe, instead of one man there are two, and they are *standing*. John says that when Mary Magdalene came and saw the stone taken away she went and told the others, who came, and when they saw the linen and empty napkin they believed and went away again to their own home; but Mary, staying behind to weep on the outside, stooped down and looked into the sepulchre; she then saw two Angels, as they are called, *sitting*, "one at the head and the other at the feet." Jesus himself is also present on the scene in John's account. Notice, again, there are *two* Angels this time, but they are sitting! Now, could any of the relators of these discrepancies have been present, when they in their descriptions so contradict each other in a matter of such vital importance. Why did not Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John compare their accounts before giving this revelation to the world? We have not time to mention the different names of the visitors at the tomb; but at your leisure, you can compare the four accounts, and you will find a vast difference indeed.

We still affirm that our friend has not maintained his position, for, even if the records were authentic, which state that Jesus worked

"miracles" it does not prove that he was "divine." The wonders of the Old Testament scriptures were far greater than those of the New Testament. Did not the magicians of Egypt perform very wonderful "miracles"? Did not they change the rivers into blood when they were *already* changed into blood by Moses? Was not THAT a very great miracle, indeed? Again, was that not a wonderful miracle to destroy all the horses by a mighty hail-shower, and afterwards to send horses and chariots across the Bed Sea with the Israelites? The stoppage of the Sun and Moon on their fiery journeys; the dividing of the Jordan with Elisha's cloak; the swallowing of Jonah by the fish were superior to any of the New Testament "miracles." Was not the miracle of "the widow's cruse of oil quite as wonderful as "the feeding of the five thousand?" Did not Elijah raise the son of the Shunnamite woman? And is not that as wonderful as the raising of Lazarus, Jarius's daughter, and the widow's son at Nain? Thus, even the resurrection from the dead cannot be accepted as a proof of the divine origin of Christianity. Did not AEsculapius, Christna and the Christian Fathers do the same (if records are to be trusted)? The Roman Catholics claim to have performed "miracles:" therefore, the Roman Catholic Church is of divine origin!

But, as specially touching the "resurrection," we may summon to our aid the splendid sarcasm of Gibbon, who will certainly be admitted an authority. In the fifteenth chapter of his celebrated work "*The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*" he says:—

During the age of Christ, of his Apostles, and their first disciples the doctrine which they preached was confirmed by in, numerable prodigies. The lame walked, the blind saw, the sick were healed, the dead were raised, demons were expelled, and the Laws of Nature were frequently suspended for the benefit of the Church. But the sages of Greece and Rome turned aside from the awful spectacle, and, pursuing the ordinary occupations of life and study, appeared unconscious of any alterations in the moral or physical government of the world. Under the reign of Tiberius the whole Earth, or at least a celebrated portion of the Roman Empire—was involved in a preter-natural darkness for three hours. Even this miraculous event, which ought to have excited the wonder, the curiosity, and the devotion of mankind, *passed without notice*,—in an age of science and history! It happened during the life-time of Seneca and the elder Pliny, who must have experienced the immediate effects, or received the earliest intelligence of the prodigy. Each of these philosophers, in a laborious work, has recorded all the great phenomena of Nature,—earthquakes, meteors, comets, and eclipses—which his indefatigable curiosity could collect. Both the one and the other *have omitted to mention* the greatest phenomena to which the mortal eye has been witness since the creation of the globe!

Now, is it the evidence of the books of the Bible only which is to support the doctrine or theory of Jesus's "resurrection" from the dead? Josephus, who, of all others, should have known the history of his own country, would certainly have known of the *resurrection of*

*God*, which happened just prior to his writing, if such a wonderful event had occurred. Other historians, such as Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, and, in short, all those historians of Rome, and of Greece, who must have known, are silent; and we challenge our friend to produce a single contemporaneous or immediately succeeding historian, outside the gospels, who alludes to this "resurrection" of Jesus. And yet we have to accept it on the testimony of these books, which we have shown to be full of contradictions and interpolations! Our friend says the apocryphal gospels are their own refutation. Why? Because they contain such ridiculous nonsense. Do these gospels which we possess tell less ridiculous things? Do they not contain some accounts which, if read for the first time in this age by an enlightened and intelligent person, would be rejected, just as you reject as mythical the stories of the Greek and Roman poets? What do miracles prove when taken as evidence in support of the divine origin of Christianity? They simply show or prove that "God" could not do a certain thing as his divine laws existed, so he changed his laws and wrought miracles! This is truly weakness of argument in earnest! He endeavors to do a thing by one method, then he tries another, which argues the weakness of the first! No man could do worse. It makes him no higher than Jupiter, or any of the Heathen deities. Hear, hear.

Though our friend will not admit that the Koran is of divine origin, yet the Christian may take many lessons from it, on subjects on which he very much needs instruction. What heathen mythology but contains some example, some precepts in morality, love, and affection. Our modern poets, too, are full of heavenly teachings, and all filled with the noble sentiments of love and devotion. We may find one illustration in Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" that causes us to think of the "heathen" "Hector and Andromache." Did Christ introduce anything new into the world which could not have been equally as well produced by mortal man? Did he say or do anything that could not have been equally as well said and done by ordinary beings of his tuition? If "miracles" were all, then other men have performed "miracles." The blind have been restored to sight by Spiritualists; and if the mere fact of claiming proves the position, then the Roman Catholic Church performed "miracles." This shows that Church also to be of divine origin! (Hear, hear.)

Now, let us see what our friend has admitted; and which admissions totally ruin his position as to the divine origin of Christianity. We first showed that prophecies did not prove the divine origin of Christianity. Then the morality of the bible is not such as to indicate divine origin; and the mere records themselves do not prove his case; for they would prove equally as well that other religions were of divine origin. All the positions our friend has taken have been destroyed: therefore, his case is not proved. In all instances we have convicted these men, who are to support his position, either of deliberate or unintentional falsehoods; but in either case, the records are unreliable. They are admitted to be the works of men. How, then, can they be of divine origin? Our friend has not met this argument, if—  
[reporter failed].



In conclusion: If Jesus was God he certainly manifested great ignorance, because he believed in "the flood," and the story of the Creation, &c. Now, certainly, "the flood" did not take place, as described in Genesis, as all science proves —and as we are prepared to maintain. (loud Applause.)



MR. GREEN:

As my friend did not finish his argument about the flood, I will not trouble to refer to it further. He will require to show from the record, and from what can be proved to be the discoveries of science, that there is a contradiction before we could receive it. I deny that there is any contradiction between the record and the *ascertained facts* of science,

Now, in regard to this matter of Draper and Smith. It is certainly an unfortunate thing that my friend referred to it at all; for this reason, that the more he troubles about it the deeper he gets into the mire. You will notice that in his last statement he had that extract read from Draper, which states that "when Alexander issued his letters, orders, and decrees, styling himself King Alexander, son of Jupiter Ammon, they came to the inhabitants of Egypt and Syria with an authority that now can hardly be realised." Now, does that statement differ from Dr. Smith's, when he says that "he consulted the Oracle, but refused to disclose the answer he received?" There is really no contradiction, but there is a simple verbal discrepancy, similar to those which we find in the gospels, and which my friend styles contradictions. They are both trustworthy historians, but one leaves out a few unimportant details which the other puts in, and my friend has consumed his time on this matter, instead of trying to take to pieces my argument, in regard to the resurrection, or the argument in reference to Daniel's prophecies. He has *not time to show* the difficulty there is in understanding the prophecies of Daniel, on account of its ambiguity! Nor has he proved that it has been misunderstood by any person, either Jew or Gentile. This you will find when you read the published debate.

Now, as to his remarks with reference to the Deity not being satisfied with the blood of his son. My friend, I presume, believes in a deity, and I am sure that his deity is not to be satisfied with anything short of the actual sufferings of every wrong-doer, to the very least fraction of that which he has incurred. (Applause.) But in the gospels we have an intimation that just as a father, or a mother, may bear suffering for a child, so the Lord, in a way that only infinite wisdom could devise, only boundless love could suggest, and only infinite compassion could carry out, has provided means whereby himself, in the person of his son, who bore the chastisement due to man, might vindicate his laws and uphold his position as the King of the Universe, and at the same time show mercy to the guilty. Let my friend compare his theory with this beautiful, sublime, and unique one. Let him show that his system meets the fondest aspirations, the dearest hopes, and the most ardent longings of the human race, as

Christianity does. Let him show that, and we will be prepared to give it more consideration and respect than we confess we can do just at present.

In regard to the other points which have been referred to, though I should very much like to notice them all, I find time will not permit. My friend, in his summing up, has assumed that he has proved the fallacy of our position, by showing these Bible contradictions. Now, until he can show that there are contradictions between Smith and Draper let his mouth for ever be closed in regard to those of the Bible. ([Applause and disorder.] Let us not be misunderstood. Our friend has introduced Draper and Smith. Now, I referred to them, not to show that they were unreliable—indeed their *apparent* contradictions would rather prove them to be true and reliable authors—but to maintain that on whatever principle he may explain their apparent differences, the same principle would be applicable to the gospels. You will remember I stated I was not proving the inspiration of the New Testament, and the published debate will show this fact. I was not concerned with that; but if that were our proposition, I could give you much evidence upon it. I was concerned to prove that these men who wrote the gospels were reliable historians, and that upon that simple ground their statements prove Christianity to be of divine origin. I have not said that their statements prove them to be divinely inspired—that would be proved in another way if the proposition comes before us. If, however, our friend cannot reconcile the apparent discrepancies between Draper and Smith—and he has not attempted to do so, though it is the simplest matter possible—let him for ever hold his peace as to the so-called contradictions of Scripture.

Let me now just give a brief summary of what I have endeavored to show during the five evenings of this debate.

I have pointed out, first, the unbroken continuity of Christianity, from the first century till now. I have showed this, so far as the earlier four centuries were concerned, from the heathen writers. I have proved from these same heathen writers the identity of the doctrines in the first century, that were held to be vital to Christianity, with those that are now found in the New Testament. Then I have noticed the Sun theory of Sir Wm. Drummond, and the mythical theory of Strauss and Kenan, and have shown by the evidence presented that none of these theories would bear even a cursory examination, and that they were without any real support. Then, further, you remember, I pointed out that these gospels were known to have been written by the four persons whose names are attached to them,

and my friend has never yet attempted to invalidate that evidence. You will see from the printed debate that he has admitted this, but, when doing so, he did not apparently see what I was aiming at. Having admitted that fact, he has admitted what was largely fatal to himself in his subsequent argument.

I have endeavored, further, to show how these gospels had been handed down to us comparatively pure, and that by the multiplying of copies, and by translations, we have ample means of showing that the gospels are substantially uncorrupted; and that all the errors that have crept in did not invalidate, in the slightest degree, any

single doctrine or important statement, and that an examination of these discrepancies only established in the mind the fact that these records were substantially the same that those evangelists wrote.

I have pointed out that thirty distinct prophecies were all fulfilled in the Lord Jesus Christ, but especially the prophecies in Isaiah VII, 14th v., and in Daniel II, and IX, which my friend only very cursorily noticed. I dwelt much upon these, and in the printed debate you will see the importance of this portion of the argument. My friend has admitted that his argument based upon the mythological stories is not reliable. Better the admission late than never. I have also established the divinity of Christ's person by the prophecies, and their fulfillment in his person; by their teaching as to his ancestry, nature, character, birth, and place of birth, and the work which he would perform. All these prophecies were fulfilled in him. We have noticed the declarations of Christ, as to his divine claims, supported by his miracles, his prediction as to Jerusalem and the Jews; and his own death and resurrection being incontestably established by overwhelming evidence, and have also shown that Christianity and the doctrine of the atonement harmonise with man's condition and needs, which no other system does.

Now what has my friend done in reply? Simply occupied the chief part of his time by pointing out what are merely apparent contradictions, and not real ones. He has done literally nothing to disprove these points, and the chief part of his time has been taken up as I have said, and not in dealing with the arguments which have been adduced, and which, beyond doubt, prove the divine mission of Christ, and the consequent divine mission of Christianity. (Applause.)

*End of Debate on Divine Origin of Christianity,*

SIXTH EVENING:

THURSDAY, 14TH MARCH.

---

SECOND PROPOSITION:

"THAT THE BIBLE (*King James's Version*) SUPPORTS AND PARALLELS  
MODERN SPIRITUALISM IN ALL ITS PHASES, TEACHINGS,  
AND PHENOMENA."

---

*Affirmed by Mr. Walker. Denied by Mr. Green.*

---

MR. WALKER, having been appropriately introduced by the  
Chairman, gave the following opening speech:

Spiritualism has two aspects, a scientific and a religious—presenting itself as a science in one of its aspects for investigation and for the benefit of humanity. It is in this respect, comparatively speaking, of recent origin. As a religion, in another aspect, it embraces the spiritual or (so-called) "supernatural" in all religions and ages. It is as old as man; and thus its tenets and the phases of its expression, as to the facts that compose its basis, have been evidenced in all ages of the world, and among every people. Viewed in the light of philosophy, it will be seen that these phenomena and these facts have been registered in the beliefs and religious faiths of humanity wheresoever humanity has been found. Spiritualism is based upon this central fact, viz., *that there is a continued existence of the individual, identical, human being*: that after death the senses, the thoughts, the identity, the individuality, and all those wonderful attributes that go to constitute the real being, as apart from all other beings, will continue still, and be just the same on the next plane of existence as on this; so that memory and the recollection of others upon Earth will remain *the same* as they were prior to death.

Now, this establishes, at the commencement, the fact that each individual entering into the spiritual world will take the individual characteristics, and idiosyncrasies, and varied peculiarities that are the common possessions of those individuals; and thus it will be readily

understood that if union between these and those still remaining behind be possible, it must be taken as a natural explanation, by those upon the mundane plane, that the spirits will manifest differences of opinion, differences of conjecture, differences of methods and expression,

and different degrees and shades of thought, &c; for most Spiritualists believe that there is no very great difference between the first stages of spiritual life and the last stages of material life. So that if you receive communications from your friends who have recently left your earthly sphere, their discussions, opinions, conjectures, and thoughts may be just as varied as though they had but lately removed to a distant country upon the earthly plane and were now sending their thoughts by means of letters or any other method of communication that is familiar to you.

In proving our proposition, therefore, should it be objected that spirits differ, that their communications are contradictory, and thus somewhat unreliable, you have now a solution to the difficulty; and such objection, instead of being really valid, proves the truth of this science; for if Spiritualism be a fact, on the basis thus laid down from the different standards of mind, these varied shades of thought must naturally tend to prove their genuineness in a greater degree than if they were all uniform and stereotyped. Now, Spiritualism is thus assumed for the present to be a fact. We expect that our friend will not deny its existence; but even should he deny the phenomenal and scientific aspect of it, and doubt that which, to us, are matters of fact that cannot be disputed, at all events, we suppose our friend will not deny its existence as a belief in the minds of its millions of adherents. Then it must be remembered that these individuals have come to their conclusions and their belief in spirit-communications, with the philosophy for their explanation, from what each, and every one of them know to be *actually demonstrable facts*. There are recent cases, and we might add there are numerous cases, where individuals have attempted to explain the phenomena of Spiritualism upon other grounds than those claimed by the supporters of this science. There are those who have said that in the first place it is a delusion—that it is certainly trickery and imposture of the worst order—that it is the effort of conjurers and designing men who make dupes of all others less informed than themselves. Thus, in the estimation of such expositors, the whole subject has been thrown out of the scientific world, so far as they are concerned, as being unworthy of investigation—at all events by them, and condemned without a hearing.

However, we ask in all earnestness those who have this predisposition to judge it so to consider its demands upon their attention, and then give it that investigation, in an unprejudiced and scientific manner, which its importance, if only in the minds of its adherents, calls for, they having investigated it and come to their own conclusion, and then, let them account for the facts as they may, they will most assuredly be convinced that the facts are there. (Hear, hear!)

Numerous experiments have been made by sceptical individuals who had a desire, if possible, to be of benefit to humanity and posterity, with the object of exposing that which they, before entering on the investigation of spiritual phenomena, considered to be a monstrous fraud, or delusion. They have been, however, compelled, in justice

to their own honor and impartiality, to report the facts, and some of these reports remain upon record, as, for instance, the case of those drawn up by several committees of gentlemen, adverse to Spiritualism, who were appointed to investigate the phenomena of Spiritualism by the London Dialectical Society in 1869. Out of many of those, who went with a determination to *expose* all the frauds they could come in contact with, there are a number now, men of acknowledged ability, who are adherents, and able supporters of Spiritualism: both in Europe and America this has been the case over and over again; and a few names high in public estimation may be mentioned,—Professors Hare, Wallace, Crookes, Varley, Judge Edmonds, Gerald Massey, the Rev. J. B. Dodds, and even Colonel Olcott, who, of all others, was a man of such keen insight and shrewd perception that he was engaged by the *New York Herald* to expose "this delusion." This man, with all the force and appliances which his mind and his past experiences could suggest, went down to the Eddy brothers for the express purpose of exposing that which he considered to be mere trickery, and he finally came out of the trial a firm advocate, and a *believer* in that which he went with such confidence to investigate and *expose*. This is not by any means an isolated case; for there are numberless instances of this kind on record, as well as many living witnesses to give their attestation thereto. We can safely say, without fear of contradiction, that all those scientific men who have entered into the matter thoroughly and candidly, and have systematically taken all the evidence that could be brought in favor of Spiritualism and against it,—who have weighed matters carefully, and have refused to investigate none of the phenomena—we say, out of all these not a single

individual afterwards has opposed Spiritualism. In fact, all those scientific men who have given it thorough investigation have become *convinced* of the facts appertaining thereto. These cases are of such frequent occurrence that any individual doubting can at once satisfy himself as to their existence. There are innumerable mediums throughout the world, located and travelling in nearly all the countries upon which the Sun shines, through whom the truth of Spiritualism can be ascertained by any one who will take the trouble to inquire into the subject. Talk as we will, experiment has proved that the simple "rap" of the Spiritualist is a demonstrated fact in science. It can be produced, under the conditions of its occurrence, judged of, and as carefully considered as any other phenomena of Nature. Professor Crookes in his investigations has shown this. Serjeant Cox in his investigations has demonstrated this. Professor Varley, and a number of other scientific men of like standing, have all come to the conclusion that, whether they be spirits or devils, or unknown forces, certain it is that the facts are there, and no physical law, at present understood by scientists, is sufficient to account for the phenomena that are at present recorded in the history of this science. From what we have said you will perceive that these phenomena are not simply communi-

cated in this age and absent in all others; for, if history tells aright, there has been no age that has not claimed communion with the spirit-world; even the creed of the Anglican Church says, "We believe *in* the communion of saints." In the Catholic Church records these things are often mentioned. Swedenborg claimed to have communion with the "Saints," and to receive inspiration through spiritual agency. Quakers claimed to be moved by the spirit, and to speak "as the spirit gave them utterance;" and the Shakers of modern days have all claimed these powers. There are evidences more striking than even these, for the biographer of John Wesley tells us that in his house at Epworth there were spiritual manifestations of the most marked and novel description, corresponding in every particular to our modern manifestations; and those of Luther tell us that he had communion on several occasions with "the devil," or, as our friend would no doubt say, with "an evil spirit." So the fact is thus laid down at the commencement, that Spiritualism is, and always has been universal; and it is our duty now to show that all the phenomena and phases of Spiritualism are *exactly paralleled* by similar cases which are recorded in the Bible. Hear, hear.

Bear in mind we do not undertake to prove the Bible by Spiritualism; neither do we attempt to prove Spiritualism by the Bible. But this we *do* say: take the Bible as it stands, then take all Spiritualism from it, *and you have nothing but the bare letter*, without interest,

and of no service whatsoever to the generality of mankind. In fact, almost every page of the Bible contains some evidence of a union between the super-mundane and the mundane worlds; for, from Genesis to Revelations there are records of communication between one and the other. Now, in this spiritual communion, of course, you will say, in the cases mentioned in the Bible, that they were "angels" who then communicated,—that they were a separate race of beings from those said to communicate with Spiritualists now. This will have to be proved, if the opposition to our statement is to be maintained; for we are of opinion that the words "Angel" and "Spirit" *are convertible terms*; and, moreover, that the words "Angels" and "Men" are used in the Bible to signify the same beings. However, that you may see that our opinion is not groundless, but based upon the Bible records themselves, we will illustrate our meaning by examples therefrom. The three "angels" that came to Abraham, mentioned in the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, are called men. "And lo! three *men* stood beside him;" and the two men who appeared unto Lot, mentioned in the nineteenth chapter of Genesis, are also said to have been "angels." Here we see the two terms are used to convey the same meaning. Now, in modern Spiritualism we have the same phenomenon of spirits appearing, or, if you like, of messengers—[for the word "angel" simply means "messenger"]—appearing, clothed in material form and material garments, so that they can be seen by the material eye, and touched by the material hand. But the philosophy of Spiritualism will inform you that you do not touch in reality the spirit, but only those material garments with which it has temporarily clothed itself so as to be cognisable to your senses. Thus, those spirits who are able to utilize the Laws of Nature are able to clothe

themselves in garments so that they can be recognised, touched, felt, and handled by those to whom they manifest themselves.

As a remarkable parallel of this modern phenomenon, an instance of this kind can be found in the case of Jesus, one of the ancient mediums, who lived in Nazareth: he had been crucified and buried, as the records say, and when his disciples were assembled together—the doors being closed—"came Jesus and stood in their midst, and saith unto them 'Peace be unto you.'" He was recognised, and Thomas (who had doubted) was asked by Jesus to see the holes of the nails in his hands, and to feel the wound in his side, thus showing that the body had been materialised for the special purpose of recognition, with its defects, its wounds, and Earthly appearances. Surely no one would maintain *that* was the body with which Jesus ascended to heaven! For, if so, Jesus ascended to heaven with wounds belonging to flesh and blood!—and Paul declared that "flesh and blood cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Here we have wounds, which are evidences of flesh and blood! If, then, Jesus ascended to heaven with this body he ascended in a mutilated body: and—just think of it, ye Christians!—a "wounded God through all eternity!" Better say that Jesus appeared to his disciples in a materialised body, exactly similar to those materialisations that occur in modern *seances*—which surely is a more rational explanation of the phenomena, as recorded. (Applause.)

Throughout the Bible we have numberless instances of this kind. We have mentioned the three spirits, or "angels" that appeared to Abraham, speaking to, and eating with, him—at whose conversation Sarah laughed; and the two that lodged and conversed with Lot. In the 6th chapter of Judges we have an account of "an angel of the Lord" coming to Gideon; and we find this angel gives an illustration of the spirit-light—which is *decidedly* a spiritual manifestation of our time. Let us see how it is brought about: "And the Angel of God said unto him 'Take the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and pour out the broth,' and he did so. Then the Angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and there rose up *fire out of the rock* and consumed the flesh and the unleavened cakes." Gideon was afraid then, and said that he had "seen an angel of the Lord face to face."

The story of the fleece is another illustration of some of the phenomena of spirit-circles. You will remember, that as a sign Gideon placed a fleece upon the floor and asked that in the morning the fleece might be wet with dew, and, on the following morning, that the fleece might be dry, but the ground about it sprinkled with the tears of the night, and the record gives us to understand that the sign was given. Is not this similar to the phenomenon of the flowers dew-sprinkled when they are introduced into our spiritual *seances* now? Thus, we have a record in the Bible of the very same phenomenon, though the object of its production may be different.

Now, among the spiritual phenomena, as we have already mentioned, there are appearances of lights and the production of sounds, voices, &c. This is *decidedly* maintained and put forward upon scientific evidence by Professor Crookes in his "*Phenomena of Spirit-*



*ualism.*" In the Old Testament we find accounts of the same appearances, to some of which we have made allusion. To cite a few more instances, however: In the night "the Lord" directed the Israelites through the desert by a pillar of light, and by a pillar of cloud by day. When Saul—as mentioned in the New Testament—was on his way to Damascus, a great *light* appeared unto him, and he heard a voice. Returning, however, to the Old Testament, when Gideon desired to have a test from the angel that appeared unto him, the angel touched the cake, and at once there was *fire!* Here, again, is the spirit-light. Elijah desired to show the authority of his God and his powers to the worshipers of Baal,—and we are told that "*fire* came down from heaven and consumed his sacrifice." In the 3rd chapter of the 1st Book of Samuel you have the phenomenon of Samuel laying by himself when a voice addressed him. He naturally ran to Eli, as the voice, no doubt, was similar to what he had been accustomed to hear. This he did three times, until "the Lord" made known his wishes. Here was an instance of the voice being distinctly heard. In the case of Saul on his way to Damascus you have the same instance, when the voice addressed Saul in these words: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Another instance was when "the Lord" spoke to Moses out of the burning bush,—where you have the phenomenon of the spirit-light also manifested.

Then, there are cases mentioned in the Bible where spiritual beings have come down and interfered on behalf of humanity for the purpose of benefiting those who were specially concerned,—as in the case when "the angels" closed the lions' mouths, so that they could not hurt Daniel. Again, when the three men Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were in the fiery furnace, a fourth was seen to be among them, and "the form of the fourth was like the Son of God," whilst the fire burned not the three. Here, also we have manifestations of clairvoyant power for perceiving that which had no special existence in the material world. Then we have the occasion when Peter is in prison, and where "the angels" came to him, and the chains dropped from his hands. We have another instance in the case of "the angel" appearing to John on the Isle of Patmos: John was about to worship this "angel;" but in the 22nd chapter of Revelations, 9th verse, we have the assurance of his earthly origin, and his acknowledgment of a superior power; for, refusing to be worshiped, and denying that divine respect should be paid to him, he says: "See thou do it not, for I am thy *fellow-servant*, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book—*worship* God." This shows that he had once been on Earth like unto John, that he claimed no superiority—but rather the contrary,—and accordingly he

instructed John to ". worship God." It is this mistaking of spirits, or "angels," for the infinite Deity that has so mis-led the world in all ages, and which Spiritualism exposes, and is destined, ultimately, to abolish. (Applause.)

Now, you will ask us whether we assert that all the Bible says is true, and whether in all it says, it supports and parallels modern Spiritualism. In answer we say that we take all its truths, prophecies, errors, and phenomena to be just exactly what they are, and we use our discrimination in regard to them, as we would in regard to similar

things related in other books. A few years ago, at a convention of Spiritualists in Minneapolis, Minnesota, it was resolved—"That the Spiritualists recognise no man or book as master." Consequently, we are at liberty to reject the errors of the bible, and to affirm that in its Spiritual truths it parallels Spiritualism. We say that all the phenomena that can be mentioned, outside the bible, are found, or have their counterpart, or parallels, in the bible. So, in this respect they parallel each other; not that we say the bible, or rather, the phenomena or teachings there given, go to the full extent of modern Spiritual teachings, but so far as they go they parallel each other. It may be that Spiritualism goes a little further in some respects: it has only in so doing left the bible behind; but up to where the bible stopped they parallel each other. It is only thus far that we claim this to be the case. We do not say that the bible proves Spiritualism; for Spiritualism stands or falls upon the evidence of its facts—which facts are open to the proof for all who have the inclination and perseverance to thoroughly investigate the subject. Even if the bible proves to be false, still Spiritualism will stand; but, whether the bible is false or true matters little for our discussion; for, what we have to show is that all that Spiritualism has in the shape of facts the bible has also. Again, so as not to be misunderstood, let us repeat: All that Spiritualism has in the shape of phenomena the bible has. We do not say all that the bible has Spiritualism has. We would request you to note the *distinction*.

Now, there are several enumerations of Spiritual gifts to be found in the bible—gifts that are not specially for the time in which these books were written, but which are evidently intended to be utilized by all persons who were to follow. If our Chairman will read as rapidly as possible from the 1st Corinthians, 12th chapter, 1st verse, until we tell him to cease, we shall be thankful. You will see there Paul's opinion in reference to Spiritual gifts, where he enumerates them and speaks of the same spirit acting through different individuals with different organisations, which, of course, will produce different results. We have the advice given that these gifts are to be utilized variously as they fall upon different individuals:

The CHAIRMAN then read as follows:—

"Now, concerning Spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant: ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led: wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administration—but the same Lord: and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal: for, to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to

another discerning of Spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh through one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." Hear, hear! Now, will you read the 14th chapter, 1st Corinthians, 1st verse?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:

"Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophecy. For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understandeth him; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now, here you have the evidence of Paul, that there *are* spiritual gifts. He distinctly and emphatically declares that "the spirit is given to every man to profit withal." He tells you to "covet earnestly the best gifts." He tells you that there are different kinds, and asks you to search after the grand spiritual gift of prophecy. There could be nothing more distinct or emphatic than this; and we claim that Spiritualists, in this particular, are fulfilling Paul's injunction, and realising the promise and assurance relating to these self-same gifts.

Now, will our friend turn to the 2nd chapter of Joel, 28<sup>th</sup> verse?

The CHAIRMAN read as requested:—

"And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions, and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit, and I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the Earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke."

MR. WALKER: Then, in the 2nd chapter of Acts, we read: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they (the disciples) were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it (*sic*) sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance." After this it states all that were present were astonished at the diversities of language, each one hearing his own language spoken: and Peter said that the promise which was mentioned in Joel, that was then apparently fulfilled, was not only unto them and their children, but to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God should call. Thus, we have the manifest promise or prediction of these spiritual gifts to those who were believers, not only for that day and age, but to those "that were afar off." Now, we have a representation or exact parallel of all these gifts in modern Spiritualism. We have healing the sick by "healing mediums;" we have those that perform what would have been termed "miracles" in the olden days—such, for instance, as introducing physical substances into their presence by no apparent cause. We have those who are prophets, in that sense of the word, which implies that by a knowledge of the causes now in existence, they can foretell that which

will occur on the morrow. Just as the astronomer, by knowing the motions of the planets, their actions, and influences upon each other, is enabled to tell of some new and hitherto undiscovered planet, measure its orbit, its density, size, and all connected with it, by simply witnessing the laws in operation, and variation among the others, so are the spirits, by studying the laws at present in operation, enabled, through earthly organisations, to manifest this same phenomenon of prophecy.

Now, we are distinctly told in the Bible not to believe every spirit. Thus, it is shown that in those days there were differences of spiritual manifestations—that some were reliable and some otherwise, at any rate, these gifts were then used; and, for the sake of showing you more thoroughly that the advice then given was to test or try the spirits, we refer our Chairman to the 1st epistle of John, 4th chapter, 1st verse.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

" Beloved, believe not every spirit, but *try the spirits* whether they are of God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now, here we have a direction which will assist us in our explanation of spiritual phenomena, and an injunction given us to test whether the spirits are true and reliable, or false and frivolous. We have the opinion of John, given in the following verses, as to what, in his opinion, constitutes the real test of a good spirit. In this respect John may be correct or not: we are not discussing that point; but, at all events, it shows that John knew that differences existed in the qualities of spirits. He says, as above quoted, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits." This is just exactly what all true Spiritualists would wish you to do, and what they *ask* you to do: to take no man, no spirit, no book, as final, decisive, absolute, almighty, or infallible; but to test all by your reason, intelligence, and judgment, and by the light and aid of your past knowledge. In this manner you can try the spirits, "whether they are of God" or not. That there were evil spirits who could take possession of men is shown by the labors of Jesus and his disciples, who were able to cast out evil spirits, and who spent the greater part of their time in such work. We are told that Jesus cast seven of these evil spirits out of Mary Magdalene, and out of one individual "a legion" of spirits were cast. There were those who believed that Jesus did these good things through "Beelzebub, the Prince of the Devils," and that he was under his influence whilst being able to cast them out, just as in the present day many say that the phenomena of Spiritualism emanate from "the devil." Hear, hear!

So we have established the fact of cavilling existing in those days; and, at the same time, proved that even then there were good and evil spirits manifesting themselves. It may be said, however, that in the Bible we have no certainty in the evidence as to who these spirits were, that they were not the spirits of men who had once been mortal, and had been possessed of intellect, judgment, &c, as we ourselves are. But this will be shown to the contrary by referring to the 28th chapter of the 1st book of Samuel, where we find that Saul sought communication with Samuel through the mediumship of

"the Witch of Endor;" or, rather, "the woman that hath a familiar spirit," as stated in the Bible. On that occasion *we* are told that Samuel distinctly appeared, and he was called a god; or, more correctly speaking, the woman said she saw him among "the gods" who were ascending from the Earth. He speaks unto Saul: it is true he does not encourage Saul in that which he is bent on doing, implying that he had got outside the pale of good, spiritual communication, and that he had only now come to the woman for his own evil purposes. Then, as was natural, Samuel rebuked him, and foretold his death and that of his two sons. Now, mark you, the prediction runs in this method, "Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel, with thee, into the hand of the Philistines, and to-morrow shalt *thou and thy sons be with me*; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." Now, the question naturally arises, where was Samuel? Was he in heaven? If so, and Samuel was justified in saying as he did, wicked king Saul, with his two sons, *next day went to heaven*, for he is reported to have said to Saul: "To-morrow shalt thou and thy two sons be with me." Was he in hell? Then, it is sad to think that Samuel—that good "prophet of God"—was in such a place! (Applause.) It is evident from the context, from the way the prediction is worded, that Samuel was in the spirit-world, and that Saul and his sons should, in the world of the disembodied, be with him on the following day. With this as a key, we can understand "how Moses and Elias could be recognised, whilst speaking with Jesus on the mount, at "the transfiguration," for these two were also in the spirit-world, as to their spiritual bodies. This spirit-world is considered by some to refer to that spiritual home which Jesus described when he said, "In my Father's house there are many mansions:" not *two* divisions, one for the good, or "the saints," and the other for the evil, or "devils;" not one for "the sheep," and another for "the goats." There are "*many* mansions;" and this is what Spiritualists claim, when you find in their literature descriptions of the different spheres, societies, mansions, houses, possessions, &c., for you may change the name as you like, so as best to express the meaning; yet the idea is strikingly harmonious with the statement made by Jesus in the above quotation. We can now only very briefly allude to the fact made known by Elisha, that it was possible for a, spirit which had once been in the flesh to have influence over the individual remaining in mortal life. We will refer our friend to the 2nd book of Kings, 2nd chapter, 9—10 verses.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"And it came to pass when they were gone over, that Elijah said unto Elisha, 'Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee,' and Elisha said, 'I pray thee let a *double portion of thy spirit* be upon me.' And he said 'thou hast asked a hard thing, nevertheless if thou see me when I am taken from thee it shall be so unto thee, but if not, it shall not be so.'"

Mr. WALKER: Now read the 15th verse?

The CHAIRMAN read accordingly:—

" And when the sons of the prophets, which were to view at Jericho saw him they said *the spirit* of Elijah *doth rest on*

*Elisha*, and they came to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before him."

Mr. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now, there you have the request of Elisha from Elijah that a double portion of Elijah's spirit might be upon him. Afterwards, Elijah was taken away from his brother prophet:—at least the record so states—"by a whirlwind into heaven." "And Elisha saw it, and he cried, 'My father, my father,' the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. And he saw him no more; and he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces." And then did a double portion of Elijah's spirit descend upon him? (Loud applause.)



MR. GREEN (who was received with great applause):

Mr. CHAIRMAN, and RESPECTED HEARERS—I must congratulate my friend upon his ingenuity, for he certainly has been very ingenious in the address which he has just delivered, and has certainly brought forward matters to parallel phases of modern Spiritualism that it would have been very difficult indeed to have conceived it likely that he would have adduced. (Hear, hear.) I may say that it is as well that I should put myself right both with my friend and with the audience, as to the relative positions that we occupy to-night. And, in order to do so, I shall just give expression to a few prefatory remarks which I have prepared, for the purpose simply of enabling my friend to see where I stand.

It may be said, in regard to modern Spiritualism, as well as of most things, what Solomon said in his day, "That there is no new thing under the Sun." And it is certainly a fact that those who will study modern Spiritualism, and compare it with some parts of the ancient philosophies, will see that it, at least, is not new. Indeed, it may be said with truth that modern Pantheism, Rationalism, Idealism, Materialism, and Spiritualism, are but modern editions of what may be found in the ancient philosophies, in history, and in the Bible. There are several terms under which the various phases of this system have been known,—if, indeed, it can be called a system (my friend gives it the high title of a science, which, however, might be taken exception to, if it were worth while debating the point); and as a brief definition will aid our investigation, I would define these terms just in order that you may be able to understand the true position we occupy.

In regard to *Magic*, one of the terms used in connection with these phenomena of the ancient times: Webster defines it, "As the science of producing wonderful effects by the aid of superhuman beings, or of departed spirits;" while Calmet says it is the "Invocation of the Devil."

*Enchantment*—Webster defines as the "Art of producing wonderful effects by the aid of demons."

*Divination*.—The same author says, "A diviner is one who pretends to reveal occult things by supernatural means."

*Witchcraft*.—Burkitt defines as "All kinds of influences produced by collusion with Satan."

*Familiar Spirits* are defined by Webster as "Demons, or evil spirits supposed to attend at call." Benson defines them thus: "The spirits of dead men were supposed to speak in the images or idols of worship of the heathen." Barnes says: "Among the heathen nations nothing was more common than for persons to profess to have intercourse with spirits, and to be under their influence."

*Necromancy*.—Stack house defines as "Raising up the ghosts of deceased persons." Calmet says, "Necromancers are those who consult with the dead." Dr. South says, "They utter communications which they pretend to receive from the dead." Dr. Jahn says, "They were those who pretended to raise and consult persons who were dead." As this last term—*necromancy*—covers what appears to be included in modern Spiritualism, the others need not be further noticed.

I would remark that Necromancy is just as true as history itself. There is no difficulty in this matter. It is a universally conceded doctrine of revelation accredited by all learned Protestants from Luther down to the present day. Necromancy was taught in Egypt before the birth of Moses, and from there travelled all over the East. Hence, laws against it were part and parcel of the Jewish code. To deny the possibility of intercourse with the dead, would be to affirm that God made laws against things which had no existence, which he would not be likely to do. The fact that he saw fit to enact laws against witches, wizards, and necromancers, as much proves the real existence of these things as that of the enacting of laws against, image-worship, and against the abominations of the Sodomites, proves their actual existence. The Witch of Endor and her intercourse with the dead was as real a fact as was the existence of King Saul and the prophet Samuel. Balaam, who was a soothsayer and enchanter, as certainly lived, and was as real a character as Moses. From as far back as history will carry us, down to the Christian era, witches, witchcraft, and familiar spirits obtained all over Asia. Paul, who was beset by a damsel with a Pythonic spirit, places witchcraft *among the abominable sins of his day, and warns Christians against it*. While some among modern Christians have ridiculed this belief in the possibility of intercourse with the dead, and have even made a mockery of these solemn realities, no well-educated Christian, with a sound and enlightened mind, will attempt to do so.

Let me here call attention to the word *demon*, which, in my judgment, more correctly represents the beings, intercourse with whom forms the subject of the present debate. This word is said to be of Grecian origin, but this is not quite certain. In that language it is written and pronounced *daimon*, and is supposed to be descended from the verb *daiois*, which means *to know*. The word simply means a person of intelligence, or a knowing one. For their great learning, Aristotle and Thucydides were called demons, and hence the word was considered by Platonists to be a title of honor. This was, however, a special appropriation of the word. Some of the Platonists elevated the spirits or departed heroes, public benefactors, and distinguished men, into a species of demi-god. and applied the term to them,

making it thus the title of an object of worship, while, on the other hand, it degenerated into the *genii* of poetry and imagination. It is not necessary to trace the various transitions of this word, suffice it to say that the word demon, from simply indicating a knowing one, became the title of a human spirit when divested of its clay tenement, because of its supposed initiation into the secrets of another world. In proof of what I have now stated, I cite the words of Hesiod, who ante-dates Homer by nearly one hundred years. Hesiod, as reported by Plutarch, says: "The spirits of mortals become demons when separated from their earthly bodies." Plutarch not only quotes these words of Hesiod, but endorses them by avowing his conviction that the demons of the Greeks were the ghosts and *genii* of departed men, and that they go up and down the Earth as observers, and even rewarders of men, and although not actors themselves, they encourage others to act in harmony with their views and characters. To good demons, and the spirits of deceased heroes, they allotted the office of mediators between gods and men. Hence we have the saint-worship, and saint-mediators of the dark ages, and of the less favored portion of the Anglo-Saxon race. It was in this light that Zoroaster, Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, Plutarch, Celsus, and many others, regarded the demons of their day.

Now, the convictions which arise from these considerations are, 1st, That a more correct term to denote the Spiritualism (so called) of the present day would be *demonology*, and if I should be found using this term, I wish it to be understood that it is not used out of any disrespect, but as being a more correct representation of the thing. 2nd, Another conviction will be that modern Spiritualism is simply ancient Demonology, to all intents and purposes, with so much of the modern veneer as to make it pass current.

Now, the proposition which, my friend has undertaken to prove is, that "The Bible (King James's version) supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena." In my judgment, he has a remarkably hard task before him. He certainly has manifested great boldness in taking such a proposition, which has been simply and purely of his own choosing; and if it is not proved beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt, to all impartial thinkers during this debate that he has utterly failed to establish his proposition, then I know of no proposition that can be shown as incapable of being established.

There is one matter I should have liked just to have noticed here, and that is, a line of argument which my friend brought up during the debate on the previous proposition, to the effect, that unless the truth of Christianity can be mathematically demonstrated it is unreasonable to expect that men should believe it to be of divine origin, and which, when applied to the present proposition—as I shall yet apply it—will place my friend in a dilemma; but at the present time I will just refer to some things which my friend has mentioned in his opening address.

Mr. Walker has been endeavoring to show that modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena, is paralleled and supported in the Bible, and he has referred you to a number of matters of the most singular character indeed. Why, even the closing



of the lion's mouths by the angels of God, in the case of Daniel, is quoted as a parallel case with modern Spiritualism! Now, in order that the case may be paralleled, we want to see where, in the history of modern Spiritualism, we have a case where lions' mouths are stopped,—ravenous lions that had not had food for a certain lengthened period. The mouths of these lions were stopped, and, though they were doubtless ravenous for food, they were prevented from injuring the prophet, their natural ferocity was tamed, and they left this apparently defenceless man unmolested. We ask for a case paralleling this in the history of modern Spiritualism. (Applause.)

Then we have the case of those Hebrews in the midst of the fiery furnace. Here, again, my friend quotes it as a parallel to modern Spiritualism. I need only ask, where have we a parallel case in the history of the Spiritualism of to-day to that in the Old Testament referred to of these three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, and yet unsinged, not a hair of their heads injured? When our friend produces the parallels of these scenes, then we shall be able to give them fuller examination. But now he assumes a position, without having attempted to prove it, that the angels mentioned in the Old Testament, and these spirits that my friend is desiring to convince us now communicate their messages through men, are identical—that they are really the equivalents and counterparts of those angels.

(Hear, hear, and applause.) Let me give this an utter and emphatic denial; let me call upon him for actual proof, and not for his mere assertion. We affirm that no such thing can be proved. Now, because these angels that came to Abraham and Lot appeared in the form of men—mark you, in the *form of men*—my friend would have you to suppose that the mere appearing in the form of men made them to be disembodied spirits of men! I ask, is there any proof of tins in my friend's statement? Is it not simply a rash assertion without the slightest possibility of proof? I deny that there is any foundation for this statement at all. I grant that the term "angel," which is usually applied to a class of spiritual beings, and which simply means a *messenger*, is used when the word would be more correctly rendered messenger, but I deny that the term "angel" is ever used in the whole of the Bible record from beginning to end, in the sense of disembodied spirit, or as in any way equivalent thereto. (Applause.) I grant that in the case referred to in the Revelations, where it says, "I am of thy fellow servants the prophets," there is an apparent support of this position of my friend; but when it is understood that in the Jewish mind there was a clear distinction between the demons, which they regarded as the disembodied spirits of wicked men, and the angels referred to in the Scriptures, this apparent support is removed. Then my friend affirms that the angel which appeared to John in the island of Patmos was at one time upon Earth. It is but a mere affirmation; we have no proof at all that he ever was in this or any other world in human form. I ask my friend to give us more substantial proof than he has thus far done.

I was highly amused—I cannot but use the expression—at the reference made to the prophecy of Joel, 2nd chapter; and also to the statement in the 12th chapter of the letter to the Corinthians. I can

only refer you to the quotation from the Corinthians, as I see my time is drawing to a close. You will notice it is said:

" Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. Ye know that ye are Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led. Wherefore, I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. Now, there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit."

Now, who is there in this audience that can be mistaken as to the meaning of my friend? He desires to impose upon your want of discernment. I wish to cast no reflections, but there certainly was an attempt to impose upon your want of discernment, or your supposed ignorance of the Scripture statements, when he would try to make it appear that for his theory of multitudinous spirits, imparting powers to mediums to do certain things, there is a parallel in this passage when it is said, "there are diversities of gifts, BUT THE SAME SPIRIT"—(applause, and hisses),—and that spirit is shown in the other verse to be really *the spirit of God*. (Applause.)



MR. WALKER:

Our friend has commenced by giving you a definition of certain words, informing you that the terms "necromancy" and "demonology" were the only ones he desired to make use of; for, to his mind, these are synonymous with Spiritualism and its facts. He commences by telling you in his opening remarks that Spiritualism is no new thing; and for this, indeed, he might have quoted Solomon, where he says: "There is nothing new under the Sun." We are reminded, but just as we ourselves should argue, that this system of communing with the spirit-world was known among the ancient Greeks, and all nationalities of "the Heathen" world. Even among the Jews this Necromancy, this Demonology, this communion with "*familiar spirits*" was practised, as is evidenced by its having been forbidden; which, certainly, is an evidence of its existence. Our hypercritical friend would wish the term changed from Spiritualism into *Demonology*. However, let us go back to the Bible and its times, and see if this term will apply; for, if it will apply to those who hold belief in the communion with the spirit-world in our day, and among modern Spiritualists, it will also apply in the cases of similar nature related in the Old and New Testaments. Now, in the Old and New Testaments we have evidence that whilst these evil spiritual gifts were *forbidden* to be exercised or made use of, we have evidence equally strong to show us that spiritual gifts upon a higher plane were exercised, and that many persons passed through life with no other avocation save their possession and exercise of these gifts. Thus, whilst the edict of Saul was in existence, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," Samuel was making use of his spiritual powers, and actually communing with spiritual beings. Even Saul, prior to his *interview with "the Woman of Endor,"* and his forsaking the com-

mands that were supposed to be, or actually were, given him from "the Angel of the Lord," was numbered among the prophets; for you will remember that on his return from searching for his father's asses, the multitude cried, "Is Saul also among the prophets.?" He could gain information by means of dreams, "Urim and Thummim," and the various methods adopted by the old Jewish prophets. It was only after he had been, in the estimation of Samuel and "the Lord," rebellious, that he was tormented by an evil spirit; and in his distress he sought communion with Samuel, by means of the "Woman of Endor." Now, here is a piece of evidence which our friend, giving him credit for sincerity, has overlooked, viz., that *Samuel appeared*, whether through witchcraft, necromancy, demonology, or through proper mediumship, or through Spiritualism, as it existed in that ancient form: by whatsoever method employed Samuel appeared, Samuel spoke, Samuel prophesied, and Samuel's body was in the grave at the time. Here we have a clear and emphatic presentation of the fact, that the individual Samuel, who had once been in the flesh, was there in the presence of, and speaking with, Saul. This, then, answers the point raised by our friend, that there was no proof that those individuals who communicated from the supermundane states were men in the ancient times,—that these "angels" were spirits of *disembodied men*; but that, on the contrary, they were, according to our friend's supposition, separate beings, and distinct entirely from the sons of Earth. If our friend asserts that they were "angels" upon a different plane of being to disembodied humanity, we ask him to give us proof of this—(applause),—not to give us the naked, bare assertion that they were so, especially when we have *such strong negative evidence* to such a position that the case of Samuel presents. He has taken the position entirely for granted, that this is the case. He says they appeared in the *form* or men, and implies that they were not men! Does the record say in the *form* of men? We should say, in the words which Jesus used to the Sadducees: our friend "doth err, not knowing the scriptures." [Hear, hear.] They are called men in one instance; and they are called—"angels" in another. Those individuals that were seen on "the resurrection" morning were called men: "And two men stood beside them in shining garments." Now, it is here distinctly shown that they were called *men*: it does not state that "angels" came in the form of men. Then "angels" were sometimes called men. Now, what is the difference? Is there a separate race of these beings, altogether distinct from that humanity which has left the Earth? If so, our friend must prove it. (Applause.) In the text we quoted from Revelations, we think the assertion made there by the "angel" was most decidedly to the point. The angel said to John, when he fell down to worship the disembodied: "See thou do it not, for I am thy *fellow-servant*, and of thy *brethren* the prophets." Now, in the case of the "transfiguration," who were those two beings that appeared to Jesus and his companions upon the mountain? Had they lived upon the Earth in past times? The first was Moses; had *he* lived upon the Earth? With him was Elias; had he lived upon the Earth? We are given to understand that they had. Will our friend deny this? They were individuals who had been known among the Jews, and came as beings that were

recognised as Moses and Elias! The most fastidious will be satisfied that, granting these events occurred, they were beings who had formerly been in the flesh; and thus we have proof that those who communicated in olden times were those who had once been mortal men upon the Earth. Moreover, it is a fact that men were taken for spirits, as was the case when Jesus was walking on the water, when his disciples thought he was "a spirit." Again, when Peter had been liberated from prison, he went to the other disciples, and when the damsel saw him she said: "It is his angel," thereby showing that the terms were synonymous. (Applause.) Here, then, these facts certainly parallel some of the phenomena of modern Spiritualism; and if communion with those who once lived upon Earth is to be termed *Demonology*, then Jesus himself was guilty of practising

demonology. (Applause.) For he communed with Moses and Elias upon the mountain; and if a shift be made by saying that only those who commune with evil spirits practise demonology, still would Jesus be proved guilty, for with "the devil" himself he had once a remarkable interview, when this evil spirit "took him up to the pinnacle of the temple," and afterwards "to the top of a *very* high mountain!" [Laughter.]

Now, we know from these evidences that one individual could, at different times, have different influences. During one portion of his life he could be influenced by good spirits—"by the spirit of the Lord,"—and during another portion by evil spirits—as, for instance, in the case of Saul. Will our friend refer to the 18th chapter of the 1st book of Samuel, 10th verse? where we have it stated what the spirit was; and in which we think we shall find some elucidation of the difficulty of conceiving where the evil spirits come from.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"And it came to pass on the morrow, that the evil spirit from God came upon Saul, and he prophesied in the midst of the house, and David played with his hand, as at other times, and there was a javelin in Saul's hand."

Now, then, after Saul had been once numbered among the prophets, after he had been a servant of "the Lord," after the "spirit of the Lord" had been with him, but had now forsaken him, an "*evil spirit*" came and tormented him. It is perfectly clear, then, if modern Spiritualism is to be called demonology, the doings of these individuals in the old records must also come under, and, therefore, receive the same term. [Hear, hear, and loud applause.]

Now, our friend has endeavored to gain a point, by referring us to the different spiritual gifts mentioned by Paul, and saying that these gifts were obtained through the influence of God's spirit; but, we ask, what is "God's spirit," but the spirit which is spread abroad in every individual constituting humanity? The spirit of God is universally embodied in his children—(applause)—for we speak of the God which Paul says is "above you all, in you all, and through you all." If there is only one individualised spirit that assists the Christian, what are we to make of the text: "Are they not all ministering spirits?" It says, in the 1st chapter of Hebrews, last verse: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister

for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" If our friend says this is but given to the church, or to a special body of Christians, we would ask where outside Spiritualism—and, perhaps, in a minor degree, the Catholic church,—do these gifts still exist? Where are they? Have you the gift of prophecy, oh! Christians? Have you the gift of clairvoyance? Have you the power to work "miracles?" Can you heal the sick? Can you speak in unknown tongues? Can you interpret tongues? If not, you are not those to whom these influences come; or, if to you coming, ye have buried them. (Applause, loud and long-continued.) Now, the very fact that these powers are now wielded—that these facts do exist—proves that they must come from the only Source that can give them; and that Source need not be looked for outside the Laws of God. We know that, though there may be myriads of spirits thus operating, it is God that worketh in them all: it is "the same spirit," though there may be diversities of gifts. We admit *all* this: we believe THE HOLY GHOST (but not the myth alluded to by Christians) still breathes through all God's creatures; and when any act of prophecy is performed through the agency of spirits we look upon it as a manifestation of the divine Being to his children upon Earth. (Applause.)

But, to return to a point we mentioned in our last address, and to which our friend has carefully avoided allusion. We quoted the passage where the spirit of Elijah came again upon Elisha. Was that the spirit of an individual who had lived upon the Earth? Does our friend deny this? Was there not afterwards "a double portion" of Elijah's spirit upon Elisha? Does not the record say so? And will our friend go back upon it? If Elijah did exist—did at one time live upon this planet, and then *afterwards* came and *influenced* Elisha,—what is to prevent the same occurrence, the same phenomena, taking place now in our day? (Applause.) Has God closed his eyes to the necessity of this? Is there not now as great a need of spiritual gifts, as when Paul, alluding to the self-same subject, said: "Covet earnestly the best gifts," and is man *now* so angelic that there is less need of Paul's advice, than when he said: "The spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Did not Paul know what he was saying? Did he know what he meant when he, to all intents and purposes, said that those gifts were there; and would be developed in those who "coveted," or earnestly desired them? Are we to believe Paul, or shall we credit the *ipsi dixit* of our friend? We again ask, where, outside Spiritualism, do these gifts occur? and not till our friend has pointed out where other parallels can be found to the Bible, or, rather, any religion that the Bible parallels in this respect, outside Spiritualism—(though, even if he did this he would only strengthen our position) shall we cease to say that the promises of the Apostles, and the prophecies of Jesus have been ignored by Christians. Now, the position we take, as Spiritualists, is this: that the channel of communication between the two worlds has never been closed in any age: that the laws which worked in the olden times among the Jews and apostles, disciples, and followers of Jesus, have never been annihilated, but still exist; and that which happened then can happen now. And if our friend says to the contrary, and affirms that this is not so, then we ask him to give us proof, and the why and wherefore? (Applause.)

We shall ask him where it states in the Bible that these laws of inspiration, this "gift of the spirit," "these manifestations of divine influence" have ceased; where does the record say they ceased, and give the reasons *why* they should cease? Where tells it us what necessity there was for them then, and why there is not the same necessity for them now? Is the Christians world, (to say nothing of the "heathen,") so perfect that spiritual warnings are not *now* required, as of old? Now, the very fact that the Bible condemns these phenomena of an evil nature—that the Bible forbids the use of that which our friend calls necromancy, or the communication with evil spirits, would seem to suggest a parallel the most striking between the Bible phenomena and those of modern Spiritualism; because it is admitted that there are good and bad spirits in modern Spiritualism, and truthful and deceiving communications received now, as in the Biblical times. We do not disguise the fact, and we, with all frankness and sincerity, warn you that there *are* evil spirits among those who produce the seance-wonders and manifestations. There are many now, both Christians, "heathen," and Spiritualists, who require evil spirits "cast out" of them, just as, in the time of Jesus, there was the necessity for casting out those evil spirits from Mary Magdalene and others. But you have directions given you, by which, with the aid of your own judgment, you will be able to decide most correctly who are false and who are true that thus communicate.

Our friend says that Spiritualism is demonology, with just so much of ancient philosophy and Biblical morality to give it sufficient standing to be welcome to those who support it. Just so; save that we deny the charge of demonology, without militating against the argument we have produced and intend to re-produce in this debate. We can safely say that we take the good from *every* system; and we hesitate not to go to all systems,—to go to Pantheism, to Atheism, to Christianity—to each and to all—to Brahminism, to Buddhism, to Mahomedanism; and if we can find good moral precepts or examples in them—no matter by whom first mooted—we say that we appropriate them, and make them our own, by applying them in our daily lives. (Applause.) Our friend will tell us this does not show how modern Spiritualism parallels the Bible; for he has already implied that the doctrines of Spiritualism are Pantheistic, if not Atheistic; and it will now be our duty to show that even Paul was a Pantheist, judging from his words when he says, "In God we live and move, and have our being;" and when he talks of God being "above all, and in all, and through all," he has simply quoted from the Grecian poet Aratus, who says:

"In God we live, whom we can never trace,  
Tho' seen, heard, tasted, felt in every place:

The loneliest spot, by mortal seldom trod,  
The crowded city, *all* are full of God;  
And we are all His offspring."

We will conclude by referring to Pope's lines, where he says:

"We are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body Nature is, and *God* the Soul."

In these matters Paul's ideas were exactly on a par with those of modern Spiritualism. [Applause.]

MR. GREEN:

My friend has quoted a passage from the epistle of John, and as he has repeated it several times over, I think the better way will be for me to read a little more of what that passage says. It not only says "believe not every spirit," but "try the spirits whether they are of God, because *many false prophets* are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. And every spirit "that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is the spirit of anti-Christ whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." It is not going beyond that passage to say that my friend is one of the representatives of the spirit of anti-Christ. (Applause, and disorder.)

Mr. WALKER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have not denied that Jesus came in the flesh, but we *have denied* that God, the infinite Ruler of the Universe, was ever incarnated, and became as the sons of men. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN : I ask you to notice that the statement is as to whether a being called Jesus Christ, the Saviour, came in the flesh, or not. Now, I affirm that my friend does in reality deny this; but he uses the term in one sense, and I use it in another. The word of the apostle distinctly states, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is *come* in the flesh is not of God." Now, who was Christ? Was he not the Messiah, represented in the Old Testament as divine in his origin, and whose name should be called "Wonderful," "Counsellor," the "Mighty God," the "Everlasting Father," &c? And is he not spoken of in this very chapter as being God's son in such an especial sense as can apply to no other human being? The passage in the 12th chapter of the epistle to the Corinthians, which my friend has quoted and dwelt upon, if he had noticed also the previous passage he would have seen that those persons who are represented as having the spirit of God *declare "that Jesus is the Lord."* My friend denies, that he is Lord, nor can he with truth affirm that he does not deny it. He admits that he is Lord in the sense that Lord means *master*, for he adds, "he was master of his flock." (Hear, hear.) But we say that Jesus called himself Lord, and was so called by his disciples, not in the sense of *master*, as we use that term, but as the superior of every master in the Universe. (Disorder and interruption.) Then, may I ask my friends, who are so ready with their interruptions, [as, indeed, they have been on all the previous evenings,] how comes it that those words are found in the passage which say, "that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit?" Does it require the spirit of God to enable a man to know and acknowledge that Jesus was *Lord or master of his own flock!* Such an interpretation of the passage would be simply absurd. The thing is transparent, and my friend's argument shows on the face of it that it is a subterfuge. We say our friend *does deny that Jesus is Lord*, and, therefore, to affirm that the spirits, which he says come to him and others, are the same as those spoken of by the Apostle in this chapter, and which is really the spirit of God, is to take the statement of the book in a wrong sense altogether. (Great interruption and disorder.) I must

confess that it shows very bad taste on the part of our Spiritist friends to make these continual interruptions. If they have such invulnerable bulwarks, why should they be so disposed to interrupt? (Applause.)

Let me remind you that Mr. Walker has to show that the Bible *supports* and *parallels* modern Spiritualism *in all* its phases, teachings, and phenomena. Now, may I ask where in the Bible we have a spiritualistic seance, where there is a gathering in a circle, and setting a musical box going, with the medium making all those contortions of face and body, which indicate the contentions of the spirits to gain possession of the medium? This is no caricature; I have seen it with my own eyes. I ask where do we find any of those early apostles turning off the gas, shutting themselves up in a dark room, and then being amused by spirits pitching flat-irons, &c, about? (Applause and interruptions.) This is what my friend has to prove, viz., that all the phases, teachings, and phenomena of modern Spiritualism are to be found within the backs of this book. My friend need not at all trouble to prove that a great deal of modern Spiritualism is like what is found in the book. I admit it at once; I admit that there is much that is beautiful in modern Spiritualism, but that which is beautiful, friends, is borrowed from the Bible. [Applause.] We have had this quotation about there being many mansions in my Father's house; we know that. Our Bible gives us this cheering information from the lips of Jesus; and the Spiritists have taken this and other matters which the Bible has given them, and have used them as the basis on which to work, and have added their crudities to them. We have plenty of the phenomena connected with demoniacal possession mentioned in the Bible. We have men represented as wallowing and foaming at the mouth, and rolling on the ground; and I can produce Statements from the spiritualistic literature, where Spiritualists declare they have seen mediums wallowing just in the same way. We can find you plenty of the same phenomena as that of modern Spiritualism in the Bible, but it will be of a kind that will not please my friend.

I shall now bring his attention to another point, for it is one of considerable importance. You remember my friend asked for mathematical demonstration on the previous proposition and said that unless we could demonstrate that those prophecies had reference to Christ, and had their fulfillment in him, just as we could demonstrate any proposition in Euclid, that it was not to be believed, and there was no reason to expect that belief could be given to them. I deny that statement altogether. We must believe some things without mathematical demonstration, just as in business, and in the social affairs of life. So also in the sphere of morals and religion. We cannot get, nor should we expect mathematical demonstration in all cases. Nevertheless I gave him mathematical demonstration from the pen of Mr. Gregory, of the military school at Warwick, who pointed out that there were no less than three hundred and twenty-five millions of millions of chances to one against those prophecies being fulfilled; and that there must have been a divine, omniscient, and omnipotent mind, controlling the events of the nations to bring about all these things. Now it was not I who asked for this mathematical demon-



stration, but my friend; and he now wishes us to reject Christianity and accept this so-called modern Spiritualism; therefore is it not a right application of reasoning that I should say. "My dear sir, give us the mathematical demonstration which you asked for in reference to Christianity, and then your demand that we reject Christianity and accept Spiritualism, will have some appearance of reason in it?" I would ask (and I would say, while asking, that I am not at all intending to question the fact that my friend *may* be aided by unseen beings, —it may or it may not be true,)—I would ask, as this is one of the phenomena of Spiritualism, have we evidence that can be mathematically demonstrated that he is possessed by these unseen agencies? Let me call your attention to one or two things. My friend is said to be, when in his normal state, simply an ignoramus, and little better than a clodhopper; but I can assure you I have conversed with him in his normal state, and have found him to be a moderately educated gentleman, tolerably well read in such matters as those under discussion, and he seems to have a remarkably good memory. Now, when we know that he has had ample opportunities of obtaining access to those works from which he has so copiously quoted, aided no doubt, by his good memory, which we know can be cultivated by the aid of mnemonics; I say what is there in all that my friend has done, that conveys to us with the certainty of mathematical demonstration that he is aided by unseen beings? (Applause.) You have seen how many times he has been convicted of what (perhaps facetiously) he calls *lapsus linguae*, but which I would term lapses of memory, and which might be expected, and are only reasonable, in the case of a person speaking much from memory, but which are *not reasonable* in view of my friend's pretensions. I say if he were influenced by unseen agents, might we not expect greater accuracy from them? seeing it is they who speak, and not our friend,—although I have to address him as though he was the principal and the only one concerned. I say, if we are to believe this,—[and I wish again to say I do not care to call the matter really in question:—]—if we are to believe that he is possessed with these unseen agencies, then, if his requirement to have mathematical demonstration of the truth of Christianity were just, I would ask to have mathematical demonstration of this fact: I ask for demonstration that will prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that he has spoken so eloquently as he has done, unaided by memory, or reading up in these matters. I ask that it may be proved that he is not simply acting on a good memory and well informed mind, rather than from the aid of unseen beings. [Applause.]

Now, when my friend speaks of certain phenomena as evidence of spiritual presence and operation, I would ask, have they mathematical demonstration that there are spirits present on these occasions? Now, I want to give you evidence from A. J. Davis, and other spiritualists, who were lights in the spiritual world that we have not only no mathematical demonstration in Spiritualism, but that we have unfortunately a great amount of imposition, with a modicum of reality.

[Mr. WALKER'S CHAIRMAN here rose and requested that the proposition for discussion should be read by the chairman. After being read he said.]

"Now, you will observe, ladies and gentlemen, that Mr. Walker is not called to prove Spiritualism at all, but that the Bible parallels it in all its phases and phenomena.)—(Interruption applause, and disorder.;

MR. GREEN; If my friend's chairman were possessed of more information, I am sure he would be less troublesome with his interruptions; and I must ask, Mr. Chairman, that I have time allowed for these interruptions. If my friend had been present at the first meeting of the committee when our proposition was agreed upon, he would have known that I said distinctly, that while denying Mr. Walker's affirmative proposition I took upon myself to prove the worthlessness, unreliability, and general dangerous tendency, of Spiritualism. It was not put in the proposition because it was not considered necessary. Mr. Walker is called upon to prove that Spiritualism is paralleled in the Bible in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena. That is what I have asked that he would do. I am just now intending to do one little part of my affirmative side in showing the worthlessness of these things. No mathematical demonstration can be given for any so-called facts in Spiritualism, no matter in what sphere it may be, and I think I shall be able to prove this to you. In answer to the question how tables and chairs can be made to move &c, A. J. Davis, in his work called "Spiritual Intercourse" say: "But it is asked, how can a spirit move a table, or a chair, or a candlestick, and guide the moving article to some particular locality, without the use of bones, muscles, nerves, &c, as a human spirit can do while in the corporeal body? The answer to this question will cover the whole ground occupied by the following inquiry, —Why do spirits only visit certain localities and individuals, thus seeming to manifest exclusiveness and partiality'? And I proceed to state that the two individuals already mentioned as members of the family I visited at Stratford Connecticut; the young girl and her brother were both exceedingly surcharged alternately, at the time the manifestations were being developed, with vital magnetism and vital electricity. Magnetism, which is positive and electricity, (which is negative,) would at different times preponderate, each having the ascendancy in their systems. I was one day ascending with the boy a flight of stairs, when suddenly there came a loud, quick rap under his left foot, which frightened him exceedingly, because he supposed the sound was made by a spirit, and which he was educated to believe to be an evil spirit. But I instantly perceived that his system had discharged a small volume or current of vital electricity, from the sole of the foot, which electricity, by its coming in sudden contact with the electricity of the atmosphere, produced the quick concussion which we heard. When magnetism preponderated in the systems of these individuals, then nails, keys, books, &c, would fly towards them; and when electricity preponderated, then these various articles would move in an opposite direction."—You see it is not spirits, but electricity.—"I have heard instances of mischief cited as occurring in this house, in evidence of Satanic agency, which I now discover to have been sometimes accomplished *by the youth in his sport, sometimes by electrical discharges and magnetic attractions, and sometimes by the most unpardonable mischievousness of persons unknown to the family.*" Then, speaking on page

53, Mr. Davis says: "Those of my readers who are at all acquainted with the recent discoveries in pneumatological or psychological science, or with the symptoms and effects consequent upon an incipient somnambulant state, will readily understand how one mind can cause another to feel and behold things *which in reality have no existence*. For instance, it has been affirmed by the parents of Henry, and by others visiting at their house, that many articles have been instantly and invisibly carried from one place to another in the room where they were sitting, and that the articles so moved were rendered invisible while being conducted through the air." Thus many things are asserted by this family and other individuals associated with similar phenomena, *which are in reality nothing more than mental disturbances*. And this upon the testimony of A. J. Davis. [Applause.] Moses Hull, of advent notoriety, but now an editor, debater, lecturer, and, indeed, a very oracle among these modern philosophers, says, in the August number of the *Rostrum* for 1868: "We once risked almost our all upon circles. We have waded through mud and water, travelled through rain, snow, and cold, and sat for two hours at a time for spiritual manifestations: have hardly ever failed to get manifestations oftener coming from spirits, *in than out*, of mortal bodies. We have, however, at circles received many good tests of spirit existence and power. We have received very fine communications on such occasions, yet if our readers could imagine the great amount of chaff we have winnowed, for the few grains of important truth acquired, they would hardly bestow the amount of labor and pains for the benefit received. We believe circle-holding to be a positive injury to spirits. Hence *they oftener than otherwise misrepresent themselves*. It is in many instances a *positive injury to the medium*. In many instances, we notice that the sitter, by excessive communication with spirits, *gives up his manhood, and is thrown off his balance*. Look at our good old brother Marble, of Dungeon rock notoriety, digging and blasting in the granite rock for ten long years in obedience to spiritual power. Had he trusted to his own judgment, instead of following the *ipsi dixit* of disembodied wags, thousands of dollars in money, and a ten years chase after an *ignis fatuus* might have been saved." [Hear, hear, and applause.]



MR. WALKER:

We would request that all those who are commencing to investigate the phenomena of Spiritualism should follow the admirable advice given by our worthy opponent, to trust their own judgment in preference to the statements of spirits, until they are able to know and test the latter thoroughly. In fact, we have always advised this: so that our friend's advice and quotations upon this matter were altogether uncalled for, unless intended for those who are totally ignorant of the subject, and are about to investigate it.

In reviewing his argument upon the present occasion, we must call attention to his shrewdness—if we may term it so—in not noticing the arguments we adduced, showing the cases in the Bible paralleling the phenomena of modern Spiritualism. Those "gifts," too,

are not noticed; nor are they shown to exist in his church, or anywhere outside Spiritualism and the Catholic church. Now, these claim to possess them; and these gifts are, according to the Bible and his own showing, from "the Lord," or the Good Spirit, or "the Holy Ghost," and yet our friend ignores them!

Our friend has admitted that there are good points or qualities in Spiritualism; but, says he, they take *all those from the Bible!* We ask what does it matter, or what difference does it make where we get these good points from, so long as we have them? (Applause.) The fact that they exist is sufficient. In fact, we take all the good we possibly can from the Bible, and every other source open to us. We do not reject truths and sublime conceptions simply because they happen to be mentioned in the Bible; nor do we take them for the same reason. We admit the Bible to have many glittering gems of truth in it, and we would ever have you respect, love, and revere such a self-sacrificing disposition as that which Joseph shows in his forgiveness of his brethren, and Jesus displays in the pardon of his enemies. Whether these were related in the Bible, or out of the Bible, or had been found in any literature whatsoever, they are noble examples, fit for the love and affection of, as well as imitation, by mankind. (Applause.) The reformatory measures of Jesus, the morals he taught, whether they had been recorded in the New Testament, or the Koran, or the Vedas, or by the Grecian poets, would matter not; for they are valuable, and they are ours, just as much as they are any Christian's, in existence. We claim them; and therefore, in this respect, we are claiming that *all of good* in the Bible *parallels* and *supports* modern Spiritualism. Now, our opponent attempts to throw ridicule upon the phenomena of Spiritualism, and asks where, in the olden times, were there circles with closed doors, and putting out of lights, with musical-boxes playing? We would ask at what time did the occurrence of "the resurrection" of Jesus take place? Was it in broad daylight? No, it was in the night-time. Then, again, where were the disciples when Jesus appeared to them? We are told, "The doors being closed, then came Jesus, and stood in their midst." Now, here was a gathering, or collection, of individuals for spiritual meditation, and in every respect it was similar to the *spirit-circle* of the present day. We have had the attempt made to show that these circles are detrimental or injurious, both to Spiritists and mediums; but, even supposing such were the case [though we deny it], we would remind him that our object is merely to show that the cases cited in spiritual literature are paralleled by the phenomena of the Bible. [Hear, hear.]

The argument that magicians and conjurors sometimes do [though not under the same conditions] that which is said to be done at the *seance*, is answered and paralleled when we remember that when "God" sent Moses down into Egypt, nearly everything that Moses did the Soothsayers and the Egyptian astrologers did also, *without* the aid of spirits, or "angels," and without "the command of 'God.'" In fact, they performed even greater miracles than those of Moses; for Moses (sanguinary man) *changed all the rivers into blood; and then, without being turned again into water, these individuals also changed them into blood!* (Laughter, and applause.) This was a greater

miracle than all the rest. Now, as to the ridiculousness or absurdity of the phenomena of Spiritualism, what more ridiculous event has our friend to point out in modern Spiritualism than that of Balaam's ass talking? Was not *that* ridiculous?—a donkey speaking! (Laughter.) And this same donkey, mark you, controlled by the almighty mind of God!!! Is not *that* worse than ridiculous? Now, our friend will say it is *not* ridiculous. Why? *Because* it is related in the Bible, and happened a few thousand years ago. But, when facts superior, or on a parallel, so far as control is concerned, occur in these days, and are recorded in Spiritualistic literature, then they become ridiculous and nonsensical! [Hear, hear.]

Our friend asks us whether flat-irons were thrown about by spirits in the olden times? Did they possess flat-irons in those days? (Laughter.) If he will prove to us unmistakably, by the record he quotes from, that there were flat-irons in *those* days, we will endeavor to show that they *did* fly about. (Laughter.) He has ridiculed the movement of material substances—ridiculed the subject fully to the satisfaction of his friends. Does he not remember that the grave-stone over the tomb of Jesus was moved? Was not that a physical substance? Surely there is not much difference in that respect, or anything more ridiculous in moving a table, than in moving a tomb-stone! What is the difference, but the purpose intended? If, by the movement of the table, or by the simple rap, a single materialist can be brought to believe in the existence of his soul, and the immortal life beyond the grave, we say, dear friends, that *that* rap is well worthy of our consideration, and is performing a grand mission in the world. (Applause.) Many who have now a knowledge of man's immortality are indebted to the simple spirit-rap that first arrested their attention when they were almost confirmed materialists. Our friend objected on a previous occasion to our asking for mathematical demonstration in reference to the prophecies; and yet he asks us to demonstrate Spiritualism by that method. Now, we do not lay the same claim for Spiritualism as he did for the prophecies; and, therefore, not until we say that Spiritualism is of specially divine origin need he press such an argument. He said, recurring to his old arguments, that all these prophecies in the Bible were fulfilled. Where, may we ask him, was Jesus referred to in the records of the fulfilment of the prophecy, as "the Everlasting Father?" If he were called "the only-begotten son," how could he be "the Everlasting Father?" Or, again, where was he called "Counsellor?" Let him produce these passages; or, if he cannot, let him for ever remain silent on these points. (Applause.) Then he asks us to demonstrate to you that the utterances of the spirits are not influenced by the intellect, talents, or faculties of the medium: indeed, he asks us to give demonstration positive that we, and not the brain of our instrument, father the arguments we advance. Now, does he know all the past career of the instrument we are using, that he could venture even on such suspicion? We ask from our friend if the medium Jesus,—whom we love and revere as an elder brother,—gave at all times demonstration of his claims? Though unable to do "many mighty works there because of their unbelief," was he not influenced by unseen agencies? And is the principle less in our case

than in his? If, because we have advanced nothing strikingly new, or beyond the capacities of normal minds, our medium is not influenced, then the same may be said of Jesus, for he produced nothing that could not have been said or done by mortals with exalted faculties.

Our friend said, in his first speech of this debate, that the medium was supposed to be controlled by these outside influences; but he at the same time remarked with emphasis, "You Christians know on what I depend," or something to that effect. What he no doubt meant to say, or give you to understand, was that he was controlled by "the Holy Ghost," or "Spirit of God!" But, if he were controlled by this power, and the medium simply by his own spiritual guides, ought his position not to be a superior one to ours? Now, if our friend will undertake to live with this medium, or keep him under his care and supervision for six months, that he may know all in connection with him, then we will demonstrate from what source he derives the information he is made to utter. (Laughter.) This is not a matter that can be proved immediately. It is necessary that you know the whole life of the medium, from his infancy—to know what education he has received, in order that you may be able rightly to judge whether he is well read, and able thus to speak, in what is termed the normal condition. These ventilated suspicions to our detriment should be proved by our friend before assertions are made that will at all prejudice you against the statements we make as arguments. Until our friend has a direct and positive knowledge of that about which he speaks, he has no right to make any assertions whatsoever. [Hear, hear!]

Now, so far we have proceeded well. He has admitted that what we have given is supported by the Bible. If he says we have taken all the *good* from the Bible, and if he could find instances of *evil* men frothing at the mouth, then the *good* and *evil* of Spiritualism are paralleled by the Bible. (Applause.) If the good of Spiritualism is taken from the Bible, and the evil of Spiritualism is *paralleled* by the Bible, then Spiritualism is paralleled by the Bible. There can be nothing clearer in logic than this. If our opponent admits our premise *by his own assertions*, then we certainly have no difficulty to encounter in carrying out our debate. We do not need to show that every little peculiarity is paralleled; for we simply allude to the main facts—that spirits did communicate in olden time—and these different phases of spiritual manifestations were then carried on. It is true the object of the manifestations may be somewhat different, but the phases are the same. It matters not whether the "angel" came down to close the lions' mouths, or roll away the stone, or release Peter from his prison, or converse with John on Patmos, the central *fact* of spiritual communication was there in all cases. It is so in all spiritual manifestations. The object of each individual spirit may be different; but the phases they exhibit, the phenomena they manifest are parallel and equal. Just as though a man travelling in a train went to a station, and another man stopped at the same station, but with a different motive. One may go for his pleasure, the other to meet his doom; but it matters not, for if they go on the same line they *parallel* each other in this respect. The Spiritualism

of modern days and that of the olden times are parallel, as we have shown; and thus our case is proven. (Hear, hear! and Applause.)

But that you may have a better understanding of the position we take, let us quote to you the words of Jesus himself, as recorded in John XIV, v. 12: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do, he shall do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father." Now, where have the Christians performed such works? Where have they done works even equal to Jesus of Nazareth? Did Jesus know what he was saying? Could he speak that which he wanted to express, or was he reported correctly? Could he fail to make himself understood? On the contrary, the language is most clear and unmistakable. "The works that I do, he (the believer) shall do also; and greater works than these," Ac.

We have the evidence of Jesus, the evidence of Paul, the evidence of John, the evidence in the book of Kings, and in Genesis—we have evidence throughout the Bible to support these facts. And if evidence should be demanded that the spirits communing with Earth were the spirits of men who had once lived on Earth, we have it undeniably in the cases of Elijah, of Moses, Elias, and many others. When Jesus was in "*Hades*," where we are told in a certain "creed" he was, Peter informs us that "he went to preach to the spirits in prison, that were sometimes disobedient in the days of Noah." This parallels our doctrine of the spirit-world; for here we have the fact that this communion was possible—that these spirits who had been in rebellion, and were, in consequence, figuratively speaking, "in prison," could be visited by Jesus, the pure, the good, the holy man, who then "preached" to them, thus showing that they could communicate one with the other. Here we establish the fact of the existence of the spirit-world, and the fact that the good could there at times hold intercourse with the evil. For what purpose we ask? To benefit them. How benefit them? By *releasing* them from prison. If they could not be so benefited, of what use was "preaching" to them? Thus, the doctrine of *eternal progression* is shown, which is the basis and foundation of the religion of Jesus, as well as of Spiritualists. Those "disobedient" spirits could be released from "prison," surrounded with better influences, and thus brought into the path of progression. (Applause.)

We shall leave now our case here for the present, having shown that the good and evil of Spiritualism is paralleled in the Bible. We have admitted all the good and evil of Spiritualism, and we have also directed attention to the good and evil in the Bible.

Before going farther on, we may take the subject of the inspiration which flowed in olden times through the prophets. The necessity for these manifestations is as great now as ever it was. There is fully as great, if not a greater, necessity for it now to convert this sceptical age to a belief in the sublime doctrine of immortality, and the relationship between one life and another, as ever there was. We will conclude this address by asking our friend to inform you in his next speech where, outside Spiritualism, you can find any possible means of converting to a knowledge of man's personal responsibility here, as well as to the reality of spirit-life, those dark and benighted

beings who deny the existence of anything beyond this material world,—and who do not acknowledge the inspiration of the Bible, or the divine origin of Christianity. (Continued applause.)



Mr. GREEN:

May I just say, dear friends, that Mr. Walker need have no difficulty in regard to the fact of my admitting that much of what is mentioned in connection with modern Spiritualism is paralleled in the word of God. You will notice that the proposition is "that modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena, is *paralleled* and *supported* by the Bible." It is modern Spiritualism *in all* its phases, teachings, and phenomena; and if my friend imagines that he has already proved his case, then certainly he manifests an amount of credulity, I did not credit him with. He certainly imposes upon this audience when he for a moment desires it to be believed that he has proved his point. Let me ask you, has he referred to a case which parallels that of Daniel in the lions' den? Has he given us the case in modern Spiritualism that parallels the case he cited of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace? Has he given us evidence that the spirit of God, by which these supernatural gifts mentioned in the epistle to the Corinthians, were manifested, was the same as that deity which he says has taken possession of him? Can we say that it is clearly demonstrable that the God of the Bible is only a disembodied spirit similar to those which our spiritualistic friends say now take possession of them? My friend evidently believes in Pantheism; he declares that all is God, and in this respect modern Spiritualism and Buddhism are simply one and the same thing. Buddha declared that man was God; and my friend takes apparently this position, that man is God, and God is man; and that therefore all these disembodied spirits are part and parcel of God. All I can say is that I should be glad if my friend would enable me to obtain that which I am most anxiously seeking for, viz., the truth, but he will have to adduce more evidence than he has done before we can accept his theories as the truth, and reject the one which we have received and in which we believe. (Applause.)

Now I say to you,—while admitting that much phenomena similar to that of modern Spiritualism is to be found recorded in the Bible,—that all modern Spiritualism is utterly *worthless*, and *unreliable*, and *dangerous*; and it is *this* which our friend desires us to accept and at the same time to reject Christianity, which is of divine origin! I say that if modern Spiritualism were universally accepted, it would really throw the world back century after century; would take us back to the time when those Caananites of old, by resorting to spirits, and adopting some of the things that we find embodied in modern Spiritualism, became debased, and grovelling, and sank into such depths or infamy and vice, that the land is reported as vomiting them out. Let me read to you another extract pointing out the worthlessness and unreliability of this system. But before doing so, let me just notice my friend's remark that if I will keep him for six months he will give



me an opportunity of testing the truth of what he is professing. Well, I may say I am too poor a man to entertain that proposal. And then my friend twitted me with making a business of religion. I need only just say that every one of you can come and hear me fifty-two Sundays in the year, and you will never be asked for one penny, nor will any contribution plate ever be put before you soliciting your donations for religious purposes. I leave you therefore to make a comparison with the charges you have to pay to listen to my friend. So that you see it might be considered as hardly a reasonable suggestion that I should support my friend whilst he gives this demonstration. He asks us to reject Christianity as of divine origin, and to receive Spiritualism as the grand panacea for all the ills of men. We say, before we can be expected to receive it from him, he must give us demonstration, clear and unmistakable, that it is real, and true, and worth receiving.

Now then for my quotation. Dr. Randolph, for many years a noted medium and lecturer, as quoted by Errett, thus testifies, "I was a medium for about eight years, during which time I made three thousand speeches, and travelled over several different countries, proclaiming the new gospel. Experience has taught me that *sixty-five per cent, of the medical clairvoyants are arrant knaves, humbugs, and catch-penny impostors*; thirty per cent, are refined, sympathetic, nervous persons, who arrive at approximately true diagnoses by sympathy, such are not clairvoyants of course. And five per cent, of the whole are really what they claim to be, in various degrees of perfection. I am personally acquainted with three hundred and forty-one professed medical clairvoyants, and of these there are seven actual seers who will stand a testing, and of these *only one is in America*," notwithstanding its millions of Spiritualists! This man, who had for eight years been a medium, and delivered no less than three thousand speeches, says, "the result of my observation is, that if one-half-dozen sounds out of every five thousand that pass for spiritual be genuine, that is, not made by the medium's foot against the leg of a table or chair, or by some other jugglery, it is a large percentage. When invisible musicians play pianos in dark rooms, if the hands of the medium be mittened and held by others, and the music still goes on, the inference is that they do not produce it. Writing upside down is an art readily obtained after a few weeks private practice. Matches, or a lump of phosphorous, make very good imitations of spirit-lights. When spirits in a dark room blow horns and talk through trumpets, if unknown to the medium a little printer's ink be rubbed on the mouth of the instrument, a beautiful black circle will, when lights are introduced, generally be found adorning the medium's labial appendage. *Dark circles are the king humbugs of Spiritualism generally*" I well remember one at which I was myself prevailed upon to be present, and from which I assure you I was longing to be away. I resolved like the little boy that had got into a difficulty, that if I once got out, I would never get in again. I felt indeed as if they were engaged in works of darkness, as indeed they were surrounded by physical darkness. I must however say in justice to those who were present that the persons there were of the most respectable class that can be found in Melbourne. "Of speaking-mediums Randolph continues, "Twenty

five per cent, are, in my opinion, victims of demoniac influences I twenty-five per cent, are deliberate impostors! eight per cent, may be under healthful spiritual influences, such as are to be found in all Church history; twenty-five per cent, are honest-hearted men and women, laboring under the world-saving fever, who delude themselves and others by imagining they are under the special spiritual influence of some defunct philosopher; and the remaining seventeen per cent, consist of persons who have the power in themselves (although they assign it to the sprits) of inducing at will a dreamy sort of ecstasy, or "trance"—(please apply this to the circumstances we have seen these last few nights)—"during which they are frequently insensible to physical pain, and possess an extraordinary *power of mental concentration*. This trance can easily be induced. I can enter it at any time in *five minutes* when I choose to do so. It can also be brought on by *the use of lozenges* made of sugar and the juice of a plant that grows wild by the acre in Central New York. Generally, five of these lozenges will produce a kind of walking clairvoyance and mental intensity, fully equal to the solution of any problem that can engage the attention. A preparation of the common strawberry and blackberry will do the same. It is, in short, the highest state of mesmerism reached by a shorter, safer, and quicker road." (Applause and dissent.)

Now, if any of you want to become Spiritualists, I will read you a short extract from the *New York Observer*, which will enable you to do so, and also to fully understand that system which we are asked to receive as a substitute for Christianity, and a panacea for the world's woes. "Many persons are inquiring for some explanation of the wonderful spiritual phenomena which they have witnessed, and of which we have heard so much during the last few years. The following items may assist them a little in this work. A contribution to the literature of Spiritualism is made this week in a published letter from Mr. Faulkner, philosophical instrument maker No 40 Endell-street, London. Mr. Faulkner writes, that for many years he has had a large sale for spirit-rapping magnets, and batteries, expressly made for concealment under the floor, in cupboards, under tables, and even for the interior of the centre support of large round tables and boxes; that he has supplied to the same parties quantities of prepared wire to be placed under the carpets and oil-cloth, or under the wainscot and gilt beading around ceilings and rooms, in fact, for every conceivable place; that all these obviously were used for spirit-rapping, and the connection to each rapper and battery was to be made by means of a small button, like those used for telegraphic bell-ringing purposes, or by means of a brass-headed or other nail under the carpet of particular patterns known to the Spiritualists. He describes these rappers as calculated *to mislead the most wary*, and adds that there are spirit-rapping magnets and batteries constructed expressly for the pocket, which will rap at any part of the room. He has also made drums and bells which will beat at command, but these two latter are not so frequently used as the magnets are, because they are too easily detected."

Now, I have read to you proofs from this work. (Professor Carpenter's *Bible and Spiritualism*.) I have given you this last extract from the *New York Observer*, written by a business man,

Mr. Faulkner, who states that he is a large manufacturer of these machines for producing spiritualistic manifestations. Now, I ask if one fifth, or one twentieth, or one fortieth, of these are genuine—and we rather think with Randolph, who delivered three thousand addresses, and was a medium for eight years, that only five per cent, are genuine,—then I ask in the name of reason, I ask it with all the earnestness of my nature, why should we give up the pure, sublime, elevating, and glorious principles of the religion of Christ for this delusion?—(laughter and applause),—in order to accept that which, even its advocates, admit, is an *ignis fatuus*, to lead us on—to uncertainty! I say, why reject Christianity to accept this little bit of corn?—(to use the simile, of the ancient preacher, who said, the butcher threw down a little corn to entice the pig into the slaughter-yard, that there it might be laughed)—why, I say, should we be drawn into the meshes of this blighting system, which, by its deceptions, causes persons to lose the proper equilibrium of their nature, and so destroys their power to continue in a course of moral uprightness? The principles held by my friend make every man his own deity by saying that these spirits are part of God. I will give you quotations on subsequent evenings to show that this is the theory. Now, if every man is his own deity, then it appears to me that men of lustful, unclean, and evil natures can, according to the spiritualistic theory, follow the bent of their inclinations, for they, being part of the Deity, are a law to themselves, and have no other restraint than their own will and that exerted by the law of the land. I ask, friends, is it not an awful, blighting, and damning system, that will encourage men to become worse by having intercourse with spirits, from which intercourse they may gain apparent authority to do evil things, which, without authority, they would never dream of doing. (Applause.)

I will show from this book of my friend, Mr. Browne, that when a man is just swung into eternity, who has been guilty of the deadliest crimes, that that man goes abroad in the world, according to the spiritualistic theory, seeking to incite other persons to acts of the same kind, and when persons yield themselves up to commerce with these unseen and wicked beings, the consequences are not difficult to imagine. I have known one or two cases of this terrible kind. Many of you will remember the case of a woman who was drowned some little while ago. There are persons in this room who knew the woman. I do not know whether it would be right to mention the name, but as she is dead, and the case was in the newspapers at the time, it can do no harm. It was a Mrs. W. I knew the person, and was aware that she had been under spiritist influences. She told me she was continually hearing a voice inciting her to do bad deeds, and telling her to make away with herself. When persons are encouraged to have intercourse with spirits, they have no control as to the kind of spirits they receive, so they lay themselves open to receive those terrible tempting spirits, who urge them to do wrong. She tried to commit suicide several times, and at last succeeded, under the impulse of these spirits. I was told the other day of a person who, in reply to the question "You are not a Spiritualist I suppose?" said "Oh, yes, I am, but the misfortune is, I can only get communications

from bad spirits." She was a poor, depressed, and melancholy-looking person. She said, "I long to get communications from good spirits, but only these bad ones come, and they tell me to go and hang myself, or drown myself, and suggest to me many, other abominable things."

Friends, I ask, is there anything that has been presented to us to-night, having in mind our mend's own admissions in regard to the uncertainty of this Spiritualism, bearing in mind also the fact that our own reason, without any other true light to guide it, misguided, perverted, and tainted as it is, is to be our only judge; is there anything to show us that there is truth or reliability in the system, that we should be induced to accept it? It would place us in a vortex, hurling us round and round and round, until we were engulfed in the abyss of moral debasement. (Applause.)



## SEVENTH EVENING:

TUESDAY, 19TH MARCH.

MR. WALKER (who was received with great applause), after a few opening remarks from the Chairman, spoke as follows:

Our friend used some remarks during his last argument, which seem to us to have one of two objects. He either intentionally endeavored to throw ridicule and abuse upon Spiritualism, which we are defending, or else he tried to show, by the list of authors he quoted from, that there is no truth whatsoever in Spiritualism. He quoted from Randolph, where that individual states that only a *few* out of a large number of spirit-media are inspired, or controlled, or in any way assisted by spiritual agencies; that only one or two out of a vast number of thousands that may be enumerated are thus assisted or guided. Now, are these true representatives of the cause of Spiritualism, who, after giving this small proportion of genuine mediums, say that the rest are either deliberate humbugs, impostors, or otherwise deluded by some mental hallucination, or subjects of a very diseased state of mind, or possessed of such an abundance of magnetism that those phenomena take place without the interposition or aid of spirits, and who are termed wretched counterfeits or spurious Spiritualists? We deny that such are representatives of the cause, and as such, therefore, cannot be quoted. But, granting for the sake of argument, that there be but five per cent, of genuine spirit-media, as asserted by Randolph—and which statement has been adopted by our friend in his quotation,—granting, we say, that there be but this small proportion, still, before our friend can maintain his position (which, we think, is indicated by the hint that is thus thrown out,) "that media are *all* impostors," or "that there is *no truth* in Spiritualism,") he must demolish the five per cent., and not leave *one* remaining. If, by the quotation, he wishes not to say that all of Spiritualism is false, but wants to show that there are some, (even though they may be few,) genuine spirit-media in the world, then we have established our position, by *his* quotations and admissions; and we shall have these *true* mediums to parallel those who were true mediums of whom we learn concerning in the Bible; and the false mediums, which form the residuum, we have shown also, by our friend's admissions, to be paralleled by the false prophets or mediums of the Bible.

Now, we want to ask a few questions here, that we hope our friend will distinctly answer; and the questions are these: Are the phenomena of Spiritualism, either in a small percentage or in a great percentage, genuine? Is there a single true medium? Is there a single spiritual phenomenon occurring in the ranks of Spiritualism, that is justly so called? Does our friend deny *in toto* spiritual phenomena? If not—if he admits *one* phenomenon, and *one* medium, our case is *proved*. We claim no more for the sake of argument than the established honesty and genuineness of a single spiritualistic medium. We might claim far more than this, if our friend took the position that none of the phenomena are true; but we will meet him upon his own line of argument. If he admits even *9*, *few* of the vast number of phenomena that are recorded as having taken place are true and genuine, then he grants us our position, and all we have to do is to show that the false and the true are alike paralleled by the Bible, and this is all we claim in the proposition stated *viz.*, "That all the phases, teachings, and phenomena of modern Spiritualism are paralleled by those in the Bible." (Applause.)

Our friend endeavored to make a point by asking if there were modern Daniels in dens of modern lions, which had been kept hungry; and whether, as in the case of Daniel, their savage ferocity had been tamed, which had rendered them passive in an instant? And then he asked whether "angels" come down in these days, as of yore, *to* assist these modern Daniels? We wish specially to draw your attention to the fact that we are not here to prove that there are these *actual* occurrences, these *identical* facts in re-occurrence; but merely that the phenomena of the present day are paralleled by those recorded as having occurred through spiritual agency in the Bible. We are here to prove that the laws which governed these phenomena in ancient and modern times being identical, the phenomena *parallel* each other, but are not repetitions of the *same* facts. That the sources of the ancient and modern phenomena are the same, so far as they are governed by the same laws, and controlled by the same class of beings is probable, but that the very *identical* persons, produce precisely, under exactly the same conditions, the undoubtedly same phenomena that occurred 2000 years ago, we should never be so foolish as to affirm. Suppose we wished to prove that a fire which takes place in Boston is paralleled by a fire which occurs in Chicago, would it be necessary that exactly the same description of buildings should be burnt, and that the latter place should be called Boston also, in order to make the comparison or parallel of the *fires* complete? The fires parallel each other, though the names of the places where they occurred, and the description of buildings burnt, are different.

Then, with reference to mediums. In order that we may prove cases to be parallel, according to our friend, we should have to show that all great media were called Jesus, before any parallel could be admitted. We do not endeavor to do this. All we claim is that the language Jesus used, when speaking of the spiritual gifts, we shall use also, and say, with him, "The works he did we shall do also." If our friend is prepared to prove that Jesus is to be taken as an authority, then we say we can parallel Spiritualism by the Bible. We are not attempting to parallel the Bible by Spiritualism, but

Spiritualism by the Bibles—MARK THE DIFFERENCE! Everything that took place, as recorded in the Biblical compilations, has not, we admit, a counterpart or parallel in modern Spiritualism. We should, indeed, be sorry to have to find a counterpart in Spiritualism for *everything* that is suggested or written in the Bible. (Applause.)

In the concluding portion of our friend's argument on the previous evening he instanced the case of a woman having committed suicide, and he stated that she had been tempted to do so by a spirit! Now, really, this is a method of argument that our friend would not wish us to employ; but, as he has employed it, then we must, in all deference to the validity of the argument, parallel such a case in the Bible! Jesus, the great medium, it is therein reported (whether this was true or not we shall not now question) was placed upon a pinnacle of the temple by "the Prince of Devils," or demons; and "the Devil" himself asked Jesus to cast himself down from thence, for, "the Devil" said, "It is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou shalt dash thy foot against a stone." Here is a parallel—here is an *evil* spirit asking Jesus to cast himself down from "the pinnacle of the temple," and to commit suicide, as you term it! Now, we have paralleled *that* by the Bible. If you want *more* instances, was not Judas, the disciple of Jesus, similarly tempted—was he not tempted to "betray Jesus, and afterwards to commit suicide? So that here we have *another* parallel; (Hear, hear)

Our friend, in a species of eloquence, appealing to your feelings, attempted—we will not say incautiously—to point out how horrible it was for a spirit to go about teaching others to do as he had done, and based his remarks upon a quotation from a work by an earthly friend of ours, but without giving you the full text, and without stating *why* that spirit went about in such a manner,—without telling that the individual had been *illegally murdered*, but simply telling you that the spirit went about prompting others to do wrong; thence he warned you against having anything to do with a system that had such "demons" as these at work within it! He seemed to have forgotten that the foundation and basement of *his* theology is "that the *Devil goes about* as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour!" (Applause.) He asks if you are to give up Christianity for such a system as Spiritualism. Now, when our friend has heard us say that you are to give up the good and *genuine* of Christianity his question may be reasonable and of some avail; but, until we *do* tell you to do so, he has no need to make such remarks, or to alarm you by saying we wish you to leave your Christianity and adopt Spiritualism in its stead. We ask you to do no such thing; but we say to you, bring all the truth you have—all the nobleness you have—all the virtues you have, for Spiritualism fervently claims them all, but rejects, with equal force, the *errors* of Christianity. (Applause.) The virtues and the truth you have are as much the property of Spiritualism as they are of Christianity. We ask you only to reject or leave that which cannot be substantiated by the book itself, by history by reason, by Nature, by science, and all the highest unfoldments of this and future ages. We ask you to reject *only* that which is, on the face of it, manifestly *erroneous*. Come to us with all your good and all your truth. That

we say, is Spiritualism; and this you will find paralleled in the Bible in many places, such, for example, as where it states "cleave to that which is good," "eschew evil and do good." Our friend has shown that evil is paralleled in the Bible; and thus, according to our friend's admission, the debate in this instance, you must admit, is in *our* favor. (Hear, hear!)

We are not here to defend the follies, foolishness, and weaknesses of Spiritists. We know full well whence they have taken them: viz., from out of the ranks of "Orthodoxy." So much is this the case that "heterodoxy" has become almost a virtue. There are men—indeed, we know not a few—who, not being able to change their natures, still practise their follies and vices in the ranks of Spiritualism, where they are more conspicuous and noticeable than whilst they were Christians; and thus they brine ignominy, shame, and slander upon the cause we are defending; but why, we again ask, condemn a system for the follies or wrongs of some of its followers? If we are to be judged by the follies, weaknesses, and mistakes of those who advocate our cause, and those who claim to be Spiritualists, and our friend uses these arguments against our system, then must we, in fairness to ourselves, ask,—f or whom were the lunatic asylums built? For whom were the first gaols and penitentiaries erected? For Spiritualists? We say before the name was known you had lunatic asylums, you had gaols, you had culprits, you had vicious men, you had murderers, you had thieves, just as you have now! May we ask the question: Is Christianity *responsible* for these? Shall we say, forsooth, because a Christian divine falls from the path of virtue that all Christians are immoral and rotten to the core? Shall we say, because Calvin murdered Servetus—or gave authority for his murder—that, therefore, all Christians are murderers? Shall we say, because your religious "revivals" have crowded many lunatic asylums that, therefore, all Christians are lunatics? Shall we say that, because (according to the Bible) "the Devil goes about as a roaring lion," therefore all Christians must be under the influence of "the Devil"? Certainly not; but, if our friend makes us do so, we must follow the same line of argument that he would so foolishly adopt, and show that there is not a vice in the Spiritual ranks, not a single folly or crime among us, or that we can even be suspected of, that cannot be *paralleled in the Bible itself*.—(Hear, hear.) We would ask that we may be allowed to refrain from this; but, if our friend introduces those charges of immorality which are heaped upon Spiritualism, we shall have to do it, in order that we may maintain our proposition, that Spiritualism is paralleled (in ALL its phases) by the Bible itself. We shall, in that case, be obliged to read from the book, in order to show that our position even in this respect, is capable of the most decisive proof. However, this would be unfair, because we wish not to show that because you have some evils, you have, therefore, no good, or that the good but simply covers, like a thin veil, the immorality that lies like rotting bones behind. We will give you every credit for all the good, all the beauty, and commendable morals that can be found in the Bible, and thence transplanted to your religion; but, we promise you, with every assurance we can command, that every immoral act that is laid to the charge of Spiritualists can be also found lying even at the



feet of those men who are called men "after God's own heart;" and that we can find passages and allusions to those who have been "in the service of 'the Lord'"—who have been His own prophets, doing His own work—that reveal the fact that these have been equally bad, and in many instances, far *worse*, far more depraved, than the most depraved and sensual of Spiritualists. (Applause.)

For the sake of the feelings, for the sake of the modesty and purity of those Christians whom we are addressing this evening, unless our friend mentions this matter again, and presses home the charge still further, we shall forbear in such an ordeal, and leave you at your leisure, in the chamber where none can see you *blush*, to peruse the passages which we hope not to be called upon to read, this or any other evening, during our debate. (Applause.)

Now, in reference to another assertion of our friend, viz., that all these phenomena were trivial—or, at all events, he mentions one or two that were trivial, such as the flying about of flat irons—which was one of the phases of Spiritual phenomena he himself had witnessed,—he also dwelt much upon the darkness of the room where these trivial phenomena are said to have occurred, and said that he felt dark indeed. Now, because, in one instance, he did not see that which delighted him, does that prove that *all* the phenomena are to be cast aside as of no service whatever? If we have the instance of flat irons flying about (which, however, we do not believe he will find frequently recorded in well-attested Spiritual works—f or we should rather think that some more convenient article of furniture would be found flying about)—(laughter),—but supposing, as we said, that flat irons *do* fly about, we will call upon our Chairman to read from the 2nd Kings, 6th chapter, 4th and 6th verses.

The CHAIRMAN read accordingly:—

"So he went with them. And when they came to Jordan they cut down wood; but as one was felling a beam, the axe-head fell into the water, and he cried, and said, 'alas, master, for it was borrowed.' And the man of God said, 'where fell it?' And he showed him the place. And he cut down a stick and cast it in thither; '*and ike iron did swim*'"

MR. WALKER: Wherein, let us ask our friend, consists the great difference between the flying about and swimming about of a piece of solid iron? (Applause.)

Mr. GREEN:

I am sure it was quite a pity that my friend robbed his parallel of its perfection, and I really wonder, he did not bring the Spirits from the "vasty deep" to make the axe-head float, for until he does this I can hardly see that the cases are parallel. I may tell you that although my friend says he does not think the matter of the flat irons is to be found in the accredited works of Spiritualism I actually saw that flat-iron and the dinge it made on the table. It was supposed to have been thrown by a spirit, but we do not find in the case of the axe-head that spirit-agency was considered necessary. I may say that

what struck me as very singular was that the lady trance-medium thought that the flat-iron looked very much like hers. (Laughter.) Now, let me say to you that I am not at all alarmed by my friend's threat to bring up so many terrible things from the scriptures. I hope he will find abundance of work to do before this and the next night (and another, which I hope we shall have) are over, in order to maintain his position. I really think that this evening he will find that he cannot take it altogether for granted that he has proved his point so easily. May I just here say that for every single sin that he can produce from the Bible, we will find the strongest and most positive condemnation. But for every sin we can produce among Spiritualists we will find the most thorough vindication by Spiritualist writers. (Applause.)

To return to the points that were mentioned last week. You remember Mr. Walker took exception to my statement that the more correct term for Spiritualism was Demonology. As evidence that that was not the correct term, but that angels would be a more correct one than demons, he cited the case of angels appearing in the form of men, and he affirmed that the angels that appeared to Abraham and Lot were the parallels of those disembodied spirits that now take possession of human beings. Now, I would just point out that we have no account at all in the scriptures of these persons being real men with disembodied spirits in them, and consequently I here fail to see the parallel. My friend's argument, if put into syllogistic form, would be something like this: That as angels appeared to Abraham and Lot as men, and as disembodied spirits appear to men, that therefore angels and disembodied spirits are one and the same! Now, if you can see that conclusion, following from those premises, I must confess you have a keener perception than I have. And yet this is the species of argument that my friend has used all through the debate. We can grant that some of the phenomena of Spiritualism are true; and as I said before, we can admit that angels appeared as men to Abraham, and that spirits appeared to men—disembodied spirits—demons, as I believe they are more correctly termed,—and yet how do these two admissions prove that demons and angels are the same? Then he brings forward that passage in the Acts of the Apostles where it is represented that Peter's angel appeared at the gate of Mary's home when he was still in prison. They were frightened when they heard the knocking; and as they did not believe it was Peter they concluded it was his angel, or rather, as my friend will have it, they concluded it was his spirit, though they called it his angel. My friend says this proves that angels and disembodied spirits are synonymous terms. If Mr. Walker had looked at the narrative more closely he would have seen that the people knew? full well that Peter was living. They knew, not only that the edict for his execution had not been given, but that it was not to be given till Herod came and gave judgment on the following day. Knowing that Peter was lying alive at the very time in the prison, they could not make the mistake which they must have done if my friend's statement is correct. I presume that he does not believe that a spirit can be disembodied till the person is what we call dead? Now there is a passage in Matt. XVIII, 10, which says, "Take heed that ye despise not

one of these little ones, for I say unto you that in heaven *their angels* do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." This fact is presented as a warning against offending these little ones who believe in Christ, and whose angels are represented as beholding the face of the Father, or having access to him. If my friend had quoted this passage he would have had a parallel case to that of Peter, where an angel, or ministering spirit, is mentioned. (Our spiritist friends have borrowed this from Christianity, only they make their *demons* ministering spirits. We say demons and angels are different beings.) Hence we read of "the angel of the Lord encamping around the dwelling of the just," and of God sending forth his ministering spirits. Hence, the early Christians believed that ministering spirits, or angelic beings, attended Peter, and when they heard the knocking and the voice of Peter, yet knew that he was lying in prison, and that he was not dead, they said it was his angel. So much for my friend's parallel here.

Let me ask you to notice the position. Really, I can hardly believe that my friend is in earnest when he talks about having proven his proposition. It seems to me that in his pleasantry he must be endeavoring to impose on our credulity. I must confess I can hardly believe that in his ordinary normal state he could imagine that he has done anything like proving his position. You will notice that the proposition is that the Bible supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena. Now, I will ask you what is meant by the word *support!* Does it not mean that the Bible *countenances, encourages, and sustains* Spiritualism? And will he show that modern Spiritualism is in harmony with what we Christians believe to be divine truth as here communicated? Now, has my friend really attempted to show that the Bible supports it? He has given you what he calls parallels, but has he really shown that there is the slightest parallel? I will read a passage from Leviticus XX, 6, and ask if it supports and parallels modern Spiritualism: "And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people." Again, in the 27th verse of the same chapter, "A man, also, or woman, that hath a familiar spirit" (which my friend believes himself to have) "or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death, they shall stone them with stones, their blood shall be upon them." My friend must have a new dictionary if he believes such words as these, denouncing in the most unmeasured manner this intercourse with familiar spirits, this necromancing, can be made to prove that the Bible supports modern Spiritualism! In the book of Deuteronomy XVIII, 6-14, we read, "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or *consulter with familiar spirits*, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord, and because of these abominations the Lord thy God shall drive them out from before thee. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. For these nations which thou shalt

possess hearkened unto observers of times, unto diviners"—(they did the very things my friend wishes us to do again)—"but as for thee, the Lord thy God has not suffered thee so to do." (Loud applause.) So much for my friend's support from the Bible.

Now, we come to the matter of the parallels. My friend says he does not profess to parallel the Bible with Spiritualism, but Spiritualism with the Bible. If I understand our proposition aright it is, not that Mr. Walker is to take a long string of cases that are in the Bible, saying that they are all thus and so, and that they are all paralleled in Spiritualism, but that he is to show us certain phenomena in Spiritualism, and then to produce from the Bible certain things of a parallel character. Now, until he does this, I hold he has not even attempted to prove his proposition, much less done it. I say until he does this, I am literally astounded at his stating that he has proved his position. I can only imagine that he must be playing a little with the audience, or he could never be so simple as to suppose we believe him. (Applause.)

Now, let me call your attention to the first parallel given—that in regard to the materialised spiritual body. You know this is a great thing with Spiritualists. This materialised spiritual body is supposed to be assumed by spirits immediately they have left their clay tenements. Now, my friend urges that the case of Christ is paralleled by modern Spiritualism in this. He says, "Surely no one will say that Christ went to heaven with that body in which were the prints of those nails in his hands, and the mark of the spear in his side!" "Surely, he (Christ) said, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven! No one can surely suppose that Christ went to heaven with those marks!" There are millions upon millions that have the conviction that, with that very body on which were the marks of the nails and the spear, he ascended gloriously in the sight of his disciples. My friend is altogether at sea in his quotation of scripture here. We believe, with" Paul, that flesh and *blood* cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, but does my friend not know that Christ lost his blood upon the cross? (Laughter, and applause.) Does he not know that when the disciples thought that the risen Christ was a spirit, that the Lord said I am not a spirit, "for a spirit hath *not flesh* and *bones*, as ye see me have." He was flesh and *bones*, but not flesh and *blood*; and hence my friend's quotation is not appropriate. He had flesh and bones, and with that body resurrected from the grave, with the marks of the nails and the spear, we affirm he ascended into heaven. But mark, my friend professes to take his parallel from the book; now will he bring us his disembodied spirits with *flesh* and *bones*? Whatever may be his idea as to Christ, one thing is certain, that so long as we have the Lord's statement that he was not a spirit, and that a spirit had not flesh and bones as he had, then his parallel goes to the winds.

Then, further, taking these spirit-lights, I may tell you what many of you may doubtless already know, that they can be manufactured very easily with phosphorus. However, my friend's statement or belief is, that only those persons can see these lights who have spiritual vision, that is, who have the aid of disembodied spirits. There must be this power imparted by the spiritual agents in order to discern

these lights, if I am not laboring under a wrong impression. My friend actually gives as the Bible parallel to these spirit-lights that column of fire that stood between the Israelites and the Egyptians. I ask, had all these six hundred thousand men of war demons in their bodies, in addition to their own spirits? Because they all saw it as a tangible pillar of fire, it was cognisable to their senses. I ask my friend to give us this pillar of fire and pillar of cloud in modern Spiritualism? I want a parallel? When he gives me a parallel in modern Spiritualism to this case, I will admit that he has begun to prove his proposition. Then there was another case he got from the Bible about fire coming down and consuming the sacrifice, and the parents of Samson seeing the flame and the smoke, &c. Now, it was an angel they were speaking with, and not a disembodied spirit. We have no account of his taking possession of their bodies, as my friend's spirits do. Let me ask you to observe that we want this paralleled in modern Spiritualism. We want a fire lighting without human agency, under a sacrifice upon the altar, and consuming it. Where, I ask, is it? Echo only answers where? (Applause.) Then we have this light which appeared to Saul on his way to Damascus. Our friend tries again to make every one of these soldiers that were with Saul to have demons, for they all saw the light, but did not hear the voice. Here we have the assumption, that all these persons had spirits in them, to enable them to see the spirit-light, although the book says that it was not a disembodied spirit, but Jesus himself, who uttered the words, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest," and who also caused the light. My friend expects you to gulp down all at once, that this same has its parallel in modern Spiritualism! Let us have the parallels, then we will acknowledge it to be so. My friend must really be presuming upon our credulity to a very large degree.

Then we have these material substances; and my friend has again referred to the flat-iron. I am glad he has. He says they had no flat-irons in ancient times. I must confess I am ignorant when they were invented, but I presumed they must have washed their linen, and if they washed their linen, they would require something to smooth it over, and must have had irons or their substitutes. However, that is beside the question. I merely mentioned flat-irons, because I had ocular demonstration, as I said before. He gives the case of the moving of the stone from the grave of the Saviour, as a parallel to the phenomena of modern Spiritualism. Notice that there were soldiers there to prevent that stone being moved. That stone had been actually sealed, and there were no persons there willing to act in harmony with the spirits. Our friends make a great point of this, that the medium must be in harmony with the spirits, but there was no one there to act as medium. I ask where have we in modern Spiritualism the phenomenon of a ponderous stone being removed from the grave of any human being? Here we have a case of persons armed with weapons, bound and pledged, and taking all possible care that no power of a human kind should move that stone away; and yet it was rolled away by an angel, as stated in the book, and we believe it. My friend will have it that it was some disem-

bodied spirit that came and rolled it away, frightening the soldiers so touch that they took to their heels and fled. When my friend produces the parallel, we will believe it. (Applause.)



Mr. WALKER.

We must compliment our friend on the spirit of pleasantry he throws into his remarks, as he plays upon the fancied ignorance of all Spiritualists who have read spiritual literature. However, that is not the point we have to draw your attention to just at present.

Let us briefly review the points he has called in question. In reference to the axe-head floating upon the water: he tells you that this does not parallel any phase of Spiritualism, because there were no disembodied spirits present: at least, the record does not tell us so. The other evening he went to the trouble of showing us that some of the phenomena in connection with spirits take place, without the aid of spirits, from the superabundance of magnetism in the medium! Is not this the exact counterpart, in common with many cases mentioned

in the Bible, of such cases to which our friend drew your attention on a previous evening, and at which, if an opponent of Spiritualism had been present, or better still, if Andrew Jackson Davis had been there, he would have seen a stream of magnetism issuing from the medium and producing the phenomena.

Our worthy opponent informs us—though he does not explain wherein we have failed—that we have not paralleled instances that are mentioned, nor yet attempted to do so; and then he attempts to explain away our parallelisms! First, he says, we have not attempted to show parallels, then he admits we have made parallels, and then he attempts to explain them away! (Hear, Hear!)

Is our friend trifling with us, or does he mean what he says in all sincerity, when he tells us that all disembodied spirits are "demons"? Has he the authority of the Bible record for this? Or does he presume again to say that all disembodied spirits were "demons," or that all good spirits were angels that never had been mortals? Was Moses disembodied? Had Moses and Elias "slept with their fathers," and been buried ere they were with Jesus? Were Moses and Elias good spirits or "demons"? Had Samuel been disembodied, and had he disappeared from the plane of mortal life when he appeared to Saul through the instrumentality of the "Woman of Endor." Was that case recorded in the 22nd chapter of Revelation, when the spirit forbade worship, saying: "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets."—Was that the language of a "demon"? Are these cases of demonology because, forsooth, there is a possibility that they who communed with these beings may have communed with "the evil one" only? But let us grant that some Spiritualists communicate with evil spirits: did not Jesus communicate with "the Devil," and have a familiar chat with him? Was not this demonology? and was not Jesus himself guilty of practising it? If we are to follow his example, then we parallel these instances! (Applause.)

We must again refer to those trivial phenomena that were mentioned. Will Our Chairman refer to the 14th chapter of Exodus, 23rd verse, where you will see that spiritual agency was brought to bear to do things quite as trivial as moving a flat-iron.

The CHAIRMAN read:—

"And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them, to the midst of the sea, even all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen. And it came to pass that in the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians: and through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians. And took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily; so that the Egyptians said: 'Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians.'"

Mr. WALKER: That is sufficient. Here we have "God" taking off the wheels of the chariots! (Laughter and applause.) If it was reported that any spirit, disembodied or otherwise, had done such a thing in the ranks of Spiritualism, it would have damned it in the estimation of our Christian friends for ever!

There have been quoted to you texts from the Bible, forbidding the practice of "divination," forbidding the seeking of those that have familiar spirits; and especially have we had quotations from those ancient laws of Moses, which, if they were put in practice to day, would revolutionise all society. However, as he has quoted them, let us see what they prove: Forbidding the practice of consulting "familiar spirits" proves, in the first place, that there *can be* consultation with "familiar spirits." In the next place, it proves that there can be communication *with good spirits*, for it only forbids consultation with *evil* spirits. We know that the prophets in those times were in the habit of divining by means of dreams. Did not Joseph dream; did not Daniel, Ezekiel, and others dream; and did not "the Spirit of the Lord" become *familiar* to all of them; and, therefore, were they not all of them guilty of the very thing for which our friend reviles Spiritualism? (Hear, hear.)

Now, we know full well that all these prophets of the past days, without exception, consulted "the Oracle" by means of dreams, and all the other expedients of diviners—such as, the flights of arrows, the movements of certain stones, Ac,—when communing with the spirit-world; for this is recorded by the writers of the Old and New Testaments. We might, along with Moses, ask Spiritualists to do all they can to prevent communion with the evil and wicked of spirit-life. We condemn it just as much as the Bible does. Here, in the very fact that we would, and do, condemn it, we have a parallel. We mentioned the case of Jesus on the cross; or, rather, his appearance afterwards to his disciples, when he had his spiritual body. Our friend endeavored, in a very ingenious manner—and we must compliment him upon it—to show that this was the *real* body he possessed before death, only the *blood was omitted from its constitution!*

Now does the Bible actually say that *all* the blood came out? We are told that blood and water came out when the spear pierced his side. Remember also "*flesh* and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of

heaven;" and, in order that our friend may prove his position perfectly, and beyond doubt, he must show that the flesh also was removed on this occasion. We know full well, Christian friends, that we touch here upon a delicate subject. But, friends, will you worship a deity with a wounded body—with an earthly structure and form? Not one of you, if you reason this matter out calmly for yourselves, would come to any such conclusion. Though there may be hundreds who would die for such a belief, are there not hundreds who lose their lives for the god of Juggernaut? Are there not hundreds who sacrifice their children beneath the ripples of the Ganges, and believe that they are doing God service in this? (Applause.) It proves nothing, your being merely convinced of a fact and believing in it. Here was the body of Jesus appearing after death when the doors were closed. Can you press flesh, (to say nothing of bones), even though the blood be extracted from it, through walls and doors without having them opened? Is it not evident that this took place by the species of spiritual phenomena called "materializations?" Our friend spoke of the spiritualized body. Now, let us correct him kindly, and with every wish to do him justice in his mistake. We do not talk of *Spiritualized* bodies but of *materialized* bodies. We believe that some spirits—nay, we *know* that they;—from all the evidence that has been furnished, materialize for themselves from the atmosphere a body, in which they can present themselves to the physical senses, and can be touched, seen, or heard by all that may be present at the time. Has our friend read Professor Crookes's investigations, or the Report of the London Dialectical Society, or Professor Alfred Wallace's views and history of the subject, and other works which give innumerable instances of spirit-lights and bodies having been seen? Dr. Samuel Watson, of Memphis, Tennessee, America, gives an account of a moonlight seance he held in the open air with many of his friends. Whilst they were together in the moonlight, there appeared to them other companions, or friends, and a globe of fire formed above the heads of those, who had come, from the immortal world, to visit their earthly sisters and brothers. In a few minutes this fire encircled them, and sanged the very grass on which they were standing or kneeling. Here is an instance which those who do not believe in spiritual phenomena laugh at. But when you find some record in the Bible of a parallel nature it is sacred, and not a thing to be laughed at. (Applause.)

Thus we have, paralleled these phenomena by referring to similar phenomena recorded in the Bible, only, that which makes one Bet of phenomena sacred to the hearts and minds of to many is, that they occurred some thousands of years ago; but, when such happen now they are, by those sectarianly educated, deemed trivial and nonsensical! Examine these matters, we earnestly beg of you. Professor Crookes gives instances of these lights appearing. Was he one to be deceived in his quiet, calm scientific moments? With his head clear, he demonstrated these powers: though probably not calling them by the name of spiritual, he demonstrated that lights did appear. Serjeant Cox is another who has attested these facts, together with Professor Varley, the great electrician, whose knowledge of electrical *phenomena* could not explain these wonders otherwise than upon a



spiritual basis. Thus, on every hand, we have these parallels. Read the book of Col. Olcott called "People from the other world." There you will find recorded numerous instances of spirits having appeared in tangible, physical bodies, which could be weighed. At one time a spirit would weigh so much, and at another, quite a different weight would be indicated, thus showing that they were able to change their weights, and thus, apparently overcome the law of gravitation. This is attested by no less a person than Col. Olcott, an individual who was specially chosen, by the manager of one of the leading American papers, as a shrewd and experienced reporter, and sent down to expose "these delusions"—for such they were then considered to be. The conclusions this man came to are detailed in his book which we advise you to read. Thus, if the evidence of these men is to be trusted at all, then these cases parallel those found in the Bible. (Hear, hear!)

Again, we would ask our friend to notice these texts of scripture where, in 12th Corinthians it says: "Now concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." where it enumerates these gifts, and tells you to "covet earnestly the best gifts," and that "the manifestation of the spirit is given of every man to profit withal." Do these words mean anything? Do they mean what they say? If so, then there *are* spiritual gifts. These gifts are not in the churches of to day; for, though they lay hands upon those who are to be initiated into their services, their laying on of hands is a dead letter, a mere ceremony, an outward shell, in which the spirit once abode, but from which it has for ever fled. The spirits have forsaken them and found other channels of communication, because, forsooth, the church has made this spiritual dispensation of Jesus so materialistic, and placed it upon such a worldly basis! (Hear, hear.)

Now, let us again review that which we have demonstrated; if the Bible is to be trusted, that Samuel, Moses, and Elias appeared as *disembodied spirits*, that a spirit appeared to John on the Isle of Patmos, who claimed to be of his "brethren the prophets," then we have similar phenomena to those of modern Spiritualism paralleled by those recorded in the Bible.

We will conclude these remarks by asking our Chairman to read from the last chapter of Mark's gospel, 17th verse, where it will be seen that these gifts are to follow those that believe, and it does not refer merely to those of that day, for, mark well, they are to follow "them that believe;" and we ask our friend, as he is a Christian, have these signs followed him or his church? (Applause.) Our Chairman will now be good enough to read.

The CHAIRMAN read accordingly:—

"And these signs shall follow them that believe, in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now there you have these gifts enumerated, and they are to "follow them that believe." The Christian church must admit one of two things: either that they do not "believe," and thus cannot perform these works; or, otherwise, that Jesus told a falsehood! One or the other must be true. Can

the church produce one of these signs to testify to their belief? Jesus said: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed ye shall say unto this mountain, 'Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you.'" Is there now no "balm in Gilead; are these powers for ever withdrawn from men? Is there not as great a necessity now for communion with these "angels," or spirits, as in the days gone by? There is,—there is, indeed! (Loud and prolonged applause.)



MR. GREEN:

Continuing my remarks in regard to parallels, I would just ask my friends present to kindly read at their leisure, and thus save my time now, the 24th and 25th verses of the 14th chapter of Exodus, and just ask yourselves, as you read, where the parallel is between that narrative and the flat-iron story. I think the answer will be sufficient without my going further into the matter.

My friend asked certain questions which I will now notice. He wished me to state whether there can be consultation with spirits, and that as the scriptures discountenance consultation with evil spirits, whether that does not really countenance consultation with good spirits? I have to say, in reply, what I said on the first night, that I believe intercourse with evil spirits is possible. I have further to add now that nowhere, in any part of the book of God, from any writer whose writings are there found, is there a single statement telling man that he is to seek intercourse even with good spirits. Every man, under the direction of that book, is instructed simply, that whenever God is pleased to send ministering spirits for that person's good, or to aid him in doing good to others, he does it, but he never tells any man to seek after any spirit, good, bad, or indifferent. I hope you will please to remember that. (Applause.)

Now, let me just notice some of my friend's remarks about the resurrection of Jesus. We can bear this strong language of his, I hope; and I trust no one will feel angry with my friend for using it. I must confess he has been as delicate as he could be, considering the line of argument he has brought forward. I say, I do not think he has attempted wantonly to wound the feelings of any, and I hope no one will be offended at his remarks. Let me inform him, and all persons of like mind with him, that we believe that Christ did ascend with that wounded body; but that we never, however, worship his perfect *unwounded* body, nor do we worship his *wounded body*. *We do not worship his human nature, but his divine*. (Applause.) I hope, then, my friend will kindly accept this statement. He is undoubtedly very ignorant as regards Christian teachings, in a greater degree even than he has charged me with being of Spiritualism. But seeing that Spiritualists teach such contradictory things, it cannot be wondered that I am not informed on all the points of their opinions and beliefs. If he can find such a medley in this book, I shall be happy to give him what credit he deserves, but he certainly has not the information he ought to have on these points.

Going back to those parallels, I have just to remind you that my friend has not produced from modern Spiritualism any parallels standing side by side with those in the Bible. He has talked about them, but he has not really produced them. We have not had a real pillar of fire given as a parallel for the one in the Bible. Talking about these spiritual lights, there are persons who have seen lights of a similar kind many times, without attributing them to spirits. I remember once, in New Zealand, having one of the greatest frights I ever experienced. I was going on a dark night along a mountainous road, lined with long grass and forest trees, and had to cross a wide creek. I was five or six miles from any house. It was a deep, rapid, fresh-water stream, which I had to cross. After crossing, and as I was ascending the opposite bank, I came in sight of what appeared to me to be the most horrible being I had ever beheld. It seemed to be a monster glaring at me with millions of eyes as I stood entranced, not knowing how to move. At last, as I had of necessity to go on one side or the other, I gradually edged my way round it, and when I got behind, what do you think I found it to be? Only a dead tree, with the roots full of phosphorus, which shone out like millions of eyes in the darkness. (Laughter and applause.) There are millions of phenomena in Nature, which, as my friend well said, we are not able to explain; but my friend takes these lights *nolens volens*, and says these are spiritual manifestations. We grant that there are many things in Nature we cannot explain, but we demur to their being accredited at one fell swoop to this system my friend is advocating. He says he does not profess to give an exact parallel to the case of Daniel. Then why does he give this circumstance of Daniel in the lions' den as a parallel with modern Spiritualism, if, as he has admitted to-night, he cannot find an exact parallel in modern days? If he cannot find an exact parallel of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace, I ask why has he cited this when, as he has candidly confessed to-night, in the hearing of you all, that he is not able to produce cases of this kind in modern Spiritualism?

My friend calls our attention to these spiritual gifts, and I am unfeignedly pleased that he has done so, for it indicates that they have some importance in his eyes. In regard to them, may I ask you to observe that he makes the gift of the spirit mentioned in Joel II, 28th verse,—where it says, "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons, and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions,"—I say he makes that spirit referred to by Joel, and the spirit referred to by Paul, to be the same as the many disembodied spirits which my friend thinks perform so many wonderful things in the present day. Well, now, he does this by a process which is really nothing less than legerdemain. He says, "I am one of the offspring of God, therefore I am Deity, and therefore I am part of the Great Spirit!" Well, after all, he has to make many spirits, because he has separate identity, and he can only do that by a process of reasoning known to himself and his spirit-friends, for it is certainly unknown to me. He believes he is quite able to bring this mass together till it becomes equivalent to the one united spirit of the Great Jehovah, that accomplishes the great wonders we see around us in the world.

Now, leaving this, I admit that spirits can work miracles of a certain kind. I am prepared to make my friend all the concessions I can. In the 2nd Thessalonians, 2nd chapter, 7th to 10th verses, which my friend referred to the other night, but took care not to read all the connection, it says, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work, only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked (or lawless one) be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, *with all power, and signs, and lying wonders*. And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Thus we see that the *lawless one* shall be revealed, and that he will come "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders;" that he will in reality work miracles, so as to carry on his work of deception, and thus lead astray unwary souls; and I affirm, that according to the acknowledgments of the Spiritists themselves, they are lawless ones. I will prove, during to-night and to-morrow night, that Spiritualism is utter lawlessness in its perfection. I will show that every Spiritualist, according to his theory, is the sole law to himself; that there is no law higher than himself; and that, therefore, so far as any law, apart from his own passions or intelligence is concerned, he is *lawless*, utterly lawless, both so far as God is concerned, and so far as man is concerned, except when the strong hand of the law must be observed. The passage quoted says, "That wicked (or lawless one) shall be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." We, therefore, look for its ultimate destruction; although it may have its day of power. May I just say here that in all I have to say to-night, and to-morrow night, I pass no reflection on the ladies and gentlemen who take the name of Spiritualists in Melbourne. I have come into contact with many of them, and some at least appear to be most honorable persons. I am not speaking of persons, but of principles.

Now, let us notice these spiritual gifts. The parallel will not hold good, unless, as I have shown, my friend can make all these disembodied spirits into one. He takes Paul's words, "All these things worketh that *self-same* spirit," &c., and affirms that this is a parallel to the many spirits of his system! He also wishes to make it appear that Christ is not represented in this passage as universal Lord, but only as Lord over his flock. He desires us to take Paul's words as he believes them. Paul says, "If any man preach any other gospel than that which we have preached, let him be accursed," Ac. Now, we take Paul's words altogether; we do not take a scrap here and quote it, and patch it up with something else to suit our own system. Well, now, have we any proof that my spiritualistic friends have these spiritual gifts? Have they the gift of prophecy? For this is one of the things he has referred to. I referred you the other night to the statement of Moses Hull, as to the case of the man who, by spirit prediction, had spent ten long years in blasting solid rock to get gold, and losing thousands of dollars thereby. If he had trusted to his own common sense, Hull said, instead of these "spiritual wags," he would not have committed such folly. That is one of the

predictions. I need hardly remind you of the one about the Queen's supposed death, at the time some accident happened to the mail, causing a delay in its arrival. Some of my audience will remember the case of the Pyg-malion mine at Castlemaine. On one occasion, that mine was in the hands of a company, and a friend of mine lent the company money. In order to keep the mine going, it was necessary to have a man working there, so as to meet the requirements of the law. My friend had this man driving in a certain direction. A number of Spiritualists were partners in the mine. As my friend did not want to keep the mine, and had bought it merely on account of a legal difficulty, and to save himself from loss, he was in negotiation with the company with a view to hand it again over to them, on the payment of his interest in it. He had a man working in it, as I have said, and, as it were to-night, he received a letter from his manager, saying "I beg of you to stop this man from driving where he is; he is coming to a reel which is only two inches thick, and there is not a speck of gold to be seen there." My friend did not know what to do. He felt that if the company, who were negotiating for its purchase, were aware of this information he had received, they would immediately give up the idea of re-purchase, though it was not his speculation, but theirs. It happened that there was a *seance* in Melbourne that very night at which some members of this company were present. At this *seance* a spirit was said to have gone down the mine, and thoroughly examined it, and then communicated through the medium, *that eight feet beyond where, that man was driving* there was a large quantity of gold, which would pay them abundantly for all their trouble. They were in, high glee, and sent a messenger to my friend next morning begging him to stop the man working where he was, and you may imagine my friend was very glad to do so. The company bought the mine back again from him, and what was the result? Why, this prediction that was made resulted in nothing. They drove forty feet, and nothing, came of it; not a speck of gold was found, and *they have not got gold to this day.* (Loud applause.) I can produce persons to testify, to the truth of this, even the very man who lent the money, and from whose lips I had the story. So much for this claim to have the gift of prophecy.

Now we have miracles. My friend claims that Spiritualists can work miracles, and cure diseases, &c. Well, doctors cure diseases, and yet they claim no miraculous power. Some doctors even cure cases that have been turned away by others as incurable. Has any Spiritualist in Melbourne ever cured leprosy? Or said to the sick and lame man "Take up thy bed and walk," and the man been able to get up and go on his way? If there is a case let us have it! My friend also quoted blindness, that spirits had cured blindness: so have doctors, and yet doctors never claim that they have spirits helping them to do it. Have the spirits ever cured a man *born blind!* If they have done this I will then acknowledge that they have given evidence of a power for good such as Jesus had. Let us have the case of a man born blind cured by the spirits, and I will admit that there is something of divinity in Spiritualism that cannot originate with the Devil, and which requires that we should accept it as from God. Until we have these things we must hold our faith in

abeyance. I hold myself to be an impartial person. I candidly confess that while I was reading the book published by my friend Mr Browne my mind was oscillating like a pendulum until, by careful reading and examination, I thoroughly saw through its fallacies. I think I am willing to read anything that will aid in the search after truth, and I do not care where the truth leads me, I will follow it. (Loud applause.) There is not a man in this hall I will give place to in this love of truth. I care not if it lead me to Rome, or to Juggernaut. But, friends, I must have evidence. Though I am a Christian, I am not a credulous old woman, and I do not believe Christians are. (Applause.) I would just emphasise this point, as the Chairman tells me I have only a moment left. In connection with these questions which I have mentioned, we want other parallels. We want the lame man standing up in a moment and carrying his bed. We want these diseases, mark you, clear cases of disease of long standing, such as that man who had been ill twenty-eight years, and the one mentioned in the 9th of John as having been born blind. Let us have the cases, and then, friends, we will give you our belief, (Loud applause.)



MR. WALKER:

Deviating somewhat from the usual method we employ in following our friend, let us notice the latter portion of his remarks first, for they are of such a nature, that, if he follows them in connection with his system, and if they apply and are true in Spiritualism, then we shall show exactly that his system decidedly parallels, in this respect, modern Spiritualism; and thus that Spiritualism is paralleled by the Bible. Before doing so, however, let us again call our friend's attention to the fact that we are not discussing whether all in the Bible is found in Spiritualism; but are endeavoring to prove that 'all the principal features of Spiritualism are found in the Bible. Our friend seems to have forgotten this, and asks us to prove that there are identical cases in Spiritualism with those in the Bible. Now, we have, as we undertook to do, pointed out parallels, in the Bible, for what occurs in Spiritualism, and not in Spiritualism, for what occurs in the Bible. With this correction of our friend's mistake,—which, no doubt, he made in an unwary moment,—we will go to the statement of his to the effect that doctors having cured blind people without the aid of spirits, or professing any such aid; in all probability, almost amounting to a certainty in our friend's estimation when such assistance is claimed, there is no spiritual power about it, but the Cure is performed as doctors do it. Men have done it without the aid of spiritual influence; and, therefore, it is natural to presume that there is no spiritual influence in any case.

Let us take the case of Daniel, in the den of lions, as an illustration to the point. We ask permission to remind our friend that travelling menageries very often have men, whom the managers pay to go into the *lions' den*, and the lions do not eat them except on very rare occasions. They go in and come out safely *without* the aid of

spirits or "angels," therefore, Daniel did not require spirits, and "in all probability, almost amounting to a certainty," no "angel" closed the lions' mouths! Our friend has thus kindly furnished us with an argument for our side, if what he says be true; for if, because doctors cure diseases without the aid of spirits it be argued that, therefore, spirits never assist in the cure of diseases, this argument is equally legitimate, when applied to those of old; and because men can tame lions without "angels," there were no "angels" in Daniel's case, no superior power exercised in the so-called miracles of Moses and Aaron, because the magicians did the same! (Hear, hear.)

We are asked to give a parallel case to the three men that went into the fiery furnace, and had not a hair of their heads singed. But, instead of a parallel, our friend really wants an identical incident, with the same men, called by the same names, condemned by the same king, placed in the same fire, with the very same people to gaze on in wonder! (Laughter, and hear, hear.) D. D. Home, however, relates a case of his having submitted his hand to the flame without receiving any injury. Of course, we have only his own testimony, but it is substantiated by that of others, who relate similar phenomena, and quite as reliable as that contained in the book of our friend. One is as good as the other. There are individuals, who profess to be conjurers, well up, probably, in the practice of chemistry, who apply chemical elements to their hands, and thereby are enabled to resist fire. They do it without the aid of spiritual agency; therefore, the three men in the fiery furnace were conjurers, and not so assisted as related. We are thus simply using the same kind of argument which our friend has used in reference to us. Why, our friend gave us the glowing description of a tree, filled with phosphoric light, that loomed up before him like a monster, with a myriad of glittering eyes, we cannot imagine, unless he wishes us to understand that all Spiritualists introduce stumps of trees with phosphorus in them into their drawing-rooms at *seances*. Even if our friend's intended illustration be taken as such, it proves, nothing, except that he saw a stump with phosphorus on it, and that, it being dark, he was frightened! As Spiritualists we, if you like, are able to take into consideration, in connection with Spiritualism, all the laws, forces, powers, and conditions of Nature that are yet known to science, and then to say that the phenomena take place by the aid, and under the influence of, disembodied spirits. We say that there are certain phenomena occurring in our ranks,—certain things that transpire, wherein mechanical force and physical matter are guided by an unseen intelligence,—which are attested by the ablest of scientific men, whose positions in life have well calculated them for the judging of evidence; such, for instance, as Judge Edmonds, Sergeant Cox, Prof. Hare, Prof. Crookes, Prof. Varley, Prof. Mapes, and Prof. Alfred Russell Wallace (the joint author with Darwin of the evolution, theory.) These men, throughout their lives, have been in search of evidence. Their statements are not only treated with respect, but are shown to have had great weight indeed when given upon ordinary, legal, or scientific subjects; and yet when they tell us of the convictions they have arrived at, (through the tests they have applied,) in their investigations of Spiritualism, then their testimony is thrown

aside! Why? Are they not, fit to be judges in these matters? What do they gain by their testimony? The applause of the world? No; quite the contrary is the consequence. What have they to gain, we ask once more? Money? No; on the contrary, they lose it; for, in losing the respect of Christians they lose the contents of the Christians' pockets. Though the world, for their courage, scorns them, and, for their convictions, reviles them, yet they testify to these facts; and, surely, their testimony proves something! Then, if it proves anything, it proves that Spiritualism is a fact, and that, as yet, no other hypothesis than that of Spiritualism will explain the facts. (Applause.)

Our friend has shown that there are false prophets—that some spirit told certain individuals where gold might be found in a mine, and, 'twas passing strange, they found no gold, but were sore deceived. All we can say is this: If Spiritualists have no higher ambition, in communing with the angel-world, than merely to know how they may get the better of their neighbors,—no higher aspiration than to learn how to get rich—to thus rob others, and increase all kinds of wickedness in this material world—the oftener they *are* deceived the better. (Hear! Hear!) Do we not advise you to use your common sense at all times? Has not Moses Hull, from whom our friend quoted, shown that you should use your common sense in preference to the teachings of those spiritual wags? In this light we will ask: Was Jonah prompted to exercise his common sense? Was he not swallowed up by a big fish? And, after all, was the prophecy concerning Nineveh fulfilled? Did not "the Lord" spend his spare moments in repenting? Would our friend acknowledge that the 'failure of this prophecy overthrew his system, and stamped it at once as a system of demonology, and not to be trusted or relied upon, and of no service whatsoever to men? Would our friend throw aside his religion because of cases of this kind occurring in the Biblical records? Because the land was promised to Abraham and his seed for ever, and because they have not got the land, is his system therefore all false? Certainly not. There is good in it. Our friend has evidently read our mind with greater ability than we can read it ourselves; for he has told us we do not accept Paul's teachings, or speeches, or writings. Now, who told him this? How did he gain the revelation? All of Paul's teachings that appear to us as true we accept, and what appears to us as in error we denounce. (Applause.) Does our friend do more than we do here? Will he accept *all* that Paul says, even if it be nonsensical?—such as his advice to take a little wine, and so forth? When Paul is giving his opinion as a man, we respect him as much as we respect anybody; but we cannot accept all he says, any more than we can accept all our friend states as his belief. On the contrary, if Paul transcends the bounds of reason, truth, and fact, demonstrable by all our past experience, then we place him out of court, with the same ceremony that we would use to any other individual, who claimed to be an authority in any matter whatsoever. Paul simply gives us his opinion. Can we accept all his opinions? They may be erroneous in some instances, and they may be true in others. Our friend even does not accept his words in one instance, as we will show. Paul speaks of these spiritual gifts, which are to be



enjoyed by those who believe in Jesus. Now, will our friend tell us who these believers are? Where are they, outside Spiritualism? Will he find them? There is not a Christian who can perform these wonders, which Paul says shall be done by those who believe in Jesus. Our friend said that it was prophesied that these delusions and lying witnesses should come. We admit there are some delusions and lies, but this is not allowing that all are lies. If "God" causes it to rain on the just and on the unjust: if "God" sends us a "strong delusion that we may believe a lie:" if "God" sends his "lying spirits in the mouths of his prophets," and we accept "the delusion" and are damned for it, "God" is the cause, for he sent "the delusion." But we know that the God we worship will send us no evil without good to parallel it, and so counteract or withdraw the effect of the evil from it. We may even see this principle in the wonders of Nature. The thistle and the rose grow together, the flower and the weed are seen side by side in the same field. Everywhere we have illustrations of it. Why should the power of the evil be there, and not the power of the good? Why should the evil man alone be permitted to torment and tempt his brothers? Is it in keeping with our ideas of God's bountiful providence, charity, and benevolence, that "devils" and their evil influences should swarm in myriads and myriads to treat us with derision; that all "Hell," with its foul denizens, should be let loose, and not one good brother, or one sweet sister, as an angel, be allowed to come and bring us joy and happiness? (Loud applause.) No, the idea of heavenly justice forbids such a thing. No one with common sense *could* accept such an argument, especially when these promises of Jesus and his successors are so definitely and distinctly made, concerning the use and possession of spiritual gifts. There have been cases of the sick being healed, and the blind being restored to sight, and the infirm being made to walk. We have these instances in spiritual philosophy and literature, and they are paralleled in the Bible. (Hear, hear.)

Our friend speaks with ridicule of the means which Spiritualists and mediums adopt, or in the past have adopted, in order to become acquainted with disorders and diseases, and of the remedies they have used to effect their cures. But, we ask, are these means any more ridiculous than "the clay and the spittle" which Jesus put to the eyes of the blind man to restore his sight? Now, we claim that the cases in modern Spiritualism of the blind being restored to sight, and this case mentioned in the Bible, are exact parallels, and that, therefore, our position is established, and that if, on the one side, ridicule can be made of the method of the Spiritualist, ridicule can also be made of the method of Jesus on the other.

You have heard it asserted that the Spiritualists are lawless! Then it remains for us to parallel *that* assertion by referring to the Gentiles, who, "having no law, are a law unto themselves." Are men "lawless" because they work in accordance with those laws that are within them? No, they are influenced by the highest of all laws, viz., those that are engrafted in the human breast by the Great Law-giver; and they carry out these laws, and therefore, live in accordance with the desire and intention of the Great Spirit of the Universe. (Hear, hear.)

We are again told that we deify men because we affirm that they constitute part of the Great Spirit we call God, *because* they are *part* of God. By what system of logic is this? Who calls a man's hand a man, of a man's fingers, or any part of man, a man? And so, who can call any part of Deity, Deity?

"We are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body Nature is, and God the Soul."

God liveth and reigneth within us, as Paul testifies, when he says: "In God we live and move, and have our being." "There is one God and father of all, which is above all, and through you all, and in you all." Could there be anything more pointed, even in Spiritual literature, or in the language of human nature, than that? When, however, we, in the present day, endorse and say the same, we are pronounced "heretics:" we are looked upon as a people who have no powers of judgment, we are held to be beings who know but the powers of darkness; but when Paul says exactly the same thing, it is declared to be God's truth, and absolute, orthodox Christianity. (Applause.) Now, by what reasoning is this? We say (and we have the evidence of others who say the same,) that the Spirit of God is in all, and through all: and thus, if God works at all, He works through the instrumentality of His laws; which are those of Nature; and thus He sends forth His ministering spirits, who fulfil His laws and perform His work. These spirits are distinct from each other, yet are parts of Nature, working through different channels, and different organisms, producing many manifestations; and so we say that God, the Father of all, living in all, works through all; and as He works through all, He now, as of old, manifests Himself in various and manifold ways. (Loud applause.)



Mr. GREEN:

May I ask you, dear friends, to try and keep in memory what Mr. Walker has just said, whilst listening to the following quotations from a work entitled the "Educator," a book of 680 octavo pages, professedly coming from the spirits of some of the most noted men that have lived on the Earth; such as Daniel Webster, John Quincy Adams, Robert Rantoul, Aristotle, Martin Luther, Socrates, Roger Williams, and others.\* "God is man, and man is God; tell us of God,—they might as well say, tell us of ourselves. The being called God exists, organically, in the form of the being called man." That is on page 303. Mart what it says on page 526. "Every one of you are Gods manifest in the flesh." "The divine existence is one grand

\* The reporter has omitted from the latter part of Mr. Walker's speech some remarks in which he charged Mr Green with ignorance of Spiritualistic literature, when he asserted that Spiritists did not believe in a personal deity, and made themselves parts of God—that God being simply a *principle* pervading all matter. This first part of Mr. Green's speech is in reply to the portion omitted from Mr. Walker's.— *M. W. G.*

universal man." Just see the direct contradiction of my friend's statement. "Man is God's embodiment, his highest, divinest, outer elaboration. God, then, is man, and man is God." It is not for me to harmonise these self-contradictory sentences. The statement is, "Every one of you. are Gods manifest in the flesh." Another spirit says: "When man became a living soul he became a God. All living souls are Gods." Do not tell me that I am contradicting Spiritualist teachings. It is my friend who does so, for he is evidently ignorant when he says they do not claim to be Gods. "They die not, so, living soul, rejoice in thy Wisdom—be a king, *A* God, a Jehovah; you are all Gods, every one of you. Look within yourself and behold yourself a God, responsible for every act. Read the inscriptions there, and thou shalt learn that thou art a God in thyself, and thine own judge." A spirit, claiming to be that of W. H. Miller, says: "God is a Spirit, man is a Spirit; then the two are one. All men who shall outlive all grossness, who shall have passed beyond all that is mundane and material, go to make up the God-head, the superior portion of the intellectual world, and the many millions who inhabit the wisdom-sphere may be recognised as the one God." Mark the contradictions again: "There is no God, friends." We have this statement from another spirit—"There is no God anywhere to forgive sin; there is no such thing as forgiveness for sin." A spirit, calling himself Orlando Jenks, says: "If I was coming back to preach, I should say don't believe in God. The idea of a God of illimitable capacity is so incomprehensible that, in our judgment, it borders on the absurd. God, in the abstract, is a nonentity, an ideality of man's brain." Another spirit says: "We must regard him (God) as a central principle, but not as a being." From the way our friend talked we would suppose he believed in a personal deity; but here we have it taught that God is a central principle, but not a personal being. Spiritism is really Atheism, as can be clearly demonstrated. Atheism is a denial of a personal God. I say Spiritism denies a personal God, and is, therefore, Atheism. (Loud applause.) Notice these words: "We must regard him (God) as a central principle—*not as a being*,—a principle existing in matter in all conditions and in all relations—a part of everything. *The Divine is of necessity a vast ocean of magnetism.*"

Another spirit claiming to be that of Joseph Foster says: "Ah! there is no God, there can be none; what is the use of a God when there is none. I tried to serve God, and there ain't any." And yet, my friend professes to say I don't know what Spiritists teach on these matters! I would ask, do they know themselves? (Applause.) In a paper entitled *The Age of Freedom* we find the following: "What a horrible phantom, what a soul-crushing superstition is this idea of an over-ruling, omnipresent, all-powerful God. Belief in a God is degrading, whatever the character ascribed to him. Where is your God? I can stand up and look him in the face and affirm that I have a right to life, liberty, and happiness, whether it is his pleasure that I should enjoy them or not. It is perfectly plain, then, that his God-head or my manhood must succumb. If I can beat him at one point he is no God. But if I can make a case once, I can a thousand times,

in the case of every single right, and if I maintain my manhood in spite of him, so may every other human being, and so the God is nowhere, utterly routed." Then again we have this statement from the spirit of Thomas Rice, who, when speaking of some friends says "I want to tell those friends that there is no God. I know there is no such gentleman as God." And yet my friend presumes to talk as he did at the latter part of his last speech, as though we had not accumulation upon accumulation of evidence from the spirits themselves that it is atheism he professes, when he talks about God being a conglomeration of these disembodied spirits.

My friend has certainly in his last speech accomplished a feat, because, though he regarded these spiritual gifts as his grand point, yet when I said we had no evidence as to the correctness of the prophecies of the spirits, but very much the reverse, and when I quoted some instances where they were glaringly false, what did he say about them? He said it served the people right for trying to get such information. What did he say about the miracles? He said we have done them. I ask where are they? (Applause.) You profess to have the power to do these miracles, and, therefore, Spiritists of Melbourne, we are acting in accordance with reason when we ask where are they? Let us have cases. There are plenty of sick, and lame, and blind in our midst; let us see all this misery relieved. *You* claim the power; *we* do not, and we give the reason why we do not claim it, from the very book which tells us about the power. My friend, if he knows anything about logic, will be aware that there are universal and particular propositions. Let me ask if that portion of the scriptures which he himself had read from Mark's gospel, about signs following those that believe, is a particular or universal proposition? We declare that those signs did follow those that believed, and we affirm that God never intended they should continue throughout the whole of this dispensation. (Applause and great interruption.) I am glad that the Christians present have shown too good taste to interrupt my friend, but I have been interrupted by those of my friend's party very often. (Disorder.)

[Mr. Walker's CHAIRMAN rose to a point of order, and said that he did not think Mr. Green had any right to draw comparisons between the behavior of the different sects present. (Continued disorder.)]

Mr. GREEN: I am quite sure both Christians and Spiritists will bear me out, when I state that I have been repeatedly interrupted, whilst my friend has been left undisturbed. I stated that in the gospel by Mark it was a particular proposition, affirming that certain signs should follow persons who believed; and the apostles alone, by the laying on of hands, could impart these gifts. When the last man died, upon whom the last apostle had laid his hands, these gifts ceased. Now for the proof that they were to cease. Turning to the epistle to the Ephesians IV, v. 11, we read: "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. *Till* we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness

of Christ That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. But speaking the truth in love may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ. They were to continue "till" a certain time, and that time was "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the son of God," or in other words, until the full revelation had been made which was necessary to the perfection of the Church of Christ, and the stability of Christian character. In the 13th chapter, 1st epistle to the Corinthians, you will find that the apostle Paul, after giving statements in regard to the nature of charity or love, says, "Charity never faileth," and then mark what follows: "But, whether there be prophecies, *they shall fail*, whether there be tongues, *they shall cease*, whether there be knowledge *it shall vanish away*, for we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come (the perfect revelation) then that which is in part shall be done away." Prophecy, tongues, knowledge, all are to vanish. Faith, hope, and love are to remain; and the fact that the former gifts did cease proves that the time when it was intended they were to cease had arrived, or depend upon it they would have continued. This is the reason why we do not *pretend* to work miracles. My friend *does* claim them; and has *not* given *any* proof that he possesses them.

Let me call your attention to another point in connection with this Spiritualism. One of its most attractive features—and it would have captivated my own heart, did I not know it to be a delusion—is that of having intercourse with departed friends. I have an esteemed father who has passed away, and if it were allowable, and if I knew I could have intercourse with him, I would gladly do so. But I know in this matter there is deception. I know that you poor people who imagine that you have intercourse with your friends are deceived; and it is because of this that I feel in earnest on this matter. I see a gentleman before me to-night who confessed that, although he had been a Spiritualist for ten years, he had never had one single evidence from any of his friends, to cheer him as to their state. Well, if he, an intelligent Spiritualist, can be in that position, may not that one be multiplied by millions? Let me ask you to notice that you never can be certain that you have intercourse with your spirit-friends. Let me read to you from page 101 of my friend Mr. Browne's book "Holy Truth": "I must also state that, as there are truthful men on this Earth, and men who are untruthful, so there are in spirit-life truthful and untruthful spirits, *or lying spirits*, as they are termed in the old book." And on page 139 it says: "We have warned you that an undue devotion to the mere physical Bide of spiritual communication is fraught with risk. Spirits who are best able to communicate thus, are little developed, unable to give you true and reliable information, *tricky frequently*, and on a low plane of intelligence, even where *graver charges* may not be brought against them. And on page 155: "As the spirits of the higher spheres can come to Earth, those in the lower spheres are quite able to come also, the path is open to both; why is this allowed? Because it cannot be stopped. The laws of the Supreme Being cannot be

altered for good or bad."—that Supreme Being is nowhere, is nobody, as our other quotations assert—"They are there, and are open alike to the undeveloped spirits as well as to those who earnestly desire to do good. *These undeveloped spirits can deceive you by personating other spirits*, and relating to you facts which they do by coming in strong rapport with you in sympathy. They do not read your brain, as often supposed, but they catch, as it were, a thread of your thoughts, and can so bring strange circumstances up at times which you have entirely forgotten." Let me read you two more brief extracts from this pamphlet (*Spiritualism Unveiled*, page 19.) Mr. Newton says: "It is alleged to be possible and common for spirits of a certain class to *assume* the appearance and characteristics of other spirits, or of other persons still in the body, so completely that the disguise cannot be detected by ordinary sight-seers. This may be so, and hence the common evidence of the identity of spirits are little to be relied on."

The next is a statement by Dr. Randolph: "For seven years I held daily intercourse with what purported to be my mother's spirit. I am now firmly persuaded that it was nothing out an evil spirit and infernal demon, who, in that guise, gained my soul's confidence) and led me to the very brink of ruin." Mark these are Spiritualist testimonies, not those of Christians

Let me give you a personal experience, but first permit me to remind you of the case of the lady at Castlemaine, which I have previously cited, from whose lips I "heard the story, of the spirit of her father, taking possession of her husband, and all those feelings being exhibited which would be natural under the circumstances. She fully believed it was her father's spirit, yet she afterwards found that he was alive; and yet, mark you, the points of identity were so clear,—that she, and her daughter, and husband, who were all mediums, were deceived. My own case is this: I have a relative who, unfortunately, was separated from his wife for more than 20 years. His brother was influenced by Spiritist literature, and practised these table movements. His children were mediums, they had written by the hand, &c., and I believe in their case the phenomena were not manufactured. Although I believe their phenomena were real, still I think, in many cases, there is reason to believe they are manufactured. They regularly held circles, and attended to other Spiritualistic routine, but, happily, they were led to give it up afterwards, because so many bad communications came, that they saw the influence was becoming very injurious to the family. Whilst the communications were going on, they held intercourse with a spirit purporting to be that of the departed wife of my relative, a brother of him« who was having this communication. Now, this spirit gave full particulars of herself; her height, her complexion,—in fact, everything about her, where she died, and the circumstances in connection with the early married life of my relative and herself. So convinced was this relative, who was holding the intercourse, of the identity of this spirit with, as he then thought, his departed sister-in-law, that, after testing over and over again, he advised his brother to once more enter into the state of matrimony. He urged it upon him, because of the fact that he was getting into years, and should therefore make a home for himself in

his advanced age, and he assured him there was now no legal impediment to the marriage. What was the result? Why, after a time, they received information which led them to make enquiries, and there, living in the flesh, near Liverpool, was the very person said to be dead, and from whose pretended spirit communications were received! She was still living at the time I was in England last year, although the statement of her death had been given some years before. Now, I ask, how can you trust in this Spiritism? (Applause.) [Time expired.]

EIGHTH EVENING.

WEDNESDAY, 20TH MARCH.

MR. WALKER, on being introduced by the Chairman with a few brief remarks, spoke as follows:

In reviewing last evening's concluding speech, by our worthy opponent, we shall have to call his attention again to the fact that we mentioned, in our opening speech, that we, "as Spiritualists, *recognise no man or book as master*," and that we profess to have no creed with definite articles, to which we, as Spiritualists, or individuals, mortals or immortals, are subject; but we treat everything just as the underlying evidence warrants, and we endeavor, so far as it is practically possible, to "*prove all things*, and to hold fast to that which is good." (Hear, hear.)

That we may save time, we would ask the Chairman to be turning to the 10th chapter of John's gospel, 33-38 verses. You will remember that last evening our friend endeavored to gain a point by asserting that all Spiritualists were in some degree "Atheists, and he quoted from certain books, that are not accepted as standard works by the generality of Spiritualists, to prove his assertion. However, as these doctrines have been published and given forth to the world, it will be our duty to show that even, as described in the language they were last evening, these doctrines are paralleled by King James's version of the Bible—that even some of the statements made by Spiritualists (or rather those who were said to be so, although we deny that they were really so), were also made by no less a personage than Jesus himself. But, let us notice the authors that our friend has quoted from, prior to doing this. And first in order, let us consider the character of Randolph—a man whose intellect at one time was comprehensive and powerful, but became erratic, and was ruined by the use of narcotics, with which he poisoned his system for twelve years, and under the influence of which he at last committed suicide. In his works he contradicted himself. He first adopted Spiritualism, then denied it, and eventually died confirmed in its faith. He, on this lamentable account, is, therefore, not accepted as an authority by Spiritualists of standing. Those works, again, that our friend quoted in connection with the society of "free lovers" are not considered as of any authority among Spiritualists. A better name for these free-loving people would be that of Christians; for a similar society is in existence now in New York calling themselves "*Christian Perfectionists*." They issue these books, which are accepted,



endorsed, and acted upon by some individuals seceding from the Spiritualist ranks. They cannot be taken as admissible authority upon aught that concerns our ethics, or facts, or knowledge. Upon the general principles of Spiritualism we are all agreed; but upon certain doctrinal points we may differ. Our friend says we had better agree among ourselves as to what Spiritualism is before we make any professions concerning it, or proclaim our doctrines. We may use the same argument, and tell our "Christian" friends to agree among *themselves* as to what *Christianity* is before they endeavor to teach it. Have you not various churches abroad throughout the land, sects and creeds of every conceivable type, all differing upon the most vital, essential, and fundamental dogmas and creeds that constitute the *summum bonum* of Christianity? Are there no contradictions in the Bible? Did we not, during the first part of the present debate, instance many of the most positive and glaring contradictions? Now, are you to reject *all* Christianity, because certain well-cultured, well-educated men, in every respect, affirm different opinions concerning it? Are you to reject Christianity because these doctors differ? If our friend says there is no objection to Christianity on that account, then how can he justly or logically use that argument, in reference to ourselves? And how can he consistently say that, because Spirits give us a few insignificant, contradictory doctrines, therefore Spiritualism, in its main or leading tenets, is objectionable, and, consequently, that it should not be endorsed and advocated. Because men contradict each other, are we to reject the testimony of *all* men? Are all men liars, because some disagree with their neighbors? Are we for ever to cease to speak with our brothers and sisters, because it is possible, and because they are liable to mislead us? It is probable that there may be some mistakes, and it is quite possible that they cannot form correct conclusions from certain premises; but, are we thus to be excluded from intercourse with our earthly friends for this reason? Then why be excluded from communion with your spirit-friends, because they are not infallible, when we claim with others that, although their surroundings and conditions are changed, they are the exact counterparts, in all respects, of mortal beings? Now, speaking as one of you, are we thus to reject all communion with the spirit-world, forsooth, because these beings having their different thoughts, opinions, and conceptions, bring these again to Earth, and thus differ as much as mortal men and women do upon the earthly plane? If the argument does not hold good in one instance, why should it hold good in the other? If you are to reject communion with the spirit-world, because there are different opinions held there, then you must reject communion with earthly beings because there are different opinions among them!

Now, as to the doctrines referred to by our friend, will the Chairman kindly read from the text we pointed out to him? The CHAIRMAN read as follows:

33rd verse.—"The Jews answered him, saying, for a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.  
34th verse.—"Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said *ye are gods*?"

35th verse.—"If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken.

36th verse.—"Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God!

37th verse.—"If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.

38th verse.—"But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him.'

Mr. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now mark the words: "they were *gods* to whom the word of God came, also," "*ye are gods.*" Paul makes an admission to the same effect. Is not this a parallel of what certain so-called Spiritualists have said? Granting *argumentum ad hominem*, that this is one of the doctrines of the Spiritualists, is it not paralleled by the teachings of Jesus himself? It is exactly to the same point. So we have even found a parallel for that teaching of Spiritualists in the Bible. (Applause.) We do not say we endorse such a theory; but we merely point to the parallel. How came it that our friend omitted to quote from such writers as William and Mary Howitt, Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall, Professor Alfred Wallace, Professor Hare, Stanton Moses, and many others of similar standing? How came it, when he referred to our earthly friend's production, ("Holy Truth") and, after complimenting our friend, and paying such a high tribute of respect to him, and esteem for his book, how came it, we say, that, after reading the quotation about the Supreme Being, in Whom our respected friend and all Spiritualists believe, he ventured to assert that we *rejected* such a Supreme Being? After reading this book, speaking so expressly to the point, and confessing with conscientious and devotional pride, not only the belief in, but the introspective knowledge of a Supreme Being, why had he the temerity, then, to assert that Spiritualists are "Atheists?" We do not call the books we mentioned authorities; but we accept the teachings of those high and noble-minded Spiritualists who make it their duty to thoroughly study the points at issue, and, in their daily lives, carry out the noble precepts and maxims of the Spiritual philosophy. How is it that our friend has rejected the writings of these, and, in lieu thereof, given us the evidence of individuals, who, by their lives and conduct, were a disgrace to the cause beneath which they sought protection? (Hear, hear.)

We said, last evening, that we did not profess to defend the shortcomings, weaknesses, faults, follies, crimes, and vices of Spiritualists, any more than our friend will undertake to defend the vices, crimes, and errors of Christians—any more than he will undertake to befriend those old sages, writers, and prophets in the Bible, with their seven hundred wives, and three hundred concubines, &c. It is indeed to be lamented that there are such men in the ranks, so tainted with the prevailing vices of the world; but, until our friend shows that such men are *only* found among the Spiritualists, his argument is of no avail. (Applause.) As we said before, lunatic asylums were not built purposely for Spiritualists, neither were gaols erected for *their* special accommodation, but for Christians, who occupied and filled them *before* Spiritualism, as a term, became known. (Applause.)

In the course of our opponent's arguments, instances have been given you where spirits had deceived him and others, and a great point was made of a quotation from Randolph, about his having been deceived by a spirit claiming to be his own mother. What really does this prove? Does he wish to say that because Randolph was deceived by a spirit claiming to be his mother, that, therefore, *all* spirits are deceivers? Would that be admissible logic? And would he like to put it into a syllogistic form. (Laughter.) If so, then we might apply the same logic to all mundane matters, and say that Arthur Orton, *alias* Roger Tichborne, deceived her that was supposed to be his mother, to that extent that she claimed the impostor as her son, *therefore*, all human beings must deceive, and do deceive their mothers! (Laughter.) Is our opponent going to carry *that* logic to its legitimate end, and stand by it? If not, then the argument in Randolph's case is out of court. We admit there may be, and are, deceptions; but that does not prove that there are no truths, no realities in the phenomena. We admit there are counterfeits; but, whilst so admitting, we claim that the genuine is behind, for the genuine coin must exist before it can be counterfeited. You should use your judgment in this as in all else, for, as John said, "believe not every spirit," therefore make use of all your experience, reason, and knowledge—in fact, everything that you can summon to your aid, to test these spirits. First of all, however, you must test those through whom the spirits communicate, so that you may have perfect confidence in both, and believe nothing on mere assertion or upon the mere *ipsi dixit* of either him who claims to be the channel of the communication or the spirit communicating. You are enjoined, in the first epistle of John, to "try the spirits;" and we also ask you to investigate and give all your spare moments to the consideration of, and calm deliberation on, this important subject, and thus devise means of ascertaining who are true and who are false, accepting the counsels of the one, and rejecting those of the other. We cannot see how Randolph could test these matters, because as we have shown, he was of unsound mind, and, therefore, could not be admitted as a judge upon the subject. (Hear, hear.)

Coming to another matter, it is with pleasure we answer our friend, where he wished to show that there was no proof upon our side,—but that we simply claimed the proof and did not produce it; he also attempted to show that certain passages, that we first quoted, and which he attempted to review, did not at all apply to Spiritualism. In reference to this we promise our friend that we will produce proofs before the close of the evening.

Let us turn to that part of the Gospels where Jesus is about "ascending into heaven," or into the spirit-world,—call it by whichever name you please, the idea is the same. He is dispensing the new gospel, and is giving commands to his followers. "Go ye forth into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. These signs shall follow those that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them, they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover."

Our friend says these remarks were particular: they were for the first disciples of Jesus and for those that believed the disciples. Now if that be so, if that clause did apply simply to those particular beings, then we need not believe in order to be saved, nor disbelieve in order to be damned, for it only applied to those individuals. (Applause and laughter.) You will, however, find that the contrary was the case if you refer to what Peter said after describing the day of Pentecost; when "there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind," which "filled all the house where they were sitting" when the people wondered at the display of languages by these humble men, Peter stood up and said, making reference to the prophet Joel: "And it shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God, I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and' your daughters shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." And then the speaker goes on to say: "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and *to all that are afar off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Why should Paul say in the 1st chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, 11th verse: "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift to the end ye may be established." Why should we be told not to be loth to entertain strangers because we might thus "entertain angels unawares?" Why should we be told to "covet the best gifts," if there are no "gifts" to covet? The question, then, is: were the Gospel promises of the New Testament simply to the first disciples, or to all the world? If to all the world, then we have these "gifts;" if simply to those disciples, then what have we to do with the New Testament, or these promises? As an offset to these arguments which we have adduced before, our friend quoted, from the 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians, where Paul says: "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away," in fact everything was to pass away but charity. "For when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Now, really, friends, what is *the perfect* thing which is referred to here? Is it the perfection of the Church? Where is the perfect Church? We ask where is it; that we may look on its perfection? (Laughter) Then, again, it says:—knowledge shall vanish." Has knowledge vanished? Do we know anything to-day? Are we all utterly ignorant? It may be admitted, certainly, that some are so; but we do think there is knowledge *somewhere*, if we can only get at it. If it is not possessed by those who claim to teach, still others have it, and therefore, it has not vanished,—so how can our friend say this prophecy is fulfilled? If the signs that were promised to those that believe abound now in the Christian Church, where are they? If the Church has lost them, then you must look somewhere else for them, and where, we ask, can you find them outside the Catholic Church, and modern Spiritualism? (Applause.)

Mr. GREEN:

I am very happy to see that my friend is increasing in his knowledge of the scriptures. He evidently has refreshed his memory since last night, and hence we have had a quotation from the gospel of St. Mark. It would be as well if he had refreshed his memory also from the book of Acts, so that he would not make such mistakes as he did in his last speech, for when he was quoting from the latter book, he used the word give instead of the word call. His spirit-guides ought certainly to be better acquainted with their subject than to make mistakes in their quotations.

Now, in regard to what was said last night, my friend was rather facetious, though, notwithstanding the fact that some appeared to have their risible faculties excited by what he said in reference to the menagerie, I must confess that I am at a loss, after twenty-four hours' meditation, to see the point, nor can I see how it bears in the least degree upon the subject we have in debate. Now, I wish you to remember that it was not I who brought up the case of Daniel. My friend mentioned Daniel's as one of those cases in the Bible that paralleled the phenomena of modern Spiritualism, and I simply asked him where the case in modern Spiritualism was that Daniel's case paralleled. He has not yet produced that case, but he gave us last night the fact of persons in connection with menageries of wild beasts having a certain amount of power and control over those beasts. Well now, if those persons do not profess to exercise that control through spirit-agency, I must confess that I am so obtuse as not to be able to see that this is a parallel to the case of Daniel. I am also at a loss to see how these men could do as they do, unless the animals were trained, and unless they had weapons with which to over-awe the beasts. Even then, as our friend confessed, these men were not always unharmed, but would sometimes lose their heads or be torn in pieces. But, taking these cases, and comparing them with that of Daniel, they afford no parallel, even supposing it were contended that the men were aided by the resources of modern Spiritualism; for Daniel was a stranger to the lions, they were ravenous and untamed beasts, and Daniel had no beam of iron to intimidate them. Moreover, when Daniel was liberated from the terrible position in which he had been placed by the barbarous edict of the king, and when those men who had been instrumental in putting him there, together with their wives and families, were themselves thrown into the den, what takes place? Why, the beasts break the bonds in which they had been held back from Daniel, and tear these people to pieces, even, as the narrative states, "before they reached the ground." Let me ask my friend's attention to that point. We want a parallel in modern Spiritualism to this case. He quoted it from the Bible as a parallel to certain phenomena, which he asserts do exist in connection with modern Spiritualism, and we want to know *where* they are?

Now, in regard to Christ being taken to the pinnacle of the temple, and there being tempted to commit suicide as a set-off to the case of that woman I spoke of as being incited over and over again by the spirits to destroy herself, I say there is no parallel in the slightest degree. There is no sin in being tempted; but there is sin

in deliberately going into the way of temptation. We say our spirit-friends are unwise in going into the way of temptation,—in seeking this spirit-intercourse, and thus laying themselves open to communications from these wicked spirits that tempt them to do wrong. (Applause.) May I say to you, in regard to this matter of the devil going about "as a roaring lion," which my friend says is the foundation of a great part of the basis of Christianity, that he has altogether either misunderstood or misread it. The words are, "be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary (not your friend), as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour." I never found fault with my friends for resisting the devil; why I blame my Spiritualistic friends is for making a *Friend* of the devil. (Loud applause.) Let me give you proof as to this making a friend of the devil. In the *Banner of Light* (a standard paper among Spiritists) for the 1st March, 1862, we have the following invocation. Another one follows it, but my time will not allow me to give them both, as this is to be the last night of debate; for though I have urgently asked my friend to give me another night, he has persistently refused. This is an invocation given in connection with Spiritist manifestations:—"Oh, thou Prince of Darkness, and King of Light, God, and Devil, greater and lesser good, perfect and imperfect being, we ask and demand of thee that we may know thee, for to know thee is to know more of ourselves. (Applause.) And if to do this it be necessary to wander in Hell, yea and amen, we will wander there with the spirits of darkness. The Church and the world tell us that the Devil goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, but we know thee only as God's viceregent, to stand at his left hand, the regenerator of mankind, the means of bringing up all things, intellectually and morally to perfection." Now, I affirm this is given as a serious matter in the *Banner of Lights* and was the invocation given just prior to the delivery of a lecture. I could read you another prayer offered by Lizzie Doten in the Lyceum Hall, at Boston, on December 8th, 1861, but, as I have said, my time will not permit it.

You have heard what my friend has said in regard to these spiritual gifts which our spiritist friends claim to possess. Again, I have only time to ask where are they? but echo only answers, where? In regard to his reference to Mark, may I just say that the Bible interprets itself, and that this passage is self-interpreting. If he will look at it he will see that the words are: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature." That is an universal proposition, and then you will notice that it says: "And these signs shall follow them that believe." It does not say these signs shall follow *everyone* that believes; why? Because the Saviour knew that they would not; and for this reason:—that he intended that his apostles should alone have the power to impart spiritual gifts and the power to work miracles, by the laying on of their hands; and, therefore, as I remarked last night, so soon as the last person died, upon whom the last apostle laid his hands, then the power ceased to be exercised. My friend tried to make a point about knowledge ceasing. Now, if his memory were not so conveniently defective in this matter, he would know that I referred to miraculous knowledge. Not the ordinary knowledge, such, for instance, as that which he has

acquired since last night, by either reading, or having read to him, while in his peculiar psychological state, that passage from St. Mark.

I have again to ask for those parallels from modern Spiritualism to the cases which have been cited from the Bible. Will my friend produce them? He was hypercritical last night about the word "identical," used by me. I did not use the words "identical cases." I said I wanted identically *parallel* cases in modern Spiritism with those mentioned in the Bible, in order that we might see that his affirmation, that modern Spiritism, in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena, is supported and paralleled in the Bible, was not a mere empty assertion.

I called your attention last night to the uncertainty of these spirit-communications, and my friend has referred to it again. He says: "Because this person or the other may have been deceived, is that proof that all are deceived?" No; but if ninety-five per cent. are deceived, then who can be certain that he is not deceived? Did I not give you proof of the assertions I made from this book entitled "Holy Truth?" Did I not give you statements, not from Randolph alone, but also from Mr. Newton, and Andrew Jackson Davis, in which my affirmations were absolutely confirmed? The latter, indeed, asserted that it required a very keen penetration to detect whether these spirits are counterfeit or not. May I not legitimately call your attention to this fact—that you *never can be certain* that your friends are speaking to you? Intercourse with *friends* is the very essence, and the most attractive part, of the theory of the Spiritualists' intercourse with departed spirits; and if it can be shown that there is no possibility of being certain that you are having intercourse with your friends, does it not show the unreliability and worthlessness of the system? Our friend rejects Christianity, because, forsooth, he says he cannot get mathematical demonstration of its truth, as clear as can be given of Euclid's propositions! I may tell him that it is beyond his power to demonstrate even all the problems of Euclid. We have, however, given him mathematical demonstration in connection with the prophecies, which he has not attempted to rebut. Let him now give us this demonstration in proof of Spiritualism. Whilst he demands this demonstration in regard to all Christian truths, he comes to us with his Spiritism, and says, "here is a great and universal panacea for all your woes;" and he wishes us to give up the glorious light of the gospel, which shines forth from this book, for a system, one of the leading characteristics of which is communion with our departed dear ones; and yet, we are assured by Spiritists themselves, that in about ninety-nine cases out of a hundred we are likely to be deceived as to whether they really are our friends and dear ones that communicate or not!! Have we not a right to ask for some means of knowing, with certainty, when we have communications from these spirits, that they are what they profess to be? I told you last night of a gentleman who was then present, and who confessed to me that although he had been for more than ten years an ardent believer in Spiritism, and had earnestly been seeking for some communication from his departed friends, he had never yet had a single vestige of a sign! Even when you do get communications you are more likely to be deceived than otherwise.

I mentioned to you that the Hell which our Spiritist friends believe in is much worse than the orthodox Hell. Now, here is an extract from a book or pamphlet that was circulated in Melbourne, and which is dated 1st February, 1875. A spirit is supposed to be communicating, and after referring to the orthodox ideas of Hell, it says: "I was in a Hell inconceivably worse than the one of tire and brimstone." Must it not be a fearful place if it is worse than the orthodox one? "The goadings of remorse I experienced were terrible, and the agonies which I suffered cannot be conceived. My prayer is that no other soul may go down to such depth, and be compelled to travel up through such Hells." Now, where is there a human being, who has arrived at years of conscious knowledge, who has not been guilty of wrong? who has not injured individuals, either intentionally or unintentionally? Yet, in the principles affirmed by Spiritists, there is no escape for him from the inevitable Hell. When a man does wrong he must suffer for that wrong in this Spiritualist Hell. He must moan, and groan, and labor, until he is able to work out his own salvation; and every one is put in the same position. Every one of you Spiritualists, who have lived to years of discretion, must go through this Hell, which is worse than the orthodox Hell. I ask you where is the comfort this theory gives? Do not believe your friends when they tell you they are in happiness. It is a lie; they are deceiving spirits; because the inevitable laws of the Spiritualists demand that they should be in Hell, and be passing through its purgatorial fires, ere they can reach the Elysian fields of Heaven. I ask, again, where is the comfort? It is robbed of every particle, and we feel that if it were only Spiritualism we had, life would not be worth having, because of this hell, *inconceivably worse* than the orthodox hell. I tell you if it were not for the remedial system of Christianity, well might we say that the dark pall of midnight covered all the human race. Better ten thousand times that we were buried in oblivion, than that we should continue alive with such a fearful future in store for us. (Loud applause.)

Let me ask you to notice another point. My friend asked me for mathematical demonstration, and I returned the compliment, and asked him for mathematical demonstration, in regard to his psychological condition. It is a legitimate point, and therefore I shall now notice it. You remember he said if I would give him board and lodging for six months, he would convince me of the truth of all that he professes as to his state. Now, I would point out that this would be a very slow process of conversion, seeing that it would take fifty years to convince one hundred persons. It would also be a very costly process, for, reckoning this board and lodging at a very moderate rate, the cost of convincing these one hundred persons would be no less a sum than two thousand six hundred pounds. But is it not, to say the least, a very singular way of giving proof of the truth of what he asserts. Now, supposing I had said that if he gave me board and lodging for six months, I would demonstrate the truth of Christianity, would it not have raised your laughter? Suppose the Apostle Paul, instead of working miracles, and thus proving his inspiration, had said to some of those unbelieving Corinthians and Ephesians, "Though I cannot prove to you now that I possess these powers, yet



if you will keep me for six months, I will show you by mathematical demonstration that I do!!" I do not doubt that my friend is in a trance. I do not say my friend is imposing upon this audience; but I believe that he is deceiving himself, or being deceived by others. Trance is a condition in which people are *supposed* to be influenced by unseen beings. Dr. Beard declares that trance is functional disease of the nervous system in which cerebral activity is concentrated in some limited region of the brain, which causes a suspension of activity in the rest of the brain, and consequent loss of volition. Supposing you turn out all those gas-jets but one, will you not see an increase in the light of that remaining one? Will it not flame up in consequence of the other outlets being stopped?—unquestionably it will. My friend's condition is one in which there is a suspension of a large portion of his faculties, and the activity of the brain is concentrated upon one set of faculties. Hence the power of memory, of language, and other faculties, are so intensified, that we have results which, in some respect, may be considered remarkable, but which, after all, are easily explainable from natural causes. Dr. Beard fully explains these phenomena, and clearly describes our friend's condition of trance. He explains also how persons can get into this entranced state in a moment, or they may do it gradually; and he mentions a number of things which will cause it. He says that observation shows that not only the imagination, but the reasoning faculties, as well as the power of language, are oftentimes greatly increased in their activity in this state of trance, as the performances of trance-speakers illustrate. Weak-minded men and women (it is said my friend is an ignoramus in his normal state, though I do not believe it), who, in their normal state, have little to say, when in trance, are able to speak continuously and fluently. Whilst there has been much exaggeration of the originality and value of these trance speeches, yet it cannot be denied that, with all their repetition and frequent senselessness, they are far beyond the capacity of the same person when not in trance. (Applause.) [Time expired.]



MR. WALKER:

We will not follow our friend's arguments, in the order in which he brought them forward, but we will notice those first that appear most prominent. We would especially draw your attention to those remarks which he made in reference to the "orthodox" and Spiritualist Hells. He has given the evidence of a few spirits, who have been in the Spiritualist Hell, apparently, but have never been in the "orthodox" Hell: so we ask, how they can be permitted to judge and compare between the two? When the spirits produce their credentials to certify that they remained some length of time as well in the "orthodox" Hell, then we will admit their evidence. Now, whilst we are upon this point, we will ask our Chairman to turn to paragraphs on page 72, of a work by, our earthly friend Dr. J. M. Peebles, entitled "Witch Poison," where we shall see the descriptions that are given

by a few "orthodox" Christians, in reference to the Hell they believe in; and then we shall see if the spirit-Hell is any worse than, or indeed equal to, it. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"Infinite justice arrests the souls of the guilty, and confines them in the dark prison of Hell, till they have satisfied all its demands by their personal sufferings, which, alas! they can never do . . . . God will exert *all His* divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacity of their nature will admit."—*Rev. M. Benson's Commentary.*

"When the damned have drunken down whole draughts of brimstone one day, they must do the same another day. The eye shall be tormented with the sight of devils, the ears with the hideous yellings and outcries of the *damned in flames*, the nostrils shall be smothered, as it were, with *brimstone*, the tongue, the hand, the foot, and every part, shall  *fry in flames.*"—*Rev. Ambrose's Discourse on Doomsday.*

"The happiness of the elect in Heaven will, in part, consist in witnessing the torments of the damned in Hell. And among these it may be their own children, parents, husbands, wives, and friends on Earth. One part of the business of the blessed is to celebrate the doctrine of reprobation. While the decree of reprobation is eternally executing on the vessels of wrath, the smoke of their torment will be eternally ascending in view of the vessels of mercy, who, instead of taking the part of those miserable objects, will say, 'Amen, hallelujah, praise the Lord!'"—*Emmons's Sermons, XVI*

"When they (the saints) shall see how great the misery is from which God hath saved them, and how great a difference He hath made between their state and the state of others, who were by nature, and perhaps by practice, no more sinful and ill-deserving than they, it will give them more a sense of the wonderfulness of God's grace to them. Every time they look upon the damned, it will excite in them a lively and acquiring sense of the grace of God in making them so to differ. The sight of Hell-torments will exalt the happiness of the saints for ever."—*lb. Sermon, XI*

"The saints in glory will be far more sensible how dreadful the wrath of God is, and will better understand how terrible the sufferings of the damned are, yet this will be no occasion of grief to them, but rejoicing. They will not be sorry for the damned; it will cause no uneasiness or dissatisfaction to them, but, on the contrary, when they see this sight, it will occasion rejoicing, and excite them to joyful praises."—*Rev. Edwards' Practical Sermons.*

"The godly wife shall applaud the justice of the Judge in condemnation of her *ungodly husband*. The godly husband shall say *amen!* to the damnation of her who lay in his bosom!<sup>v</sup> The godly parents shall say *hallelujah!* at the passing of the sentence of their ungodly child. And the godly child, shall from the heart, approve the *damnation* of

his wicked parent, who begot him, and the mother who bore him."—*Rev. Thomas Boston's Four-fold State*—p. 336.

"This will fill them (the saints) with astonishing *admiration* and wondering joy, when they see some of their near relatives going to Hell; their fathers, their mothers, their children, their husbands, their wives, their intimate friends and companions, while they themselves are saved! . . . Those affections they now have for relations *out* of Christ will *cease*; and they will not have the *least trouble* to see them sentenced to *Hell*, and thrust into the *fiery furnace!*"—*Rev. Thos. Vincent on Calvinism*.

"The rich man tormented in Hell, 'lifted up his eyes' and saw Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, and to his entreaties for succour and intercession Abraham had replied, 'Between us and; you there is a great gulf fixed.' . . . Water boils at two hundred and twelve degrees Fahrenheit, but it requires two thousand and six hundred degrees to melt rocks. This, therefore, was the *minimum* of the heat of Hell, whose *frontiers*, therefore, lie twenty-one miles below the *surface* of the *Earth*. . . . In these eternal fires every limb and member of our bodies, every nerve, and muscle, and tendon, every part of us, in fire, over which the sense of feeling predominated, would be for ever racked and tortured, and yet never consumed."—*Rev. M. Walworth*.

Mr. WALKER: These are extracts from the sermons of "orthodox" ministers. It is true they may be but the opinions of these men; but, if we are simply testing opinions, these opinions are just as valid, coming from "orthodox" Christians, as those opinions to the contrary are coming from Spiritualists. You will mark this difference, that though these spirits go to a Hell, which is said to be inconceivably worse than the "orthodox" Hell, *still they all have a chance of rising to higher and happier regions.* (Applause.) Whereas, as our friend puts it, or rather, as those individuals from whom we quoted put it—for we do not suppose our friend will endorse the views, as the matter is placed before you by those individuate—you are to be eternally frying, singeing, and broiling in flames of brimstone for ever and ever, if you believe not that which is impossible for you to believe as decreed by a God of Love!!! And this is the *inviting* Christian doctrine, which our friend would have us all embrace! Oh, *all* we sinners, who are we that we can expect to get to heaven? Can anyone of us say that we are without sin, when, according to our friend's assertions, we all possess within us the elements of eternal sin and damnation! Why damn the best, the ablest, the wisest, and noblest minds to eternal frizzling flames, and only send a *few* especially favored saints to a blissful heaven? If that is the doctrine of Christianity, then we say that the Spiritualist creed is *infinitely* superior. (Hear, hear, and applause.) The Spiritualist belief is this: that, although you suffer for every violation of law, spiritual, physical, mental, or moral, yet this suffering is not of a vindictive or revengeful character; but it is simply the effect of the transgression; and by going through the ordeal you may be brought again to the state of purity you have lost, or, indeed, to a state of

much greater purity. You have an illustration of tins in the sufferings and diseases you have to undergo in consequence of violating Nature's laws. You must endure all the agonies of a fever before you can be restored to health; and so, the sufferings of the Spiritualist Hell, to every sinner, are necessary for the purposes of purification. And one maxim of Spiritualism is that there is not a child of Nature, not a child of the infinite God, be he dressed in rags or in fine clothing, whether he strut about in gorgeous apparel, or kneel at the table to eat the crumbs that fall from the rich man's plate,—whether he be in the gutter or seated on the throne, it matters not—that child is still a child of the One Father of us all; and the kindness of that God, which is infinitely superior to that of mortal fathers, will in time redeem that child unto Himself. Thus, the sufferers in that condition of pain will pass out from their bitter experience (which they have brought upon *themselves* by violating God's laws) into a state of happiness, purity, and goodness, on the steps of the ladder of progression. But we would point out to you, that you can never escape the result of violated law by the suffering of an innocent person for you. Would it make a man less guilty, if he were charged in this world with a crime, if another were to offer to suffer punishment for him? Suppose we take a case: There is a prisoner tried for manslaughter or murder. The decree is that the individual, who has thus violated the law, is to have his life suddenly, but legally (?), terminated. Would it make that man less guilty if some poor and innocent individual were to be killed in his place? No: there would still be the crime at the door of the guilty one. Then, what would be the good of the innocent suffering for the guilty? We, on the other hand, ask of the infinite God to bestow that justice upon us which He teaches us to give to one another, and we expect it. Thus, in this respect, Spiritualism is shown to be infinitely *superior* to "orthodoxy," as represented by those exponents of its tenets from whom we have just quoted. (Hear, hear!)

We must now go to another point which our friend raised, in reference to our making "the Devil" our friend. Now, should we not, after all, "give the Devil his due?" Did he not invent the printing press, and lucifer matches, and help to discover the circulation of the blood? And, in more modern days, has he not brought glad teachings from the heavens, and brought our loved ones back again that we may receive them—that is, if the version of his works given by "orthodox" Christians be correct? Why not rather give him thanks for this? Why, because he is evil, should we be evil to him? If he is friendly, let those to whom he is so be friendly to him. We do not say that we believe that "the Devil" exists as a personage; therefore, we cannot covet him, either as a father or friend. You do not condemn Christianity because Jesus was said to have been tempted of the Devil! If the invocation instanced were rightly understood, it would be taken merely as a sarcastic way or using the "orthodox" phraseology—(Hear, hear),—and not as being an actual prayer to him in, whom Spiritualists do not believe as a personage; so that, in reality, we do not, in any sense, make this imaginary being our friend. We do not look upon him, even if he *did* exist, as a being with whom we would delight to communicate. Has not every

one of those authors our worthy opponent has quoted from told us that you are to study whom to reject, and at all times to use your common sense, your judgment, and abilities to their highest extent—to refuse the evil and take only the good, and to bring to bear every faculty you can to detect the evil influences when they come. Find us a single Spiritualist who will say that he believes it is well to communicate with the evil, or who would seek their presence at his *seance*, in his circle, or in his household! There is not one of them but would reject the evil influences, if they knew they were present. We are told to try the spirits, so we do not make these evil beings our friends. We claim that all those spirits who do communicate, are the spirits of those who were once in the flesh. (Hear, hear.) Some of them, no doubt, are undeveloped, and when you consider that in your Christian lands there are those dying in your prison-houses, those that you send from the gallows to Keep us company, those that you send, ignorant and depraved, from the gutters, many of them starved to death in your wealthy cities, and of a truth, all these are thronging our spheres; and because, forsooth, one of them attempts to communicate with the circle, or with a father or brother,—it matters not,—the Spiritualists and Spiritualism are forthwith condemned; and it is said that intercourse is held even with the Devil! When you upon Earth cease to preach to the "heathen" in foreign lands, and preach to your heathens at home, when you benefit those who are among you and purify them from being liars into truth-speakers, and convert your impure and vicious characters into noble and good ones, and thus people our spheres with a better class of spirits, then we promise you that you will never have an evil spirit communicating with you again. (Applause.)

We really are amused at another line of argument our friend adopted. It was in reference to those texts of scripture which we beg to refer to again; and for quoting which he complimented us upon our memory. How he obtained the revelation that we, or our medium, had been reading up, we know not. However, we will credit him with the revelation, though the fact is, at present, we are ignorant as to how he got it. He says the Bible here is self-interpreting. How does he obtain the knowledge that Jesus knew so-and-so? Who told him Jesus knew this? Does the Bible say that it was miraculous *knowledge* that was intended? When he shows that it says so, he will then have liberty to use that argument, *in addition* to the record. As, however, it is only the word knowledge which is used, we must accept it as such. We take the Bible to mean what it says. Why should it need the tinkering interpretation of our friend? and how unfortunate it is that we may not all understand it when we read it at first glance! It says: "These signs shall follow them that believe." If they do not, then Jesus told a deliberate falsehood. If he did not tell a deliberate lie, then he told one in ignorance. They were to preach the glad tidings of the gospel to every creature; and every creature that believed, and was baptised, should be "saved," and every creature that did not believe should be "damned!" And then the text proceeds to enumerate the "signs" that were to follow those that believed. Is the text not clear and distinct? Could there be anything more positively stated?—that is, if language means

anything at all! Probably, however, there is some self-interpreting matter in the record itself, which we have overlooked. Probably, there is some text which says distinctly and emphatically that these gifts were to *cease*. Probably, in the Bible, it is somewhere distinctly stated that the last man on whom the last apostle laid hands was to be the last man to exercise these "gifts." We ask our friend kindly to inform us, in our ignorance, where this passage is to be found—to give us the text and verse where this is distinctly and unmistakably affirmed. If he cannot do so, then he has no right to make the assertion he does. (Hear, hear.)

Then, again, let us briefly refer to his review of our remarks concerning Daniel, which we made on a previous evening. We adopted his line of argument. In reply to our assertion that Spiritualists cured the blind, he replied, "so do doctors." We adopted that species of argument, and, when he said Daniel went into the den of lions, we answered, "so do lion-tamers." It was a valid argument when it was used by him in reference to Spiritualism and the curing of the blind; but, a totally different matter when coming from our side! Is this just, we ask, or is it logical?

Again, in reference to the words "identity," and "parallel." We have proved that the appearing of "angels," as recorded in the Bible is paralleled by "angels," or spirits, appearing now; but we do not undertake to parallel lions; for lions do not form part of Spiritual phenomena. Besides, how could we parallel the case of the lions in a country where no lions are found at large. We must have all the conditions equal before there can be an *identical* case. Parallels and identical cases are very different, as we have had repeatedly to remind our friend. Supposing that fires take place in two cities, Before they can be called parallel cases each city must have the same name, and similar buildings, and all the attendant circumstances of the fires must be the same, according to our friend's reasoning, and method of comparison. (Loud applause.)



MR. GREEN:

I may compliment my friend on rendering me very considerable assistance, in his last speech to-night. Before referring however to the point in which assistance has been given, let me say that his reference to the case of the menagerie of lions is something like his remarks about the rivers being turned into blood. I have been pondering over that wonderful statement ever since it was uttered. His Inst remarks have really made me feel mischievous enough to enquire, how could they turn the rivers into blood when Moses had already done it, and never turned them back? (Laughter.)

Now my friend has been of use to me in his remarks about the operations of law from which he says there is no escape. I ask you to ponder over this, dear Spiritualistic friends. There is no escape from the law, and if your friends tell you they are happy, they lie. Every being has done wrong, consciously or unconsciously, and how-

ever unconsciously the wrong may have been done, that spirit must remedy it, and pass through purgatorial fires before it can be in happiness. Our friend asked rather facetiously, whether that spirit which gave its experience of the Spiritualistic Hell had also been in the Orthodox Hell. If so, it was capable of forming a comparison; but if not, he must decline to take its testimony. Well, you know, that only helps my point: I have said over and over again that they are not a bit to be trusted. When a spirit says the Orthodox Hell is not to be compared for a moment with the Spiritist Hell, it is not to be believed! When are they to be believed? Will our friend tell us that? Now, the portions that he read from those works, what do I care about them? Did you not know that I am pleading for New Testament Christianity? If he had read those descriptions of Hell from this book (the Bible) they would have been to the point. Let me tell you this book has nothing of the kind in it. It speaks of Hell, and the Devil, but it has nothing at all like what my friend has spoken of in the quotation read. Let me tell you our Father is a Father who is no respecter of persons: he makes his sun to shine and his rain to descend on the evil and the good alike. In order that all may be saved, God will take care to remedy the wrong that you and I may have done, if we accept the means he has appointed. Friends, you cannot remedy the wrongs you may have done here whilst on Earth, much less can you do so there. I tell you it is beyond your power. I tell you no human being can remedy them. They are irremediable. Say what you will, you cannot make it otherwise. Besides, what is the good of this punishment to the man that is suffering it? My friend speaks of it as though it was of immense good to the one suffering it. If so, then we have also the doctrine of vicarious atonement, taught whereby one receives the benefit of another's suffering! Are men really to suffer these purgatorial agonies of Hell, to right those persons whom they may have wronged on Earth? If one could do that in Hell, or in the unseen world, may not God, our Father, if he so please, vindicate his own law, and manifest his love to man, by sending his son in human form, to suffer and die on behalf of those who have sinned? Christianity shows you a way of deliverance from this Hell. How can you Spiritists have joy in the death of your friends and relations, when you know they are going direct to this Hell? I ask you, how can you be happy? I could not, and I hope I may never, never have the idea that any of my friends are going to such a place. I hope to try and lead all I can to do the Lord's will, that they may escape all this; and God, you may depend upon it, will remedy all the wrong they may have done here.

Another point my friend helped me in was that of the invocation. Now, that invocation was not intended as a sarcasm, but was said in sober earnestness. Our friend wishes us to believe that the person who uttered that invocation to the Devil, did not believe in the Devil. It seems a queer thing to me not to believe in a person's existence, and at the same time to invoke him. This is on a par with the fact that my friend believes that the Deity is himself and all human beings, and yet he invokes him as though he were a distinct and spiritual being. My friend quoted a passage from the New Testament, in regard to Christ's divinity. You will observe that Jesus

reasons thus, in this passage, John 10--34-36—"If certain persons are called 'gods' in your scriptures (using, as you will notice, not the word 'God,' commencing with a capital letter), why do you find fault with me for saying "I am the son of God?" Jesus' words are, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken. Say he of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the son of God?" Why should exception be taken to this? He does not put himself on a level with those who are there called "gods." We do not say that Christ was God; nor do we say that he was man; he was both God and man—"God manifested in the flesh." If you ask me to explain how that can be, I cannot tell you any more than you can tell me how it is that man is not mind nor body, but both body and mind. A corpse is not a man, and a spirit is not a man—man is both in one. Can you explain how it is that water is neither oxygen gas nor hydrogen gas, but both together? Oxygen is not water, nor is hydrogen water; water is oxygen and hydrogen in an intimate and mysterious union. I cannot explain to you how they become water; if you can tell me, then may I be able to tell you how Christ is not man, nor God, but both in one. (Applause.)

Our friend, when speaking of wicked spirits deceiving men, representing a spirit speaking through him, said: "People our spheres with good spirits, and we will take care that no evil ones will visit you," or something to that effect. In other words, *give us good, and we will return good*, but if you send us bad spirits from the world, we can only return you the same! How can these people, who admit they have need of good", and want it themselves, how can they do us good by their teachings? (Applause.) Does it not prove the utter unworthiness of these communications and their unreliability? Does our friend not stand convicted out of his own mouth? (Cries of "no," and disorder, with applause, &c.)

Now let me give you a little quotation. You heard Judge Edmonds and other great lights of Spiritualism mentioned last evening. It is astonishing what weight our friends attach to these men's sayings so long as they remain staunch to the cause; but when they see the error of their ways, as Randolph did, their testimony is scouted. "Oh," they say, "these men were very good at one time, but they are not so now, they are mad," Ac. Now, does not the following from Judge Edmonds, appear utter nonsense? But before I give the extracts from Judge Edmonds let me just take a few from the "Great Harmonia," by Andrew Jackson Davis:—

"On page 127 is an account of a spiritual aviary, where each *rara avis* lays spiritual eggs in the sixth sphere, hatches spiritual birds, and feeds them (the swallows and robins, I suppose,) on spiritual bugs and anglers' worms, and the turkey buzzard on carrion. And in "Supernal Theology," page 33, is an account of a similar institution on Swedenborg street, in the second sphere, except that in this case they raise only robins, humming-birds, and canaries, leaving the cultivation of storks, sand-hill cranes, and buzzards for the spheres above. So, also, in this same "Harmonia," page 428, is an account of a Spiritualist hospital in the spheres, where



Paralorella, or half-cured patients are; and on page 432, of a leather purse which some one found in the sixth sphere; and on the next page a spiritual perpetual motion. I would recommend to the proprietors of this invention, that they secure letters-patent without delay, or some adventurous Yankee will steal it, transplant it to Earth, and set it pumping oil! And on page 435 is a description of stone hammers and flint knives in the spirit-world. And in the delivery of this nonsense, the spirits use such words as these, (and which, I am afraid, our reporter will not be able to take down): Akroapnameda, appilobeda, opeathaleta, spiritual minposassusitiva, and the like! Now, I suppose there are men who call such trash philosophy."—[Quoted from Prof. Carpenter's "The Bible and Spiritualism."]

Now for Judge Edmonds, who saw a spiritual cat of the Thomas persuasion, one Sunday, in the third sphere, sunning himself in the door of a saw-mill. I will read what he says of this mill in his work on Spiritualism: "The saw-mill was at work, with four saws a-going, but I did not see around it any of the litter which I have been accustomed to here; no loose piles of slabs, no heaps of saw-dust, no decaying logs, but everything was neat and orderly. The logs were piled up in heaps, and so arranged as to be very handsome. They were arranged in piles; I counted the base; it consisted of eight logs, then above that seven, and then six, and then so on up to a point. All their rubbish and dirt, I observed, were carried off by a sewer dug underground, and terminating at the precipice already mentioned. By means of a waste weir, all the rubbish was carried off that way, and the water passed clear and pure down through the farm. When I approached, they were sawing a huge log with the whole four saws. It was a singular kind of wood, something like the bird's-eye maple, but the spots were larger, and the wood susceptible of a brighter polish. Each board, as it came from the saw, was finely polished and smoothed, and I examined to see how that was done. The back of each saw was as thick as its front edge, and so constructed that it smoothed and polished, as it went along, the roughness the teeth had made. The mill itself was a beautiful structure. He had time enough to build, and had taken care to ornament it. Just beyond this mill I saw a pasture, in which horses and cows were grazing, and through which ran a stream of water." Then a little further on we have the promise made by the dairy-woman, who was the owner of these cows, to give the Judge a drink of buttermilk the next time he came. I will read a part; in answer to a question, the woman said: "She could not tell by years, only by events; but it was before the Crusades. She added, she remained only a few years in the lower plain, when all three were united, and ascended together. I inquired of the daughter if she had never been married. She answered she supposed I would call it marriage. There was one to whom she was very much attached, and they loved each other's society, and they were a good deal together. He was now at work at the saw-mill, and she said he would come in from the saw-mill, not at all tired with his work, and kick up his heels and go to dancing. 'Yes,' added the mother, 'and you join him in doing so.' She showed me a guitar and flute, and said they played and sang together. The young girl seemed full of frolic, and fun, and joy. She could hardly keep still. As she. and

my daughter sat together, I could not help noticing the difference. My daughter was still and quiet, and apparently very intellectual. "She was not without emotions, but she repressed them, and I saw her once in a while lay her hand on her heart, as if to repress all within. We turned to take our leave, for it was time for us to go. The matron invited me to call on her again, and she would, she said, give me a drink of buttermilk." (Ibid.) Now, I ask you, when persons such as Judge Edmonds write such nonsense as that, and tell us that it all occurs in the third sphere, I ask what good is there in paying attention to any of their utterances.

Let me give you a parody on the 1st chapter of Genesis, which was given by one of the spirits. It is unique of its kind, and is from a spirit communicating through A. J. Davis: "God the life, in God the Lord, in God the Holy procedure, organised the first orb creation, in form of appearing as one globular ovarium, which was the germ of the terrestrial universe of universes, and within the globular was the embryo of the external of the universal, impersonal creation, as one curvilinear the germ of the external of the universal, personal, or intellectual creation in one form of vertical ovarium." (Ibid.) Can you understand it?

Then, again, in the "Harmonial Philosophy," we have the origin of man given thus: "In the beginning of the orb-formation, preparatory for man-formations, vehicles of the quickening spirit into intellectual formations, the universal concavity, and the universal convexity, were co-enfolded and encompassed in the universal zodiac, and within the concavity was the visible disclosure unto the germ of the terrestrial." (Ibid.) Now, can you understand it, I ask? And yet these are the philosophers whose names are held up as those whom we should read. Well, we can only say that, when we have nothing more important to occupy our time, we shall be quite willing to read a little more. Let me give you one portion from Mr. Gridley's astounding facts, being the statements of disembodied spirits: "Is it possible that a man who loves rum in this world carries that love with him to the next? Yes, it is certainly true. A spirit can enter the body of a drunken brute in human form, and partake of the exhilarating influence of his cups with the greatest ease imaginable, or he can lay his face through the staves of a hogshead of rum, and inhale its fumes till he is intoxicated, and literally insane, like a man in *delirium tremens*."

Now, I ask you, friends, if there has not been sufficient presented to show how utterly worthless and unreliable, in every sense of the word, are these communications? Have not my friend's own statements, in his last speech, confirmed, in the amplest manner, all I have said on this point? See how my friend is shirking these matters of the parallels. (Cries of "no," and disorder.) Where are the prophecies, as parallels to those I gave you the other night? Where are the miracles? I ask where is the inspiration? Let me ask my friend, has he produced one passage from the Bible that *supports* modern Spiritualism? Has he met those passages that I quoted, which condemned dealing with familiar spirits, which, as he asserts, if they had their full sway, would revolutionise society? That is his only reply, and yet he presumes to affirm that he has proved that the

Bible *supports* and *parallels* modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena! I ask, has he done so? Has he even attempted to do so? I call upon him now to show where the Bible *supports* modern Spiritualism; to show us where it has repealed the laws against those who had communications with familiar spirits. Where, I ask, in this book, are those sentences reversed? I again, with emphasis, claim to be shown *where* the Bible supports and parallels modern Spiritualism, in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena! Where is the passage, I ask again? (Loud applause.)



MR. WALKER:

Will our friend kindly refer to Vol. I of Crowell's "Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism," p. 118, where the very proofs will

be found which our worthy opponent asked for, and concerning which he said that, if he could find such evidence, he would be led into the arena of Spiritualism. He said he wanted to follow truth, even if it led him to Juggernaut, or anywhere else. Now, will our Chairman read, as rapidly as possible, an account of some of these healing miracles, as performed by the Zouave Jacob.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"Henry Jacob, musician in the regiment of Zouaves, of the Imperial Guard, was born on the 6th March, 1828, at St. Martin (Saone and Loire), in France. His education consisted of one year at the common school, in which time he learned to read and write. After twenty years' faithful service in the army, having been in the Crimean war, and in Africa, he was honorably discharged. His book is written in reply to numerous letters, asking for information, and instruction in the art of healing. He says, 'You demand of me to know how I became a healing medium. All that I can say is, that I have a conviction that this power is given me for the relief of my fellow-men, and that I have brought it to its present perfection by practising virtue, fraternity, charity, and the love of God, and by instructing all who come to me in the doctrines of Spiritualism. Before my initiation into Spiritualism, I was living in darkness. My heart had never felt the sweet Sowings of peace, my soul had never known true joy. I lived attached to the world, with all the excitements and turmoils of materiality, without realising that there was a better world, which God, the Father of all, had made for the ineffable enjoyment of those who practise goodness here below. . . My intercourse with the spirits, and their good counsels, have filled me with a living faith, and confirmed me in the truths of Spiritualism, which have strengthened my faith, and by that faith the faculty of healing has been given to me. My first conscious healing was to make rise, from his bed, a comrade suffering from the severe pains of cholera. I laid my hands upon him, by impression, and he was soon relieved. . . Love

ye one another, and ye will all find that ye possess more or less of the faculty of relieving each other's pains, and many of you will become skilful healers. Be ye always charitable, and generous, and ye will always be aided by good spirits. This is my prayer." My God, give me power, and permit good and benevolent spirits to come and assist me in my holy intention to do this work of charity, which I desire to accomplish, that this suffering one may be relieved, and unto Thy name be the praise, and may Thy blessing rest upon us all." Believe, have faith, and when you would relieve pain, after your prayer, put your hand upon the heart, and ask for the living fire of God to be given to you, and I have the conviction that a divine afflatus will fill you, and you will be enabled to relieve and heal your brethren who are suffering. At the camp at Chalons, in 1866, the fame of Jacob, as a healer, created as great an excitement as it has more recently done in Paris. The crowds that assembled daily round his tent, obliged the officer in charge to put an end to this healing practice. His fame at Versailles became a trouble, almost a nuisance, to the fine corps to which he belonged. They were beset by inquiries from the curious, from Paris and all parts of France, being stopped continually and interrogated about the wonderful power of their celebrated comrade, so that they were inclined to hide themselves when they saw any one, especially a countryman, approach. At Versailles, after attending to his duties as a soldier, in the morning, he came to the city (Paris) in the afternoon, to perform 'miraculous cures.' The blind, the deaf, the palsied, the sick, and the dying, were restored at once to health. Crowds of crippled and diseased humanity pressed into the court-yard of No. 80, Rue de la Raquette, where he worked his cures, and came away, it is asserted, whole and well, without taking any medicine, or submitting to any surgical operation. He received no pay for the boon conferred, but rich and poor were freely healed. Daily there was to be seen in the neighborhood a great crowd of carriages and pedestrians, attracted by his fame, and two hours before the arrival of the Zouave, the court was thronged with invalids, sitting, standing, and lying, who beguiled the time spent in waiting by relating stories of his cures. A score of policemen were always on hand to keep order. As the cured came out, they were greeted with frantic cheers by the spectators, many of whom would climb to the tops of the houses to get a nearer view. Persons were transported on litters, or carried in men's arms to his presence, many being so utterly helpless as to be unable to sit upright, and only able to support themselves by leaning against each other. As soon as the room was full, Jacob entered and said, 'Let no one speak until I question him, or I shall go away.' Perfect silence ensued. He then went from one sick person to another, telling each exactly the disease from which he or she was suffering. Then, to

the paralytic, he simply said 'Rise.' In about twenty minutes, Jacob dismissed the crowd." "M. de Chateau Villard, who had been paralysed for years, was present on one of these occasions, and after Jacob had willed the disease to depart, he walked to his carriage without the slightest difficulty, and when his wife wished to express her gratitude to Jacob, he immediately imposed silence and said, 'Other sufferers await me; you are cured, let that suffice: Be-gone!' The (manner in which his cures were effected is thus described by a correspondent of the *Birmingham Gazette*, and, as the story of an eye-witness, it is worthy of perusal. He says: 'The Zouave admits no one to his presence, who is not really afflicted with disease or infirmity; those who are led to the Rue de la Raquette by curiosity, being compelled to remain in the waiting room. Fortunately, I was furnished with a letter from his best friend, and became privileged at once. I entered the room, with twenty of the most ragged and dirty of the whole mob, and am thus enabled to describe the scene. The Zouave was standing as if in a reverie, when we entered pell-mell into the long, low apartment, where the cures were performed. He was leaning against the wall with his eyes half open, after the fashion of somnambulists before entering completely into a trance, the only difference being in the intense light shot out from the living orbs, beneath the drooping eyelids. He neither spoke nor moved, while his father busied himself in arranging the visitors, on the low, wooden benches before him. Every crutch and stick was taken from the infirm patients, and placed in the corners behind the door, amid the timid whines of the poor frightened creatures, accustomed to look upon the help afforded by these objects as absolutely necessary to their safety. When all were seated thus, leaning the one against the other, the father, going close up to the son, whispered in his ear. He was aroused in a moment, and coming forward with a movement, brusque and hurried, savoring of the military camp, and not in the least of the magician's sanctuary, he walked up and down for a few minutes before the eager line of sufferers. To each he told the disease under which he or she was suffering, and the original cause of the malady, and as no objection was made in any one case, I am led to suppose him to have been right in all. Presently, however, I observed him to stop suddenly, and fix his eye upon one of the patients, who sat at the extreme end of the second bench, and, after examining him for a moment, turn aside with a slight shudder, which I observed was neither of disgust nor dread, but a kind of involuntary recoil. He said abruptly, pointing with his forefinger straight into the face of the individual he addressed, 'I can do nothing for your disease, it is beyond my power, go, and remember it is useless to return.' . . . The Zouave again passed before the line, uttering simply the words, 'Rise and walk.' The sound which simultaneously

burst from the assembly could find no fitting description in any language. It was a sort of moaning whine. A kind of infantine wailing, evidently produced by fear and doubt. One feeble old beggar-woman, whose head had stopped its palsied shaking from the moment Jacob had fixed his glittering eye upon her, was the one who gave expression to the feeling which had evidently taken possession of them all. 'Oh, how can I move without my crutches?' And, having turned a yearning look towards the corner where those old friends and supporters were standing with a host of others, she began to mumble and moan most piteously. But the Zouave looked for an instant down the line, with an ominous frown upon his brow, as he found that not one of the patients had obeyed his orders. No pretension to the sacred character of a prophet or inspired seer was there, for he stamped with such rude violence on the floor that the casement shook again. He almost uttered an oath, but it was unfinished, as he once more uttered the command to rise and walk, so that others might be admitted in their place. Then came the most strange and mysterious movement of the whole ceremony. One by one, did every individual seated upon these low, wooden benches, rise and stand erect. No words can describe the singular spectacle offered by this fearing, hoping, doubting crowd, as each found himself standing firm upon the legs, which for years had ceased to do their office. Some laughed like foolish children, some remained wrapped in stolid wonder, while many burst into the most heart-rending paroxysms of weeping. It was then that the Zouave stretched forth his arm and bade them pause. All was hushed and silent for a moment. The pause lasted for some time. I have been told that it is always so, but have not been able to account for its necessity, and then the door was thrown open, and the crippled, and the paralyzed, the halt, and the lame of an hour before, walked from that long, low, half-darkened chamber, with somewhat timid gait it may be, but with straightened limbs and measured steps, as though no ailment had ever reached them."

Mr. WALKER: Now, this evidence must certainly be accepted as authentic, furnished as it is in a non-Spiritualistic newspaper, and by those who were not favorable to Spiritualism. (Applause.)

Let us now return to our friend's arguments, where he endeavoured to throw ridicule upon a few utterances, or a few teachings, or sentiments, of some of our philosophers (?), and we cannot but acknowledge he was perfectly right in so doing. We only wish we had more opponents like our friend, to remove the rubbish from Spiritualism, so that its truths and beauties might shine out more resplendently. Nevertheless, in order that we may act consistently with our proposition, we will show that even those are paralleled in the Bible. He mentioned the case of a spiritual aviary; now are birds really more ridiculous in the spirit-spheres than horses? Is it not stated by John the Revelator, that he saw the King of Kings riding on a white horse? Did not the Lord send his horses and his

chariots to escort Elijah to his home? So that one case is as ridiculous as the other. If an aviary in the Spirit-land is ridiculous, must not a stable of horses in Heaven be equally so? He tells us that Judge Edmonds made use of a few words that he did not think our reporter would be able to take down. Now, those words, which were uttered by Judge Edmonds, are not equal to those which Paul heard in the third heaven, for there he heard, we are told, *unspeakable* words. (Laughter and applause.) Again, those animals which he referred to, are they any more remarkable than those beasts that were let down in a sheet from Heaven, or the four beasts full of eyes before and behind, each with six wings? When such statements are found in Spiritualistic literature, they are ridiculous in the estimation of our friend and others, but when they are found in the Bible, they are God's truth! (Hear, hear!)

Just here permit me to remark, that it is a strange thing our friend experiences so many revelations. We cannot possibly account for it, by any means whatsoever. He tells you, friends, you are all sinners, and have done wrong, either intentionally or otherwise, whether you are enlightened Spiritualists or Christians; that you are all going to Hell, and that not one of you can escape. Now, who told him all this? He says you cannot escape; we say you can. How, you may ask? We answer, by working out your own salvation, according to the words of Paul. By working out your salvation, through living in accordance with the laws of your being, you escape the Hell described by the spirits. (Applause.) Then, our friend says we do not believe in a God. Who told him this? Is this another revelation? Has our friend heard us deny that we believe in God? Has he heard us say so? Surely he cannot have wilfully mistaken our language. We now distinctly say "we believe in the supreme and everlasting Deity, Whose infinite personality lives in all His works, and in Whom we live, and move, and have our being." When we tell our friend that we reject "God," we only mean that we reject some people's conceptions of their Deity. We do not reject the Deity Himself. We will ask our Chairman to read from the 31st chapter of Numbers, 1st verse, where you will see one of the conceptions of the Deity, which we reject, though, as we said, we do not reject Deity. On the contrary, we believe in the Deity, which is described as Love—"God is Love"—as is stated by some of the Apostolic writers, who have handed down to us their conceptions. If God lives and moves in us all, if He is in us, and we in Him, and if He is above all and through all, are we not part of Him? If we are not, then God is not equal to the Universe, if He excludes those parts which we individuals constitute He is less than the whole Universe, unless we are included in Him. We can, however, logically say:

"We are but parts of that stupendous whole,  
Whose body Nature is,—and God the soul."

—(Hear, hear!)

We will now ask our Chairman to read the 31st chapter of Numbers?

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

- (1.) "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying. (2) Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites: afterward shalt thou

be gathered unto thy people. (3) And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, and avenge the Lord of Midian. (4) Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war. (5) So there were delivered out of the thousands of Israel, a thousand of every tribe, twelve thousand armed for war. (6) And Moses sent them to the war, a thousand of every tribe, them and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest, to the war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpets to blow in his hand. (7) And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. (8) And they slew the kings of Midian, beside the rest of them that were slain; *namely*, Evi, and Rekem, and Zur, and Hur, and Reba, five kings of Midian: Balaam also the son of Beor they slew with the sword. (9) And the children of Israel took *all* the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. (10) And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles, with fire. (11) And they took all the spoil, and all the prey, *both* of men and of beasts. (12) And they brought the captives, and the prey, and the spoil unto Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the camp at the plains of Moab, which *are* by Jordan near Jericho. (13) And Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp. (14) And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, *with* the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle. (15) And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? (16) Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. (17) Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. (18) But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves."

Mr. WALKER: That is sufficient. You will there see one of the conceptions of Deity which we reject. (Applause.) We do not reject the Deity, but only the degrading definitions of that Deity as they have been given by man in all past times and ages. Now, our friend asks us to come to the point, and show him these parallels. In reply, we ask, do not people speak now with tongues as the spirit gives them utterance? Do they not cure the blind, heal the sick, and perform many such wonders, just as they are said, in the Bible, to have done 1800 years ago. (Great applause.)



Mr. GREEN:

You have again heard my friend affirm that they do believe in a God, and contradict the statements that I made previously on that subject. I will just read you a quotation or two. First, in Mr. Jamieson's own book, the 'Spiritual Rostrum,' page 144, we find these words: "After all, every man makes his own God, and in his own image. God never made anybody. Brother Brown, obey the God within your own, soul, and all will be well." And yet, my friend tells us they believe in a personal deity! My friend, Mr. Browne, said to me last night that Deity is a principle, and yet an individuality. I suppose this is also my friend's belief. I want him to define it. Will you tell me how a principle can be a person, or an individuality? A writer in the *Banner of Light*, for 19th September, 1868, says: "I have no God besides doing right. God attains to consciousness *only* in man." Where is the God of my friend? If he tells me I am not to believe what spirits write, what is the use of consulting them? Joel Tiffany, a noted Spiritualist writer, lecturer and debater, says: "In an article, entitled 'Spiritualism,' published in the December number of the 'Monthly,' among other faults and errors, I charged that its (Spiritualism) influence had tended to create a kind of moral and religious Atheism. I have carefully investigated its truth since that time, and find the charge to be just. My experience has been, go among the Spiritualists, where you will, and as a general thing they have no faith in a *living, conscious, intelligent* Deity. They feel no demand for worship themselves, and they denounce and ridicule its exercise in others." These words, you will please remember, are from a Spiritualist.

I would just ask your attention to one or two statements which my friend has made. One is, that there is a way of escape from Hell. Now, may I ask you, as this is my last speech to-night, just to try and conceive of a human being living so perfect and faultless as never to have injured another human being, either in word or action! I affirm that my friend's statement, that men can live without committing sin, is utterly misleading and untrue. I say that a man in this life, in his merely natural state, can never live so as not to be guilty of sin. I would ask the Spiritualists who are here to-night to show me a man among their number who is living without any sin. Then, in response to my demand, for instances of Spiritists working cures and miracles, we are given the case of that soldier in France, who became what is called a healing medium. Well, now, what have we in regard to him? We have his own testimony first, and then we have the testimony of a correspondent of the newspapers. I do not know whether the correspondent received, what is called in newspaper phraseology, "tip," but I do say that newspaper reporters are not always influenced by proper motives. Those who remember the case of this Zouave being in the newspapers, will remember that he never cured a case that was supposed to be past remedy; but when he saw a man who had an incurable disease, he would say "*Go*, and never come back again; your case is incurable." Did Christ and his apostles ever turn away an incurable case? The papers said there were many cases of persons whom he refused to have anything to do with. I have a very

clear remembrance of the correspondence in the newspapers in connection with the case. But, observe, there are Spiritualists in Melbourne, and yet, for a case of miracle, they have had to go all the way to Paris to bring out this man of war. Now, we have had no miracles in Melbourne, and yet there are many Spiritualists here; why have we not miracles here? My friend is an inspired man; why does he not give the proofs that the apostles gave, by working miracles? It is of no use going to other parts of the world for instances, when the power is asserted to be amongst us. Why is it not manifested?

Now, I would ask once more, has my friend made the slightest attempt

to show that the Bible supports and parallels modern Spiritism? (Cries of

"yes" and "no.") Let me say that he has not even attempted it, much less done it. He has not produced a single passage which supports intercourse with disembodied spirits. He has not tried to do it, but has gone away from the point altogether, and quoted you a passage that he supposes is a definition of Deity, whereas it is a representation of something that God did to the Midianites. Now, let me tell you, and also my friend, that I am not ashamed of that account. We believe that when our God, and my friend's God also—for you know he believes in this God of love—sends forth his earthquakes, and tidal-waves, and sweeps away thousands and thousands, we believe it is done for some end, known by Him in His infinite wisdom to be good.

If a nation has shown by its wickedness that it is likely to contaminate other nations, and thus is unfit to continue, He has a right to make another nation the instrument of its punishment, in order to impress the evil of such actions upon them; for, mind you, there is the good effect upon the nation inflicting judgment to be considered, as well as the judgment upon the wrong-doers. If God determined to make the Jews executioners of these men who had done wrong, and if he determined to cut off these men, and prevent them from contaminating the world, I say he was right; who can say nay? My friend evidently wanted you to notice the fact of the slaughter of the women and male children of the Midianite families. Let me tell you that was done as a most reasonable and natural thing; these women had led the Jews into infamous crimes, and the male children, had they been spared, would have grown up to be avengers of their nation. That it was quite natural such an injunction should have been given, all who think of the nature of the times, and the character of this people, will readily admit. God intended that these people who had been so wicked should be wiped out of existence as a nation. The inferences that my friend wishes you to draw, as to the virgins, I declare to be libels on the word of God. I affirm, that according to all the usages of war, those virgin Midianites belonged to the children of Israel *as slaves*, and not for the vile purpose he has insinuated; and yet, mark you, they were often not made slaves, but became honorable married women. The woman Rahab, who was taken in Jericho, became the wife of one of the princes of Judah, and the honored progenitor of the Lord Jesus Christ. We say the libel he tried to fasten upon the book is not properly there; it exists only in his imagination.

Now, in regard to this matter of the miracles, I would just leave them where they are. The debate will be published,—for I may mention, what has not yet been intimated, that the proceeds from

these meetings will go towards publishing the debate, so that it can be sold at as reasonable a price as possible. It was an arrangement which I made with Mr. Walker, that neither of us should receive anything from this debate. As these matters of the miracles have been sufficiently dwelt upon, I will not again refer to them, as I have only time to recapitulate a little.

Let me ask you to observe what Mr. Walker undertook to prove:—"That the Bible (King James's version) supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena." Now, has he done this? I affirm that he has not. That it is evident he has not, may I ask, again, where we shall find in the Bible such teachings as we find in the Spiritist writings? We have the statement that there is no God, and that every man is a god; that there is no Devil; that there is no sin; that every man is his own judge—his own saviour!

Let me, before I overlook it, read you a portion from the writings of another spiritualistic light. This is from Dr. Hatch, formerly husband of Mrs. Cora V. Hatch, now Mrs. Daniels, the noted trance-speaking medium: "I am aware that what I have to say will offend many who are less acquainted with the whole phenomena (of Spiritualism) than myself, and such as may feel themselves involved, and will please others; but it is for neither purpose that I write, but that the inexperienced may fully comprehend the dangers attending it. I am frequently asked if I still believe in the phenomena of Spiritualism. I answer yes. I should deem it worse than a waste of time, to write about what does not exist. But through it all I believe that there is a powerful influx of an infernal error into nearly all mediumistic minds, which greatly corrupts the moral sensibility, and proves almost universally most disastrous to its victims. I have heard much of the improvement in individuals, in consequence of a belief in Spiritualism. With such I have had no acquaintance. But I have known many whose integrity of character and uprightness of purpose rendered them worthy examples to all around; but who, on becoming mediums, and giving up their individuality, also gave up all sense of honor and decency. A less degree of severity in this remark will apply to a large class of both mediums and believers. There are thousands of high-minded and intelligent Spiritualists who will agree with me, that it is no slander in saying that the inculcation of no doctrines in this country has ever shown such disastrous, moral, and social results, as the spiritual theories. Iniquities which have justly received the condemnation of centuries are openly upheld; vices, which would destroy every wholesome regulation of society are crowned as virtues; prostitution is believed to be fidelity to self; marriage an outrage on freedom; love evanescent, and, like the bee, should sip the sweets wherever found; bastards are claimed to be spiritually begotten. All change, of whatever nature, is believed to be an improvement, as there is no retrogression. Iniquity is only the effervescence of the outworkings of a heavenly destiny. God is shorn of his personality, and becomes simply a permeating principle; the Bible a libel on common sense; and Christ a mere medium, hardly equal to the spiritual babies of this more progressive age." Now, I have called your attention, during the course of the debate, to the

fact that the Spiritists claim that there is no sin, and we find that sin or iniquity is only the effervescence of the outworkings of a heavenly destiny. To proceed with our quotation: "The most damning iniquities are everywhere perpetrated in spiritual circles, a very small percentage of which ever comes to public attention. I care not whether it be spiritual or mundane, the facts exist, and should demand the just condemnation of an intelligent community. Look at the iniquities which have been committed within the past two weeks in this city, and that, too, by spiritual mediums, who claim to be controlled by angels. It is worse than useless to talk to the Spiritualist against this condition of things, for those who occupy the highest position amongst them are aiding and abetting in all classes of iniquities which prevail amongst them. The abrogation of marriage, bigamy, accompanied by robbery, theft, rapes, are all chargeable to Spiritualism. I most solemnly affirm that I do not believe that there has, during the past five hundred years, arisen any class of people who were guilty of such a variety of crimes and indecencies as the Spiritualists of America." Friends, Spiritualism here is only in its infancy, and you parents who are bringing up your children to it will regret the day it ever entered your families. We see in America it has had some twenty or thirty years' trial, and its legitimate fruits are there seen. I know there are many pure-minded Spiritualists in Melbourne. There are multitudes of people better than their creed. But we say that Spiritualism, when carried out to its legitimate issue, makes man himself the only judge of law, and hence, whatever the perverted judgment of that man will tell him is good, that man will feel himself justified in doing; because they say that every communication you receive from the spirits you must reject unless it is in harmony with your own higher reason; and, consequently, the poor, sin-blinded, perverted reason of man is to be his sole, his only law and judge!

Is this not also evident from what I have shown from Spiritualist writers during this debate? I have shown that Mr. Walker cannot establish his position. When spiritual intercourse is possible it is utterly worthless, unreliable, and dangerous; why? Because you cannot rely on what the spirits say, but must depend upon your own judgment; and next, because their statements are utterly contradictory, to each other. For, when persons think they have intercourse with their friends, it may be, and in all probability will be, a deceiving spirit that is personating their friends, and thus they can get no comfort from these communications. And, further, we have shown that the results of wrong-doing are ever before you, no matter how much good you may have done subsequently. All the wrong you may have committed in the past, all the beings you have injured, will be brought up against you, and you will have to suffer in the Spiritist hell for them, and the right and good things you have done cannot save you from it. Where, then, is the comfort? It is, further, seen to be worthless and dangerous, because it makes every man his own God, and judge, and law; and in this respect, if men are free from the controlling power of God's judgments in the future, we know not in what a whirlpool of iniquity we may be engulfed, if all society become permeated with these doctrines. When I think of Spirit-

ualism and its teachings, when I think of its effects, I candidly confess from my heart that I am horrified,—I am simply and truly horrified. It was through this very thing that the Canaanites of old were vomited from the land; it was because, in their intercourse with spirits they sank lower, and the evil, vicious, unseen beings, encouraged the evil and vicious men in their bad ways, so that they sank: deeper and deeper into crime, until an upright God determined to exterminate them root and branch. I say, can it be that the all-wise and beneficent Creator has left men to spirits that "peep and mutter," and knock tables, and throw flat-irons about, and all these other ridiculous things? Has he left us, as intelligent beings, to this?—to these guides who are represented as saying: "Give us good spirits, and we will give you good communications?" I ask, can it be possible that God can have left us to this? (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Mr. WALKER: Let us ask our friend,—inasmuch as he has introduced matters which, we told him at the commencement, if he did produce we should have to parallel—let us ask him, we say, to give us to-morrow night to reply to the speech just made.

Mr. GREEN: With pleasure, provided it be understood that the conditions as to speaking be the same as on previous evenings; in fact, that it is to be understood the debate is to be continued one more night.

Mr. WALKER: We will, then, reserve our reply for the present.

## NINTH EVENING:

THURSDAY, 21ST MARCH.

MR. WALKER, on being introduced by the Chairman with a few preliminary remarks, spoke as follows:

Last evening, our friend went out of the usual method of argument, in order to instance cases, or bring forward charges, as to Spiritualists being of a very low, or inferior nature.

Before advancing to the consideration of these charges and the authors of them, let us call the attention of the audience to the method of argument our friend has adopted, throughout the debate, in meeting our positions. Where it serves his purpose, he takes it for granted that there is spiritual influence controlling the medium, but, on another occasion, he takes it for granted that it is a good memory—or, at least, he intimates to the audience that it may be such. And then, again, when it serves his purpose, he tells you, in all probability it is simply a disease of the nervous system. These are the methods our friend has employed, without coming to anything definite, thus playing at fast and loose throughout the whole controversy. Applause.

In our opening speech of this week, it will be remembered, we said, that if our friend adduced cases where Spiritualists were charged with immorality, we should have to go to that book, which is the basis of our friend's religion, to instance cases *there*, of immorality in those, who were supposed to be the *elite* of the Christian ancestry, or the shining lights of the old Jewish dispensation. When, after the debate had gone on so far that we had only time left for the summing-up of our arguments, our friend insidiously brought forward these charges, just at the time when he, evidently, must have thought we should not have time to reply to them. These charges were read out to you, and they were of such a nature as to cause every modest person to blush,—whether of the Christian or Spiritualistic belief. Our friend did not exercise that Christian charity, which he professes in dealing with these outlaws of Spiritualism,—even supposing they were as bad as they were represented to be. Let us appeal to you, friends, to-night—not as Christians, or Spiritualists, but as human beings, whose hearts, unchained by prejudice, are full of heaven-born charity,—to exercise your reason, your conscience, and your better feelings, in discussing this subject. Our friend told you the Spiritualists of America were low, bad, depraved, and immoral in the strictest sense of the word, but he, for reasons that you must all perceive, excluded a few of his acquaintances in Melbourne from this

sweeping denunciation, but he intimated, with surprising presumption, that the little children, who softly prattle on your knees, and sweetly smile upon you from the cradle, and whose little minds are as pure as the sunbeams, or the dew from Heaven, that these children, if brought up in the Spiritualistic faith, would inevitably become the demons or wicked spirits of succeeding generations:—that they would become the most vicious and depraved outcasts that humanity could picture. If such were really the case, dear friends, we would ask you to go home to-

night, and appeal to that Deity, (Whom, for our friend's convenience, we have admitted as existing, and Whom we sincerely believe exists—as he would have us state our creed—and Whom we are convinced exists,

when we commune with the inner soul, though our friend so persistently affirms we do not believe in His existence) we would ask you to appeal to that Deity, and to ask Him to cause these buds, these opening flowers of immortal life, to wither and fade away, and never to come to that maturity which naturally they should; for, of a truth, it would be far better that they should be thus withered, blighted, and blasted, this very night, than that they should grow up to be such a disgrace to the

Deity that made them, and the loving parents who implanted upon their tender lips the first kiss of hope,—as our friend would have us to believe

they would. Oh! heaven forbid the thought! Now let us advance to the nature of the evidence our friend adduced in supporting these charges of immorality. He quoted Dr. Hatch. Did he tell you *who* Dr. Hatch was, except merely, that he was the husband of Cora V. Hatch at one time? Did he enlighten you as to this man's moral character? Or as to his standing and position among Spiritualists? In fact, did our friend *know* who this Dr. Hatch was? Did he know he was a renegade, and that he left the ranks of the Spiritualists under circumstances so disgraceful to himself that no Spiritualist, of any standing whatsoever, would recognise him? Now, in reference to the character of this well-known individual, we have to bring before you, as evidence this evening, a document that has been submitted for our inspection by our Earthly friends, and we will call upon the Chairman to read this document, in order that you may understand who and what this Dr. Hatch was, and, after it has been read, we would ask you who would admit the evidence of such a being in any ordinary court of justice throughout your land, much less in reference to such a subject as Spiritualism, or, indeed, upon any vital point whatsoever, where the characters of others were brought in question?

Will our Chairman now kindly read the document as rapidly as possible?

The following letter was then read by the Chairman:—

Melbourne,

March 21st, 1878.

Dear Sir,

"I was present last night at the debate, when your opponent read a letter purporting to have been written by a certain Dr. Hatch, bitterly denunciatory of Spiritualists and Spiritualism.

"The fact that any cause could maintain its hold upon the public mind after the issue of a document filled with disgraceful charges against it is evidence enough that they have never obtained any credence, but when they are again reiterated in a public debate, and that by a professed minister of religion, it becomes a public duty to inquire how much of authority is due to the author of these statements.

"As this person is an American, and from the obscurity to which his crimes have condemned him, his reputation may be unknown to you, I deem it my duty to submit for your information the following facts: About twenty years ago, Dr. Hatch, a man who had already been the husband of several wives, more than one of whom he was reputed to have made away with by foul means, married Cora Scott, an innocent country girl of sixteen, he being at the time apparently about forty years of age.

"Cora Hatch being a remarkably gifted trance medium, her husband carried her round the country, exhibiting her in the fashion of a Showman. But after adding to his former infamous reputation by the notorious ill-usage of his new victim, the poor girl was at last obliged to make her escape from him, to avoid the cruel personal castigation that he was in the habit of inflicting upon her. The immediate circumstances of her flight were witnessed by a gentleman now in this audience, who was present when she sought refuge late one night with the landlady of the Tontine Hotel, New Haven, Massachusetts, from the blows of her persecutor. As her great wrongs had become a matter of public notoriety throughout all classes of society, her friends Professor Mapes, Judge Edmonds, and other prominent gentlemen of New York, took her under their protection, and on bringing the case before the proper authorities, a legal divorce was promptly procured for her. During the trial of this case, it was shown in evidence that Cora Hatch had been brutally beaten, and otherwise personally abused by her husband, that he had spent all her earnings amongst infamous associates, subjected her to the society of the lowest Courtesans, and committed acts, the recital of which filled every listener with horror, and called forth words of the strongest reprobation from the judge.

"Despised as this man had been before, the publication of this trial excited such strong indignation against him, that he was universally driven from society, and scouted by all classes, and though he strove to make capital with the opponents of Spiritualism, by its wholesale denunciation wherever he could get a hearing, he was deemed so far beneath contempt and utterly infamous, that no respectable Spiritualist in America has ever descended to the task of noticing, much less of controverting, any attacks which he could make, however slanderous.

"I give these statements on my own personal responsibility, and am ready to maintain their truth by a reference to the records of the trial, also to twelve citizens of New York, whose high social standing and undoubted respectability shall be my guarantee of veracity.

"Commending for further investigation the character of the witness through whom your reverend opponent proposes to destroy the good name of Spiritualists and the value of their cause.

I am,

Very faithfully yours,

EMMA HARDINGE BRITTEN.

Mr. WALKER: And this is the man that charges all Spiritualists with immorality of the worst dye, that accuses them of being slaves to vices of the lowest order, and drags them to the infernal regions of orthodoxy,—and all this because, forsooth, he has failed in his designs upon innocence, because he was frustrated in his attempts upon virtue! Now, is it not really to our credit that such men as these are outside and against our cause, rather than in favor of it? (Applause.) But would this argument be a fair one, even supposing all this man said were true? Is it fair to make a sweeping denunciation of *all* Spiritualists, because there happen to be a few bad ones? Is there even one good Spiritualist? If so, (and this has been admitted,) then we take that one as a sample of Spiritualism, and we disown, as representatives, all the rest. Supposing we take all the crimes that ministers of the gospel have committed,—acts which many of the reverend, very reverend, and right reverend clergymen have done, and



been convicted of, some of which are not fit to be mentioned in public? (Applause.) Were we to mention these men, would our friend own them as Christians? Would he take thorn as fair samples of his religion? Why, as we before asked, condemn a system for the wrongs and follies of a few of its worst followers? (Hear, hear!)

Supposing we were to say, look at your jails: look at your public-houses, and your cafes, your gambling dens, your places of vice, your gangs of organised thieves, and insist that all these flourish in a "Christian country,—in a land nearly swamped by the gospels. Supposing we were to point out that, in your Christian countries, you have your policemen, and your jails erected for, and filled by, Christians! If we said all this,—and *we could say much more*,—we should only be using arguments similar to those of our friend. But such would be most decidedly unfair, for we know full well that there are good Christians, who are so because they are good men, and not merely because they happen to belong to one of the many Christian sects; if these same men were Spiritualists they would be good Spiritualists! They are good men, and they are not responsible for all the shortcomings and failings of their fellow-Christians, any more than are Spiritualists for the failings of some of those who attach themselves to Spiritualism. (Applause.)

Did we not tell our friend that we were not here to defend the actions of all who claim to be Spiritualists',—did we not tell him so emphatically? Then, why does he presume to instance these cases as examples? We admit that human nature is frail and weak, and as weak amongst Spiritualists as it is amongst the orthodox. Yet we would gladly invite a comparison between the representative Christian and the representative Spiritualist, without the slightest fear as to the result. (Applause.) Our friend asked us why we went to Paris for instances of healing miracles: in return, we ask him, why he goes to America to find all this "would-be" evidence against Spiritualism? Or why should he go back to Jesus for his Christianity? (Applause.) *His own arguments, used against himself, would ruin his system.*

In our next speech, as we have no time in the present one, we will show you the immorality of that book, upon which he bases his religion. For the present let us refer to some of the actions of the Christian churches. Does he sanction the murder of Servetus by Calvin? Was not Calvin a Christian and a reformer? But should we be right in saying that, all Christians were murderers, because Calvin was? Should we be right in saying that all were guilty of cruelty, because, in the Inquisition, hundreds of souls were banished from earthly life, and sent prematurely into the spirit-world, by the blood-stained hands of torturing bigots? Or that Christianity was altogether detrimental to man's welfare, and productive of immorality, because of these far from isolated cases? We could instance the persecution of the Lollards, the war-song and death-dirge of the Crusades, and kindred wars, that deluged the Earth with blood, fought "for the glory of God," and undertaken in the name of "the Prince of Peace." But would our friend treat this as fair argument? No, he would denounce it; he would say this is not Christianity,—it is simply human nature. But when it occurs among Spiritualists, he denounces all of them, because some who claim

to be Spiritualists have been guilty of far smaller crimes and follies. If he were to insist that his arguments were fair, we should again ask, are we to charge Christianity with every crime that men, who profess to be Christians, commit? If not, then why do so in regard to Spiritualism? Do we not find wicked and hypocritical beings among those churches which call themselves Christian churches, men who profess to follow Jesus, and imitate his example and his life, whilst they are secretly guilty of crimes far worse than our friend can place his linger upon, as occurring in the ranks of Spiritualism? Let us mention a few names which are accepted as authorities in the cause of Spiritualism. Can our friend say anything against Professor Crookes, Judge Edmonds, William and Mary Howitt, Professor Alfred Russell Wallace, Staunton Moses, Serjeant Cox, Robert Dale Owen, Epes Serjeant, Rev. Adin Ballou. Drs. Eugene Crowell, A. B. Child, Wm. Hitchman, L.D.D., Viscount Amberley, Lord Adaire, the Countess of Caithness, and many others? Now, can our friend bring charges against these? yet these are Spiritualists, whose characters are as virtuous and as good, as pure, as noble, and as benevolent, as any you will find in your Christian temples, your synagogues, or your churches. (Loud and continued applause.)



MR. GREEN:

My friend has asked if anything can be said against certain names. Well, it is an old saying that when a man begins to speak against that which he formerly professed, those who were with him in those ranks will only regard him as a renegade. I am not at all surprised at the description we have had read of Dr. Hatch. However, let me just call your attention to these matters in a methodical manner; just reversing the order in which some of these points have been stated.

My friend, in reply to my question as to why he went to Paris for a case of miracle, instead of giving us a local case, asks why I go to America for my cases as to the effects of Spiritualism? Well, for a very simple reason: We are told that the same gifts that are said to exist in Paris are to be found in Melbourne, and it is perfectly legitimate to ask that they should be manifested. Before saying why I go to America, I would like to remind you that the Zouave, according to the newspaper accounts, and also that read by the Chairman, when the only real test was presented to him, and one which would have afforded some demonstration of miraculous power, viz., an incurable case, told the man to go about his business, and never come again! The Lord Jesus never did this, and moreover, he performed all his miracles in open day. This is the reason I asked my friend why he went to Paris, because he and his Spiritualist friends profess that the very same powers possessed by the Zouave are possessed by some of the Spiritualists in Melbourne; so, as I before stated, it is perfectly reasonable to ask for some evidence of them. Just as the Apostles gave evidence, by miracle, of their divine commission, so we ask our friends to give evidence of

their inspiration. Now, the reason why we go to America is simply this: In Australia, Spiritualism is in its infancy; it has not grown beyond its swaddling clothes, but in America it has grown to lusty manhood, if not to decrepit old age; and because we have there living evidences of the effects of the system, we say it is right and proper to go to America for this evidence.

My friend asks you to compare the number of ministers who have committed immoralities, and others professing Christianity, with those whom I have referred to as Spiritualists. He asks whether I will take these ministers as exponents of what Christianity is, or if their lives are to be at all used legitimately as arguments against that Christianity which I profess. I will say to you, my friends, if he can find in this book (the Bible) any passage which may be construed into a support of these ministers, in these immoralities, then their conduct could legitimately be urged against this book and Christianity, so far as its morals are concerned. (Applause.) But I know full well that this book condemns these men to the very utmost degree; that no language can exaggerate the condemnation which is given to these persons in this book. But I affirm, and I will prove it to-night, that Spiritualism *countenances* all these things, and I aver that Dr. Hatch was only carrying out to its legitimate issue the baneful effects of this system. (Applause and hisses.) May I Call your attention to the fact that Dr. Hatch is not here to speak for himself, that this letter has been written by a Spiritualistic lecturer, whose veracity I would not for a moment question, but would simply remind you of what we all know, that one story is good until the other side is heard. But do you not see how evident the method of our friend's argument is? We had Dr. Randolph represented as a man of no character, and as unreliable, because he testified against Spiritualism, having seen so much of its evil effects, that he afterwards drew back from it; and then we have Dr. Hatch, who also discloses his opinions as to the effects of this deluding system, and now both are repudiated as utterly disreputable persons. Do you not remember that only a little while ago a Mr. T \_\_\_\_\_, a public Spiritualistic lecturer recently in Melbourne, was charged in the Sydney Police Court with drunkenness, and abusing his wife? I suppose because Spiritualism had its natural fruits in Mr. T \_\_\_\_\_, that, therefore, he is no longer a Spiritualist! I say these are the natural fruits of this system, when carried out to its legitimate issue. (Applause.)

Now, as my friend has brought up this matter of Dr. Hatch's character, let me go on at once with the proof, that Dr. Hatch has said nothing but what can be abundantly substantiated. I will give you plenty of evidence, not from the names that have been objected to, but from others. In the *Universe*, one of the accredited Spiritualistic papers, for July 3rd, 1869, a writer makes a lengthy demand for better results from the Harmonial Philosophy. Among other things he says: "No more tests just now; no more sentimental theorising and sky-scraping at present,—the fruits, the fruits of our twenty-one years culture." He then charges upon his brethren that these are anything but satisfactory. Dr. Potter, another noted Spiritualist lecturer, though he subsequently forsook them, (and I

expect my friend will produce some evidence as to his badness by-and-by) in speaking of the National Association of Spiritualists—and at this time he was himself a Spiritualist—says: "True the association is disgraced by several leaders of the most detestable character. A swindling defaulter and hypocritical libertine of the worst kind, a persistent free-lover, and to complete the list, an abortionist, or child-murderer." Hudson Tuttle, an oracle amongst them, in the *American Spiritualist* for May 25, 1869, says: "Its pure garments are drabbled with the slime of selfishness, and polluted by the vampire of passion." Mark you, these are all from Spiritualistic papers. It does not matter what may be the character of these men, since these quotations are culled from their papers, circulated day by day. In the *Banner of Light*, for May, 1869, C. S. Hayford says: "Spiritualism, in its present state, is corrupting in its tendencies,—it leads to looseness of life." Another writer, in the same paper, for 22nd May, 1869, says, "Our people are the most illiberal and the meanest under the sun, in the matter of spreading the gospel we profess so stoutly to love. They run into all that is small, mean, and contemptible." Let me ask you to observe that we have had denunciations of ministers for making religion a matter of business. I called your attention to the fact that I might be heard fifty-two Sundays every year without any one being asked for a penny. But if you want to hear a Spiritualistic lecturer in Melbourne, you must pay your one, two, or three shillings, as the case may be. Now, if this is the grand panacea for human ill, why do not Spiritualists show their philanthropy by bestowing it upon all without making a charge. Ministers of churches do not make any charges, but these who claim to be reformers, and who are so ready to denounce ministers for making religion a matter of business, are very exacting in their admission fees. What is my friend doing? What is the lady doing who lectures in the city every Sunday evening? Why do they not dispense their teachings free, seeing that they lay such stress upon this matter?

Mr. WALKER: I rise to a point of order. We are not here to discuss whether we should take money for our lectures or not,—that is entirely a personal matter. (Disorder.)

Mr. GREEN: There is a gentleman in the gallery who has been exceedingly demonstrative and noisy, and I must say that these continued interruptions indicate that there is a fear of hearing the truth. I hope that the Chairman will continue his impartial course, for all who have attended this debate will know that my friend was the one who introduced this matter; for two nights I did not refer to the matter, although he charged me with making religion a "matter of business."

Mr. Walker's CHAIRMAN here interrupted with some remarks.

Mr. GREEN continued—I am sorry, but I think it is a pity my friend's Chairman is not better informed. He seems so anxious to take the matter up, that it is a pity he is not one of the debaters. If I have made an untrue statement, is it not my friend's place to take it up, and not his Chairman?

Now, returning to the point: Hudson Tuttle, in the *Ohio Spiritualist* for 15th August, 1868, says: "I sicken at the black list of

abuses which have weighed to the Earth the Divine Philosophy. When an immoral agent steps into the domestic circle, bearing the upas branch of enmity between husband and wife, insincerity, instability, and social anarchy are at once inaugurated. A large class of Spiritualists have allowed this to occur." Now, please mark this: J. F. Whitney, editor of the *Pathfinder*, New York, says: "Seeing as we have, the gradual progress it makes with its believers, particularly the mediums, *from lives of morality to those of sensuality*, gradually and cautiously undermining the foundations of good principles, we look back with amazement at the radical changes that a few months will bring about in individuals." This is the confession of a Spiritualist editor. Then, Dr. Potter, to whom I have previously referred, gives similar evidence. "I am told by prominent Spiritualists that the ablest and most influential Spiritualist in Boston has been the worst libertine in the whole city; that the most prominent and influential Spiritualist in New York has been guilty of more cases of crim. con. than any other man in the United States; that I am told in Detroit they have organised and put the most licentious man in their ranks into office. In Chicago I am told" \_\_\_\_ No, I will not read that, it is much too bad. I could read you some horrible things, but I will spare you, dear friends, as much as possible. A writer in the *Spiritual Telegraph*, No. 187, says: "I have seen mediums rolling on the floor, uttering grunts like swine, giving vent to the most hideous yells, and at times beating their bodies and tearing their hair like lunatics." The Superintendent of the Indiana lunatic asylum, in 1853, said: "A new cause of insanity has been developed. During the year eighteen have been added to our number from the so-called spiritual rappings." In the report of the Ohio lunatic asylum for 1853, I find the following: "Nothing is more worthy of notice than the large and rapidly increasing number of cases caused by the popular delusion—spirit rappings." Do such bitter waters flow from a sweet fountain? This is given as a new cause of lunacy. I will just read one more extract from this work I have in my hand before I turn to another source. These are authorities which my friend will not dare to question, because they are quoted from periodicals that are known to be exponents of Spiritualism. J. Madison Allen, in the *Rostrum* for February, 1869, after claiming that the whole marriage relation must be changed before the world can be harmonized, says: "Let us, therefore, as reformers, confront the marriage question; re-model the marriage laws; demand that those who marry shall have also the right to *un*-marry them at their simple request," etc. Yes; they would rob the institution of all its sanctity and obligation.

At the Rhode Island State Spiritualists' convention, held at Providence, in 1866 (mark you, in a convention of Spiritualists), Mr. Wheeler said: "Drunkness is just as good as soberness, vice is just as good as virtue, the devil is the equal of God, and hell is just as sweet as heaven. Hell itself, if you raise it high enough, becomes the golden floor of heaven. As Spiritualists, we have not acknowledged that there is such a thing as moral obligation." Now, Dr. Hare, a distinguished Spiritualist, as quoted by McDonald, says: "The prodigious diversity between virtue and vice is the consequence

of contingencies which are no more under the control of the individual affected, than the color of his hair, or the number of cubits in his stature."

A. J. Davis, in defending Professor Webster for the murder of Dr. Parkman, utters the following. He defends the professor by affirming that the crime of murder was not so much chargeable against the professor, as that it was the legitimate effect of a social relation between debtor and creditor; and after affirming the right of every one to do as he thinks right, says: "Every individual is surely doing a blameable wrong when he acts inconsistently with the *indwelling law of right*. But who shall say what that law is? Who shall sit in judgment against his brother?" Remember, friends, this is said in defence of a murderer. In the *Banner of Light* for 22nd March, 1862, we have the following in regard to immorality among Spiritualists: "Here is a charge mighty in itself, and we, as spirits in behalf of you Spiritualists, plead guilty to the charge . . . . Whether drunkards or prostitutes, each and every sin that had place in their organism was upheld, sanctioned, and aided by the child Spiritualism. A large portion of the professed Spiritualists are those who have come up from the hells of Earth, have unfolded into the reality of spiritual beings, and have come just as they are with their unfitting garments upon them. Nevertheless they are acceptable with God." Friends, I am not manufacturing evidence. Do not imagine that these are the utterances of Christian opponents,—they are the utterances of Spiritualists, and of the advocates of Spiritualism, uttered in spiritual conventions.

The *Healing of the Nations*, pages 163 and 174, says: "Thus the body needs no laws, having been supplied in its creation with all that could be necessary for its government. The spirit is above all laws, and above all essences which flow therein. Good men need no laws, and laws will do bad and ignorant men no good. If a man be above law, he should never be governed by it. If he be below it, what good can dead, dry words do him?" So that if there is no law for the bad man, and the good man does not need it, each man may do as it seems best in his own eyes, even to taking numbers of wives, and making away with some of them, as Dr. Hatch is said to have done!

Let me again call my friend's attention to the proposition, viz., that the Bible supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teachings, and phenomena. Again I ask him for the passage which *supports* modern Spiritualism? I ask what part of the book it is to be found in; which chapter and verse, so that we may read it? We very earnestly request its production. My friend has come here to-night, and previous nights, professedly to defend the proposition, and I ask, has he done it? If he has done it, where is the passage that he has produced? (Loud applause.)

MR. WALKER:

Will our friend kindly tell us what work he has been reading these extracts from?

MR. GREEN: A work by Professor Carpenter, A. M., entitled "The Bible and Spiritualism, or Spiritualism condemned."

MR. WALKER: Just so, an avowed enemy of Spiritualism—an American Divine; and why has our friend not read the context where these passages occur?

MR. GREEN: Does my friend read the contexts?

MR. WALKER: Where we have quoted we are not afraid of the context being read.

MR. GREEN: Nor am I.

MR. WALKER: But is it not a fact that here the context is suppressed? Are not these disjointed illustrations? Will our friend venture to assert that Hudson Tuttle advocates these views, which are brought forward by our friend as the underlying principles of Spiritualism? Will he venture to affirm that Andrew Jackson Davis, or those men we mentioned before, support these statements? No! while we have admitted, as these men do admit, that there are faults, and follies, crimes, and vices, practised by Spiritualists, we claim that their opposite virtues are to be found in the history and the ethics of tin's philosophy. As to the work, from which our friend has read, we ask you, as men, is it right to quote as authorities these moral scavengers, who take all the filth that surrounds and obscures the beauties of Spiritualism, and make a cesspool of it? We ask you, who are avowedly opponents of Spiritualism, is this right? We say, as a body, Spiritualists condemn the errors and follies of these men, and these quotations were simply made to blind you, and to make you believe that there are no good influences in Spiritualism, but that its disciples are all vicious, all lost. And then, when our friend alluded to that public person, who is known to many of you, and who has labored with great devotedness in the cause, he endeavored to show that Spiritualism was the cause of the follies he may have committed. Will our friend write to him and ask him if such is truly the case? If he replies in the affirmative we will give in at once, but if he denies it, and says that he acted in opposition to the laws and teachings of Spiritualism, then we say our friend ought never to use his case as evidence again. It is not fair, and it is a species of argument which should not be admitted. (Hear, hear.)

Our friend has read certain extracts from spiritual literature: will he undertake to read a chapter from the Bible that we will name?

MR. GREEN: If my friend wishes me to take up his time, I will explain why there are certain portions of the Bible which are not suitable for reading on an occasion like the present. My friend, however, can read what he pleases

The CHAIRMAN (silencing commotion in the audience): Any lengthy explanation cannot be admitted in Mr. Walker's time. If Mr. Green desires to make an explanation he can do so, but it must not consume Mr. Walker's time.

MR. WALKER. Then we shall now have to read to you a few of these chapters: we apologise for doing so, for though, they are found in the so-called "word of God," we cannot say that they are as moral

as the standard of morality in humanity to-day. Last evening our friend defended the murder of these Midianitish men and women, and said it was legal, in those times, to commit murder on a wholesale scale, much as Nature sends floods to drown individuals. That it was from God the order came. But was the Lord worse than He is now? Are we to consider Him as merely on a par with those newspaper writers, to whom my friend referred, who, if they happen to be on a democratic paper, write democratic trash, or, if they are on a republican paper, write republican trash? These are the productions of men, and, as, such might be expected to conform to the weaknesses of men; but we must remember that God does not form His ideas so as to conform with man's ignorance and sin, for He stands far above all and is superior to all—at least in our idea—as the God whom we adore and worship. (Applause.)

Now one of the passages that we will call upon our Chairman to read as rapidly as possible will be the 19th chapter of Genesis, commencing at the 30th verse. And here you will find instances of immorality mentioned in the Bible. If there be any Christians or Spiritualists here who do not wish to hear what may be said in this respect, we would ask them as far as possible to keep their ears closed.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"And Lot went out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him; for he feared to dwell in Zoar: and he dwelt in a cave, he and his two daughters. And the first-born said unto the younger, our father is old, and there is not a man in the earth to come in unto us after the manner of all the earth: Come, let us make our father drink wine, and we will lie with him, that we may preserve seed of our father." \_\_\_\_\_ [I cannot read any further.]

(Cries of "shame," "go on, it is only the word of God!")

The CHAIRMAN: Really, I *must* be excused. (Cries of "order.")

MR. WALKER: We will excuse our friend, and will not compel him to read these indelicate passages any further, but we hope our friends will restrain their enthusiasm and allow us to proceed as rapidly as possible. We will refer you to the 38th chapter of Genesis. If our worthy and learned opponent will undertake to read that in your midst (which he dare not, and will not do), it will show that he is not ashamed of the "Word of God." But for ourselves we should decidedly object to read it, on account of its obscenity. Ye who have arrived at the age of maturity, and whose morals have such sense of strength as not to be subject to the influences of these passages, we advise you, in your chambers, in retirement (where none can see your blushes) to read this 38th chapter of Genesis.

We will rapidly pass over many cases of immorality that are described in this book—such, for instance, as Abraham telling Sarah to lie, and lending her, not like Socrates, to a friend, but actually to a stranger. Let us pass over that instance where Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal, thus committing absolute murder. Let us pass over the instance where David, although he is said to have been "a man after God's own heart," committed adultery with one of the women he saw on a friend's housetop, and afterwards murdered Uriah, her husband, by sending him to the front of the battle.



We just mention these wicked and dishonorable things contained in the Bible and, if our Chairman will undertake to read the account, we will now allude to one of the concluding scenes of David's life, as written in the 1st of Kings, chapter I, commencing at the 1st verse.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"Now King David was old and stricken in years; and they covered him with clothes, but he gat no heat. Wherefore his servants said unto him. Let there be sought for my Lord the King a young virgin: and let her stand before the King, and let her cherish him, and let her lie in thy bosom, that my lord the King may get heat. So they sought for a fair damsel throughout all the coasts of Israel and found Abishag a Shunammite, and brought her to the King. And the damsel was very fair, and cherished the king, and ministered to him: but the king knew her not."

MR. WALKER: This is an example of the immoral language to be found in "the word of God," and which would be condemned as unfit to be read if found in any Spiritualistic book. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Let us now come to some of the accusations against the prophets. Will our Chairman refer to the 28th chapter of Isaiah, 7th verse, where he will find some of the charges brought against the prophets and priests of the day and time when these things were occurring.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble *in* judgment."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now refer to Jeremiah XXIII chapter, 11th verse, where you will find other charges brought against the prophets.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"For both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord."

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. Now, of course our friend will take the ground that this alluded to false prophets; and this is exactly what we say in regard to the Spiritualistic writers he quoted. Now that you may know something of the accusations brought against Jesus, turn to Matthew XI, 18th and 19th verses.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children."

MR. WALKER: That you may see that some of the charges, which are brought against Spiritualism in these modern days, were also brought against Jesus, and thus institute a parallel, turn to John X chapter, 20th verse.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:—

"And many of them said, He hath a devil, and is mad; why hear ye him?"

MR. WALKER: That is sufficient. There you have evidence, given by those beings living at the time, that he was mad and had a devil, are not these the same charges that the clergy, and people of position to-day, bring against Spiritualism? Let us now see the foundation of orthodoxy by referring to Romans III, 7th verse, and we hope our friend will do so as quickly as possible, for our time is rapidly flying. You will see by the quotation our Chairman is about to read that these men of the apostolic times actually told lies for the glory of God, and this practice was afterwards followed by the early Christians, who were considered honorable good, and, pious.

Are these charges against Christianity? No, but against those men who advocated it.

The CHAIRMAN read as follows:

"For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my *lie* unto His glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?"

MR. WALKER: If you were to find such cases as these among Spiritualistic literature, you would condemn it at once as being unworthy of attention.

We say spirits are liable to be deceived by mortals as well as mortals to be deceived by spirits. When those men, who claim to be apostles, give us their own evidence that they tell lies, what credence are we to give to their utterances? Friends, we would willingly forego the pain of having to refer to these matters. We know that, although all these accusations may be brought against the purity of that book, called the Bible, yet they would not make us reject one single truth, one single virtuous precept, or one single noble maxim contained within the book were it likely to lead us to greater purity of life, and higher morality. And it is just the same with regard to Spiritualism as it is with the Bible. If the dark side is allowed wholly to engage your attention, you naturally lose sight of its beauties; what would you think of a picture with nothing but dark and sombre tints, with no beautiful colors, with no grand outlines filled in with delicate lines, that seem to blush and smile as they represent some happy scene of Earth? Would you say the picture was perfect? Then, again, would you look at a picture and judge it entirely by the background? Would you not examine the whole before you would offer an opinion upon it? We ask our friend has he thoroughly investigated this matter of Spiritualism? If he has not, why does he denounce it? Has he seen all the principal mediums? Has he had evidences and tests of various natures, and become conversant with all the philosophy. Has he read even Andrew Jackson Davis's works through? For, until he has made himself thoroughly acquainted with the subject, he is not in a position to express an opinion in public upon it, and, in the words ascribed to Solomon, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it it is folly and shame unto him." (Loud and continued applause.)

Mr. GREEN:

Let me dispose of these three last passages referred to by my friend at the close of his last speech. The one in Romans III, v. 7, is too transparent an imposition for me to reply to it. Just refer to the passage for yourselves, and take the connection, which my friend remarked, I was in the habit of omitting. It was very convenient for him to make that remark, but he certainly falls into the same error here himself.

Then, in regard to the statement as to the Saviour having a devil. I need not attempt to reply to that, because no person will be imposed upon by it. Of course they were like all opposers of Christianity; though they admitted that he wrought wonderful works, they would not admit that these wonders were performed by the spirit of God. They charged him with doing them by the aid of Satanic power; and you remember on one occasion Jesus turned the tables upon them, when he asked them, if he by the agency of the devil cast out demons by whom did their sons cast them out! He thus convicted them of inconsistency, to say the least. In regard to the passage in Matthew XI, v. 18, who can be imposed upon by it? When John came, he abstained from those ordinary articles of diet which the people generally used, and they said he had a devil, because he was an abstemious man. Christ came, and acted as ordinary persons did. He was not singular. He went to a feast when invited by a Pharisee, or he sat down with a tax-gatherer. He was so cosmopolitan, he did not object to persons whom the Pharisees would consider quite unworthy. Because they had nothing else to bring against him, they said he was a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber.

Passing over these matters, which are frivolous—(laughter and applause),—let us take up that point that may be regarded as more serious from my friend's point of view. As I mentioned the other night, when he threatened me with the infliction of his (so-called) immoral quotations, I was quite ready for them. I am not quite discomposed by them, although they certainly appear very formidable. Let me state, in the first place, that every single sin that he has read as being practised by these men, is denounced in the most unmeasured terms in the very book where they are recorded. (Hear, hear.) And then, further, notice the impartiality of the book that records not only the good deeds of these men, but their horrid deeds likewise. (Hear, hear.) Let me ask your attention to the fact that every one of these men, from Abraham downwards, were punished for their crimes which they had committed against the law of God. Granted that David was guilty of adultery and murder, read the records and see the terrible punishment that came upon him and his family. You will there see how God punishes the sinner, even in the case of those men who, in other respects, are among the best of the Earth. God does not excuse sin even in the best of men, and hence Abraham was punished, though my friend libeled him when he said he lent his wife to the king. The narrative simply states that because Abraham was afraid of his life, and because Sara was his half-sister, he asked that she would call herself his sister. My friend made a wrong statement of the matter. But Abraham was punished, and he saw consequences

resulting from his lie, which he never contemplated. I hurl back at my friend the statement he made as being a gross misrepresentation. (Applause.)

Now, in regard to the case of Lot, that horrid case of incest. I would have granted it to my friend without his reading it; but let me ask, does the Bible sanction it? Does not the Bible condemn it in the strongest terms? As the progeny of these births were all bastards, does not the law of God prohibit the reception of any of them into the nation, or to the privileges of the Theocracy, even to the tenth generation? I ask where, in the word of God, is there any countenance for these things? Are they not all condemned, every one of them? And are not all the men who are guilty of these things here threatened with terrible punishment for their actions? Now, let me ask you at this point to notice the difference between my friend's case and my own. He will not dare to deny what I have said, that every single crime that he has spoken of as being committed by these men, is not only strongly condemned, and the anger of the all-wise and just *God* denounced upon it, *but the men are punished*. I say he will not dare to deny this.

Now, let me ask, where in the Spiritualistic code of laws is a law to be found against lying, drunkenness, theft, fornication, adultery, and murder? Where, I ask, is the law to be found? (Applause.) I charge it upon Spiritualism that its very essence is this: *it leaves every man a right to judge for himself* as to what he shall do, and there is no judge but himself as to what he shall do. There is no judge but himself, according to Andrew Jackson Davis, my friend's grand champion. (Applause.) I have read your statement after statement affirming that the Spiritualists know no law but the law within themselves. I have read your statement after statement that nothing but a man's own judgment is to be his guide; then I ask, in the name of reason and common sense, where is the law that prevents any man who is so disposed, and as it is said Dr. Hatch did, from taking as many wives as he pleases, murdering some of them, and committing all the crimes in the calendar, if every man is to do what seems good in his own sight—if no man is to call him to judgment? I ask my friend to put his hand upon the law. Where is the parallel between this system and the teachings of the Bible? There is no parallel. (Disorder)

Now, having replied thus summarily to my friend's points, let me take up these other matters. I am now going to give you the Spiritualists' teachings on the marriage laws, and I will begin with my friend Mr. Browne, and show you that this book, *Holy Truth*, contains at least the germs of the evils which I have represented as existing in America. On page 170 of *Holy Truth* (which you may read in the Melbourne Public Library), while professing to denounce this free-love system, gives utterance to principles which lie at its very root. I will read from page, 170 so as to do perfect justice to the author:—"I will, in the next place, speak of what is termed Free Love. I abhor the sight of it, the name of it, the very mention of it. It is not a subject worthy of man's consideration or study, and I repel, with redoubled force and vigor, the defamatory accusation which has been levelled at Spiritualists. Untold numbers there are, *victims of that ceremonial law designated marriage, which*

*pompously unites man and wife, until death doth part them," who have lifted their voices against that principle which binds flesh to flesh, but which never could bind mind to mind—which never could cement soul to soul—which could never weld the chain of affinity and true love, whose links none can sever . . . . . All those laws which are made upon your planet for the ruling of man, to bind him to one certain thing, are but ephemeral, if the true and natural law or basis does not exist or rest there; for upon that stone, and no other, can true and ineffaceable affinity and love be based. Oh, ye who have linked and tied so many, how little do ye know the responsibility that rests upon your shoulders, when pronouncing those religiously grave words of rain show, which are said to be essential to consummate the conjugal state. But, alas, how often has the frailty and inefficacy of such stultiloquent formality been verified. How often have the links which no man is to put asunder been severed, and that which was considered so sacred, and was surrounded at first with so much pomp and ceremony, has been annulled, when perhaps the least guilty have to bear the weight of the culpable error that has been committed, and whose lives consequently become a misery, being nothing else but pains and sorrows during the remainder of their sojourn upon the Earth. Let us examine how we can alter this state of things, or, at any rate, our ideas of altering it. When once you have thoroughly realized the knowledge of the laws which govern your being, when you have become capable of controlling those manifold passions which are too apt to agitate you—when these can be restrained by the inherent force of the mind—then you need no law—you need no ritual tie, to bind two hearts in one, for an all-powerful attraction will suffice to draw them together, and indelibly cement that union which harmony is destined to perpetuate beyond the shades of death. They who truly regard each other are proof against any troubles that might arise if they could be borne in conjunction." Just let me ask you to hold your judgment in abeyance for a moment. You have heard the principle, there is to be a dissolution of the marriage bond. When you have fully grasped this law of affinity, there is no need of law or ritual.*

Now, listen whilst I give you a piece from W. F. Jamieson. I may say that this was written when W. E. Jamieson was editor of the *Spiritual Rostrum*, and is to be found in the October number of volume 1. Let me read it to you, bearing in mind what I have read from "Holy Truth," as to the dissolving of the marriage-tie. Let me show you how difficult it is in the estimation of W. F. Jamieson, the Spiritualist, to find this affinity, and you will then see that free-love is the inevitable consequence. (Interruptions and disorder.) Now, I will read, as I said, from the *Spiritual Rostrum*, whilst this man, who was a Spiritualist acknowledged by all, was editor. "Moses Hull, in a few thoughts on love and marriage, says: "There is a remedy against false marriage. Educate yourselves, know yourselves, and what you want, then know the person you make your companion? Ah, there's the rub. Here is a case, a sample of many: a young man full of promise marries a blooming miss. She is all the world to him. They live twenty years together happily, each convinced that the other is the true soul-mate. They rear a family of noble sons and charming daughters. Suddenly there comes into view a

mere cloud speck-athwart their matrimonial sky, in the form of Borne peculiarity of disposition which had laid dormant all those years. The horizon is soon overcast, the light of love is shut out, the waters of hare and of bitterness take the place of the sunshine of love, all is enveloped in darkness, and two once living souls, with but a single thought, become estranged, separate, and nothing is left but the smouldering embers of a once happy marriage. 'This is not an over-drawn picture; it is taken from real life. Are there, then, no true soul-unions that shall survive the ravages of time and circumstances? We believe there are—(now mark, my friends, what comes next,)—but do not think that our author, or anyone else, has discovered a rule, or a series of rules by which man or woman can determine, with mathematical certainty, what one *among a hundred thousand million is the soul's true mate*. Approximation to marriage does not constitute marriage."

Now, here you see there is only one chance, in a hundred thousand millions, of finding out the sours true mate. If that is the case, what would be the result of doing away with the law of marriage, and allowing persons to change about until they had found the true affinity? Do not these statements show that this principle of free-love is the very essence of the teaching of Spiritism? I will not trouble you any more upon this subject of free-love. I am only led to make allusions to it under strong compulsion. I have been compelled to mention matters which otherwise I would have gladly passed by. It is because I felt a deep conviction that these are the legitimate results of the principle of every man being his own God, his own law, his own judge. And I now feel that I can never raise my voice loud enough, nor give energy enough to denounce this horrid system that would bring into our countries, that are now civilized and virtuous, comparatively speaking,—(laughter)—these horrid crimes that we read of as having taken place under Spiritualistic sanction in the United States of America. (Applause.)

Now let me, before my time expires, again call my friend's attention to the point. Let me again ask him for the passage in the Bible that supports modern Spiritualism: again, I want it; I want to read it. I nail my friend to that point. I have shown that his so-called parallels of wickedness do not apply. I want, first, the law of Spiritualism that condemns these vices; and then I want the law in the book, which we call the book of God, that *supports* modern Spiritualism. Where is it? I ask what book is it to be found in, what chapter and what verse? Tell us, that we may find it, and read it for ourselves. (Applause.)

MR. WALKER:

Really our friend must have a very bad memory, as he accused us of having some time ago, when he asks us again to repeat those texts we have so often quoted in your hearing; and he presumes so much upon your rapid forgetfulness that he curiously imagines he has established his point by blank assertions! As to his religio-philosophical statements, we know not whether he is speaking from experience, or merely asserting again without proof, when he says it is almost an utter *impossibility* to find a *true* companion to be united with for life with all the sanctity of the marriage vow. If he is not sure that it is next door to impossible to procure a suitable companion, he ought not to make such an assertion, and he should content himself with making only such assertions as he can bring proof positive to support. (Hear, hear.)

Our friend tells us that the work of our respected earthly friend, H. J. Browne, sanctions the abominable practice, falsely called Free-love, and yet he himself reads from that very work a bold and honest contradiction of that same assertion; when our friend can find such a philosophical and consistently short treatise on human nature in regard to love, in the Bible, as is contained in the writings of our friend, and other Spiritualists, he will have more reason to be satisfied with himself and his subject, than he has at present. We assert that in the philosophical account already referred to there is nothing that takes away from the sanctity of the marriage laws, or which inculcates, even in the least degree, rebellion against their purity; but advice is given, of the most wholesome character, wherein you are asked to search those laws, and to make yourselves acquainted with their mode of action and unfoldment, as they exist within your natures, and you are told not to go blindly into such a matter without due consideration of its life-long importance. The book referred to advises you not to allow your Christian parents to find you some partner simply that you may live at ease by the wealth of the being you marry, and it strongly counsels you to conform to the laws of Nature, and not to act as a novice, by allowing your parents, or those set in power over you, to influence your feelings in this respect, and force you, by the mere utterance of their wish, to live a life of legalized prostitution, sanctified by a mocking, priest-performed ceremony. (Hear, hear! and applause.) If Christians possessed more information upon these matters, there would not be so many unhappy families, nor so many gaols and workhouses, as there are at present. When Mr. Browne, as a representative Spiritualist of Melbourne, gives, in his quotations, a most emphatic denunciation of free-love, why does our friend hurl such charges against us, in reference to this same matter of free-love? Is our friend honest or dishonest in his convictions? If he is honest, then that honesty ought to tell him that Mr. Browne, at all events, is not a free-lover. You have, therefore, one notable exception. Why should Spiritualists be charged with this infamous thing, when they denounce its advocates, and abhor its claims? Was Jesus a free-lover because we are told that he loved both Mary and Martha, and because he taught universal love towards both friends and foes? Are all who are susceptible of love in its highest ideality, as represented in the Spiritualistic philosophy, to be condemned and denounced as free-lovers? We confidently answer

No. These men, to whom our friend has referred, lived in the early days of the cause, in the earlier hours of its infancy, when it was untried, unknown, and when there was a possibility of a few unprincipled persons attempting to stamp it with their own infamous characters, and imbue it with their sensual ideas, that served as excuses for immoral lives. But we maintain that the follies and vices of a few of the earlier supporters of the cause should not be brought as evidence against the reliability of Spiritualism, as it exists to-day. If they are brought forward simply to show that there are impurities, which we have had to, denounce, and are gradually expurgating from our system, our friend's time has been wasted, because we admitted as much at the beginning of the debate. Why, therefore, does he reiterate the charges? Does he repeat them simply to blind you? Our friend stated that he can find the most thorough vindications in the literature of Spiritualism for all the vices and follies committed by Spiritualists; this we emphatically deny; and he further tells us that these crimes, which are mentioned in the Bible are denounced in that book, and the perpetrators thereof invariably punished. Now, in what part of the Bible is Samuel denounced for hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord? We ask our friend to point out the text that we may read it. Where was Jephthah denounced for sacrificing his daughter unto the Lord, or Moses for massacring the Midianites; Joshua the Gibeonites; or David the Philistines? We could instance many more cases where no punishment followed wrong-doers, but our time will not permit. And, moreover, as further establishing the parallel, we repeat that the very charges our friend hurls against Spiritualism were brought against the early Christians, as historians of that period inform us, and even Paul himself accuses the Christians of *nameless* crimes. (Hear, hear.)

He asks us for parallels, when we have been giving them to him all through this discussion. There is no phenomenon in connection with Spiritualism that cannot be paralleled in the Bible. Its teachings are there, and its very faults are there also; and, moreover, some of these faults are even ascribed to that Deity whom the Christians worship, or rather, not that Deity, but the conception of Him which our friends have formed. They ascribe to this Deity the act of tempting Abraham to offer up his son as a sacrifice, merely for the purpose of *testing* his faith: as though God did not know the extent of his faith without testing it! Then they accuse this Deity of hardening Pharaoh's heart, as though Pharaoh's heart was not bad enough, and hard enough, if the record is to be trusted, without the Deity Himself going to the trouble of making it harder. Then, again, Deity is credited with sending the Devil to tempt Job,—poor patient Job! They have ascribed to their Deity the action of sending an evil spirit to torment Saul, and also with sending a strong delusion that the people might believe a lie, in order that they all might be damned! These are some of the attributes they ascribe to that Deity Whom they worship; and if it be Atheism to reject such a conception of Deity as this, then we are Atheists indeed. (Applause.)

It is very easy to bring charges against those who profess to be Spiritualists, but have we not repeatedly shown that it is just as easy to bring charges against the Church and the ministers of the Church?



If our friend still persists in bringing forward these weaknesses of Spiritualists, as arguments against the cause, then we maintain that his Christianity is of no use for the self-same reason. After our having answered the argument, his repeating it again only shows that he wishes either to hood-wink you or to be dishonest. We have every intention to be charitable, but our friend's wilful persistence in refusing to see our points, when we give them, seems to us to be attributable to no other motive than to mislead and deceive you. He is also guilty of rendering an incorrect account of documents which have been read by our side. We will instance the case where our friend says Dr. Hatch was accused of murdering all his wives. Now does the document which was read by our Chairman say that? Such a statement indicates either ignorance or dishonesty in wilfully misquoting. If not, there never was dishonesty practised.

Then, again, our friend asked us whether Spiritualism had laws to punish these cases of immorality. Of course they have the civil law, which takes them in hand in the same way as it does the Christians. And we ask, are not Spiritualists as just in their dealings as Christians; are they not as vigorous opponents of crime; and when they happen to be judges, as in the case of Judge Edmonds, do they not mete out justice (seasoned, it may be, with mercy), with the same liberal hand against wrong-doers, as fearlessly as any Christian who ever occupied that honorable position? If Spiritualists are a law unto themselves, they are only like the Gentiles, as mentioned by Paul, in one of his epistles, where he says: "The Gentiles having not the law are a law unto themselves;" and, if that is the language of Paul, do we not there find a scriptural parallel, and justification, for our friend's accusation? As Spiritualists, human beings and children of the Infinite, we endeavor, to nay, we must, act in accordance with laws be stowed upon us by the Great Unknown, and, in so doing, we follow the law of our God, and not of ourselves. (Applause.) Why are we told to prove all things and hold fast to that which is good? Why should we be told to exercise our faculties, in the first place, and then that we must accept everything on the blind authority of the Church? Has God implanted reason in man, and yet, at the same time, left him so deficient as not to be capable of performing the work which that reason was intended to do? Has He left His work unfinished? Or, in connection with the sublime gift of reason, has He left fatal weaknesses in man, which prevent him from using that reason? If so, far better were it that reason had never been given, if its exercise is to damn man to eternal Hell! (Hear, hear!)

Our friend has spoken of what he terms the immoral tendencies of Spiritualism. Why, if he knew the hearts that have been made happy, the souls that have been cheered, the drunkards that have been reformed, the atheists who have embraced the belief in Almighty God, if he knew how many gloomy materialists, (who based their all upon matter, atoms, and particles, which they could touch, see, feel, and handle,)—have been brought to a knowledge of immortal existence,—if he knew, we say, that which has already been accomplished by Spiritualism, he would, we feel assured, speak nothing but in its praise. Spiritualism has raised men above the grovelling cares and sorrows

of a clouded Earthly life, to the contemplation of the glorious life beyond the grave. Under its benign influence many have relinquished their selfishness, and have begun in earnest to love their neighbours as themselves. (Applause.)

Our friend has also dwelt upon the immorality which may be consequent upon the denial of the existence of Hell, or the saying that you would not all go to such a place; or,—if there were such a place,—upon the philosophy which told that there was an escape from it. Escape however is in accordance with Nature's laws. He says, "We are all sinners, all weak, sensual, carnal beings;" he must speak for himself in this respect. (Laughter, and applause.) We, as Spiritualists, deny his authority on these matters, and we simply say, that, compared with his system, Spiritualism is infinitely superior. According to his system, a man may be wicked, commit theft, or adultery, be guilty of vice of all descriptions, even so far as committing murder; such a man is placed in prison, and surpliced ministers, with all the solemn mockery that they can summon for the occasion, ask the man to repent and be baptised. The conditions of repentance are very easy, and, as soon as baptism is administered, belief is said to be there; and then, when they have got a man presumably fit to live longer, and made so good as to promise usefulness for society, if permitted to live,—they *hang* him. *He is good enough to keep the angels company but not the parsons!* (Loud applause.) The man, on the 'Contrary, who lives a pure and noble life, doing all the good he can, living up to his highest conceptions of virtue and duty,—when that man leaves the earthly sphere, if he has omitted to recognise all the dogmas of the church and to be baptised, he is sent to fry and frizzle in eternal flames: such is the teaching of "orthodox" Christianity! (Applause.) Which system of belief is *superior*?—the one that says you are responsible for all the sins you commit,—that for those sins you will certainly suffer, and whose doctrine is, *sin not that you suffer not*,—or the system which virtually says, sin as much as you like, and then, at last, by merely acknowledging your sins, and accepting the dogmas of the Church, *you may swing from the gallows to glory and the angels in heaven!!!* (Applause.) We must say that this appears to us to be a premium upon crime: for, if a man does not commit a capital offence he may have no parson to instruct him in the conditions necessary for salvation, and he will go to Hell; but, if he sins, his crime may be, (so to speak,) the means of taking him to Heaven! Compare the two systems, dear friends, in your calm moments, and, until you do so, hold your judgment in suspense. (Applause.)

MR. GREEN:

In lieu of better matter, my friend finds pleasure in endeavoring to establish a charge of wilful misrepresentation against me. Of course, in giving from memory what had been read by the Chairman, I gave what I understood to be the purport, and not the exact words, *literatim et verbatim*, that had been read. No person, of course, could have expected otherwise, but I affirm that the paragraph in the letter means exactly what I said. Let me read it to you: "He was the husband, or had been the husband, of several wives, *more than one of whom he was reputed to have made away with by foul means;*" of course, more than one means several,—at least two. Now, I ask, if he was reputed to have made away with them, could that have been *reputed* unless he had been charged with it? (Applause.)

I would just briefly answer my friend's question as to where Samuel was denounced for hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord. He did not want any condemnation, because he acted as a judge executing judgment upon one who had been sentenced to death by God for horrid crimes, and, therefore, he was justified in his deed<sup>1</sup>. (Applause.) Now, let me startle my friend with a statement in regard to Jephthah. He never did sacrifice his daughter by killing her. If my friend knew a little more of the scriptural meaning of sacrifice he would be aware that all sacrifices were not bloody sacrifices, and he would see that his idea in reference to Jephthah's daughter is entirely wrong. She went away for two months to bewail her *virginity*, not her approaching death; and when she returned, her father did with her according to his vow, which I cannot further explain here; and then we are told the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah, or, as it should be written, "lament *with* her." The preposition is left out in the passage, but is inserted in the margin, and the passage clearly shows that his daughter's virginity, or exclusion from marriage, was the great sorrow to Jephthah. You and I may not be able to understand this, but he understood it fully, because it cut off every possibility of his family being perpetuated in Israel.

My time will only allow me to go over a few points before terminating this my last speech, and as I proceed in my rapid review, I shall perhaps be able to notice one or two points which Mr. Walker has brought forward.

Let me again call your attention to Mr. Walker's statement that my memory must be defective, when I so soon forget the passages he gave, showing that the Bible supported modern Spiritualism. Now, I will not charge my friend with deliberate intention to mislead; I will simply ask him now to mention one passage. If he has mentioned many, he will have no difficulty in recalling one. Now, will he so far satisfy me as to mention one? (Disorder and interruption.)

Mr. WALKER instanced Mark 16th chapter, 15th to 18th verses, amid much disorder.

Mr. GREEN: I asked for the chapter and verse only; it is for me to use it as I think best, and I must say that I think it is very ungracious of the audience, or at least one portion of the audience,—for it is only one portion,—to interrupt me as they are doing, and as they

have done all through the debate. This passage which my friend cites to prove that the Bible supports modern Spiritualism is one which he never gave before for that purpose, he gave it in connection with the subject of spiritual gifts. I asked my friend on a previous occasion for the predictions among Spiritualists to parallel this passage, and I mentioned at the same time some so-called predictions which had come to my knowledge, and you remember of what kind they were. I also asked my friend for the miracles to parallel the case of the instantaneous cure of leprosy, or of the man who had been born blind, or to" parallel this passage he has now referred to. Let us notice this passage. It says: "In my name they shall cast out devils." Now, my friend does not cast out devils; on the contrary, he rather brings in devils. May I ask when my Spiritualistic friends have taken up serpents without being poisoned with their venom; when have they drunk any deadly thing without being hurt; or when have they laid hands on the sick, as the apostles did, and made them instantly recover? Where are these proofs? How do these passages support modern Spiritualism? (Applause.)

Now, I have again to say that so far as I know, and am able to exercise my best judgment, my friend has utterly failed to give one single passage that supports modern Spiritualism. (Hear, hear.) As you have seen during the progress of the debate, he has utterly failed to give us parallels in the Bible of phenomena in modern Spiritualism, or *vice versa*, and you will be able to see that this is the case when you come to read the printed debate.

May I just call your attention to certain points that have been clearly manifested in this debate. The first is, that spiritual intercourse is utterly unreliable and dangerous. You remember a statement of my friend the other night, as to giving them good spirits, and then they would give us good communications. Is not that an admission that the communications we are now receiving are not good, and hence unreliable and worthless? (Applause.) Further, I have shown that you can never rely upon what spirits say, but must depend upon your own judgment. Now, I ask, if in every spirit-communication I am to depend upon my own judgment, how is it possible for any spirit in existence to communicate any fact or truth that is beyond my knowledge? Seeing that if it goes against my reason or judgment I am called upon at once to reject it. Do you not remember the story of the Eastern Prince, who refused to believe that water congealed; it was in opposition to his reason, and so he refused to accept the truth! I say that men, because of their ignorance and determination not to receive light, may shut out truth. Further than that, men, because of their own inclinations, may receive deadly error without knowing it, simply because it meets their ignorant ideas or passions; and thus they receive these communications given by the spirits. Now, take all the men that are in Melbourne,—and I say that, comparatively speaking, ours is a fairly good and intelligent community,—yet what would be the result if every man were left dependent merely upon his own judgment? Would not utter confusion ensue? Notice, further, that the communications of the spirits may be of an evil kind, and incite to the perpetration of the most dreadful crimes. We have statement after statement, as

well as admissions made by my friend, that many of these spirits are evil spirits. I have read from this book of our friend, Mr. Browne, that some of the communicating spirits are evil ones, and that spirits from the lower planes, as well as from the higher, can communicate. The drunkard, the thief, the liar, the murderer, would each attract a spirit of like nature, and would be rendered worse by his fiendish advice. I could give you a case from this very paper, the *Harbinger of Light*, where a Spiritualist declares that these evil spirits were drawn to him, and they incited him to do very wicked deeds. Now, I say, if this is one of the theories of Spiritualism (and it is), is it not a horrid thing? Is it not a dangerous thing, that I should go and seek intercourse with evil beings, who might come to me, and if my organisation happened to be bad, would incite me to commit dreadful crimes? Are there not crimes enough without leading men to have intercourse with fiendish spirits to incite them to more hellish deeds? And then, again, the statements of these spirits are so contradictory. You remember when I quoted that passage about the Spiritualist Hell being "inconceivably worse than the orthodox Hell," my friend said this was simply the statement of one spirit who had not been in the orthodox Hell, and therefore was not able to judge. My friend professes to be speaking by the spirits, and therefore this statement of his tells very much against Spiritualism, because it shows how impossible it is to get at the truth, seeing that the spirit speaking through him contradicts the one represented as speaking in the *Harbinger of Light!* This spirit said he was in a Hell inconceivably worse than the orthodox Hell. By this he means that the descriptions (such as those my friend had read from Dr. Peebles' book) he had heard of the orthodox Hell—he was surely able to judge of those descriptions—fell very far short in its horrors of the place allotted to wrongdoing spirits.

Then let me point out that no comfort can be derived from this doctrine. Even the idea, which is fascinating in itself, of having intercourse with our dear departed friends, is robbed of its charm by the very uncertainty of that intercourse. Spiritualists themselves admit that there is just as much chance of having deceiving spirits personating our friends, as of having our friends themselves, and the cases I have given you actually prove this. There is not a Spiritualist in this house nor in Melbourne who possesses demonstrative evidence that he has ever had one communication from any departed friend. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I have shown you that the fruits of Spiritualism are evil, I have asked my friend for a law in Spiritualism that condemns lying, theft, drunkenness, fornication, and the like, and he has not attempted to give it; but answers "every man is a law unto himself." (Applause.) I say that Spiritualism saps at the root of every virtue; it destroys domestic, social, and political integrity, because it makes a man his own judge, however vitiated his appetites or his passions, or however unintelligent his intellect may be. It makes a man his own God, and judge, and from that very principle alone, I say it saps at the very root of all integrity, domestic, social, and political. May I ask what Spiritualism has done for mankind? For four thousand years the world was alive to this intercourse. We will, however, make the period shorter, and say for two thousand

years the world was *given up* to this intercourse, and the records of the Canaanites, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, all prove that this spiritual intercourse was known among them. What has it done for them? Let me ask you to read at your leisure the first chapter of Romans. The testimony we have adduced proves that the picture drawn by the Apostles was under-drawn, and not over-drawn. Think of the very cesspool of iniquity into which these nations had fallen. I grant they had far advanced in acute reasoning power in arts and science, yet I say, in regard to morality, they were sunk to the lowest depths, and there was no one to stand by and condemn them, for they admitted no law higher than their own minds. (Applause.) I ask, again, what has this Spiritualism done? What has it done in America since it has been tried? What new truth has it made known? What new morality has it revealed by which we are made better and happier? I ask you to go over the world, and wherever this delusion has appeared, ask yourselves what has been made known that was not known already? Has any moral law been revealed which we knew not already? After the evidence which we have quoted in such abundance, our friend has been obliged to admit, over and over again, that the evil principles underlying this system are as we have represented.

Do you ask what Christianity has done for man. Let me ask you to look at Africa, at India, at Persia, and look at the Papal countries of Italy, Spain, and Prance, which, though professing to be Christian countries, have caused the Bible to be padlocked. Contrast these nations that have not the Bible, with the Anglo-Saxon and other races that have enjoyed that inestimable blessing. We ask, can any comparison be made? We say no! (Applause.) The Anglo-Saxon race, that has been raised and ennobled by a belief in the glorious truths of the Bible, stands pre-eminent among the nations. And hence our good Queen might well say, in reply to that prince who asked the reason of England's greatness—[pointing to the Bible,]—that it was the cause of her nation's greatness. (Loud applause, and cries of time.) I deny that my time is expired; five minutes at least were taken from me by interruptions. Let me say that the Bible is really the charter of our liberties; take it away and what have we left, out the lawlessness of Spiritualism, so-called. I say it would throw us back at once two thousand years. Christianity has laid its foundations in eternal truth; its base has been laid along the ages, and its towers reach up to the star-spangled heavens. Christianity seeks to raise man from his low and fallen condition; it seeks to make him better by implanting in his heart love of virtue and love of God. It seeks, by pointing out to him the terrible consequences of sin, not only to show its enormity, but to lead him to forsake its paths. When we look around, and see all that Christianity has done, and that it remains to this day firm against all the assaults that have been made against it, we feel that it has stamped upon it the impress of God. And we more deeply love it, when we think of the noble men who have professed belief in its truths, of the martyrs who have bled and sacrificed their all to uphold it. Spiritualists have never done this for their system, and I think I am safe in saying they never will. (Applause, and cries of time.)

MR. WALKER:

Let us now briefly reply to our friend's various arguments. First in reference to the laws of Spiritualism, and, in connection with which, our friend has asked whether they condemn all the various phases of vice to which human nature is subject. We would ask, do not laws to check these already exist in the land? Why, therefore, should Spiritualists be called upon to make new laws, or to formulate fresh codes of morals? Are they not already made? Are there not laws now, which condemn murder and crime of every description, and are not Spiritualists subject to these laws, quite as much so as any Christian throughout the land? Let us review what our friend has advanced.

In his previous arguments, on a former evening, he said that Spiritualism took all the good that it possessed out of the Bible. Therefore we say the Bible to that extent supports Spiritualism. And then he likewise said that Spiritualism was identical with that demonology which is condemned in the Bible, so that here also we have its evil paralleled. So that, if its good and evil are paralleled, and supported by the Bible, our position is proved. (Applause.)

You have shown extreme patience in listening to an eloquent harangue about the Bible, and the good it has done; and you have been told that the secret of England's greatness was the influence of the Bible! Now we wonder where her greatness would be, if you took away her guns and ships, and whether the Bible would form a sufficient defence against the invasion of foreign powers, if her guns were taken away! Take the case of Turkey, which our friend alluded to; although her state may be comparatively dark, does she not follow the example of Christian countries and fight for her principles, however wrong they may be? Russia, again,—and what is Russia but a Christian nation?—does the same, and is not one whit better. Christians seem to be proud of their God of Hosts and Armies, the Deity, who they believe rules and governs them, because, consistently with such a Deity, they may slaughter their enemies. (Applause.) We have the spectacle of opposing Christian nations praying, with all solemnity, to their respective Deities for the overthrow and slaughter of their enemies, and those enemies are probably of the same blood and kindred. Is the Christianity of our friend utterly devoid of good? No, we will not say it is. As we do not wish to be unfair, we will give Christianity credit for the good it has done. We do not deny its good services. But we say there is more good in Spiritualism, than there is in Christianity, as now understood. Whilst embracing Spiritualism, we can glory in all the grand sentiments and achievements of the world, and the pure and noble examples of men of all religions. We can make them our own and copy them; whilst, at the same time, we reject their errors and crimes. What does our friend, more than we do, in discountenancing crime and error? (Hear, hear.)

Our friend seems to labor under the mistaken idea that only those who communicate with spirits through mediums are influenced by spirits. If such really were the case, his argument on this point might be right, but as *all* men (whether Spiritualists or not) are constantly under the influence of spirits, his argument is of none

effect.

He asks, what good Spiritualism has done, as contrasted with Christianity? Friends, if one single soul has by it been brought to the *knowledge* of immortality, that single soul will have been more benefited than the ninety and nine who had already some faint belief on the subject. But, instead of one, there are innumerable cases of this kind, occurring throughout the world. Men and women, as we said before, who were Atheists, Materialists, or possessed of some similar terrible form of belief, have come to a knowledge of a future life, and of a prolonged and happy existence, through Spiritualism and its demonstrable evidence of the immortality of the human soul, and they have thus become better men and women, than they were before they investigated and adopted this philosophy. Then another good it claims to have accomplished is the emancipation of humanity from the thralldom of that priest-craft, which has so weighed down their heaven-born souls to earth. It has taken from humanity the yoke of slavery, imposed by those whom we do not acknowledge as being competent to act as mediators between fallen souls and Heaven, or to comfort them with a species of Brummagem salvation. Spiritualism removes all that absurdity entirely, and uplifts its followers at once, placing them under the immediate and benign influence of the Deity. (Applause.)

We are asked what your city of Melbourne would become if the people trusted to their own judgment, in matters of morals and religion. But we ask, in return, in whose judgment do the people of Melbourne trust? Is not your city governed by the judgment of men appointed for the work? Does not our friend use his judgment and reason in all the affairs of his public and private life? Moreover, is it not a matter entirely of chance that our friend is a Christian, and attributable to his having been born in a Christian country? If he had first seen the light in a Mahommedan country, and had had Mahommedan parents, he would have belonged to that religion, and would have rejected all other creeds that did not conform to his convictions of truth, as judged by the Mahommedan measure. But, being a Christian, he attacks all creeds of a different nature from that religion? We honor him for this, if he is prompted to do so by his reason and judgment, but if this is the case, why should he object to Spiritualists using *their* reason and judgment, in a similar way, in matters of such vital importance? He has made allusions to the charges that have been made for listening to our lectures and discourses through our medium. In reply, we would call attention to all your vast and mighty churches, with their lofty spires, surmounted with glittering ornaments. Look at your costly peals of bells, look at your priests robed in gorgeous apparel, look at your richly painted windows, your expensive organs and well-paid choirs, chanting psalms. Is not all this paid for by charges upon the congregations? Where is the difference? The only difference we can see is, that whereas Spiritualists merely *ask* you to pay your sixpence, or your shilling, to defray expenses, giving you your option whether you do so or not, the others go, in an underhand manner, and take it from you. We venture to make the assertion that Spiritualistic Lecturers, as a rule, deliver more free addresses than Christian clergymen. But these Church Establishments will soon crumble into dust, because those spiritual gifts,



which are described as having been imparted to the Church at Corinth (or rather the promise of them), by Paul, are not now manifest and the people are beginning to make use of their common sense in religious, as well as other matters. Those signs, that were to follow those that believed, have evidently not followed our friend, otherwise it would be his duty to go about casting out the Devils that inspire our mediums. (Applause.) For he says Devils now come into individuals; and, naturally enough, we say, why does he not cast them out, if he is possessed of those spiritual gifts which Jesus referred to? He attacks Spiritualism and says that, although it has been known for some thousands of years, it has done nothing towards mitigating the horrors of the world. Do we not find records of wars and bloodshed in the Bible, as occurring among those who lived in ancient days? We say, however, that now the beacon-light of Spiritualism has been kindled, and,—like those fires on the hills in classic days, to inform those at a distance of a victory gained,—these beacons are now being lighted in every part of the globe. Beginning with the tiny rap which first startled the world, this light of truth is destined to burn with a brilliancy that will illuminate all the dark corners of the Earth. The sign has gone forth, and has swept over the land of America, and has stretched from ocean to ocean,—from continent to continent,—and already millions have received its glorious philosophy and glad tidings. Millions are practising its precepts, and its high and noble virtues, purifying their lives, so far as they are able, by living in accordance with the laws which Nature teaches them. Its principles teach men *not* to commit sin, because, for a certainty, the reckoning for every sin will come upon the transgressor. The greater the sin, the greater the suffering and retribution. When we examine its teachings we are told that there is this difference between the Hell of the Spiritualist and that of Orthodoxy,—the former merely lasts until reparation is made for sins committed, and the sufferer has become fitted for higher unfoldment; but the orthodox Hell is an eternity of *vindictive* punishment. One holds out salvation to all; the other to a few—the few elect—as you will find by turning to, and reading at your leisure. 2nd chapter Ephesians, Philippians, and 8th chapter Romans. In these texts you will find the doctrine of election is set forth giving salvation to the few, and sad and dire destruction to the majority of mankind; but, as our time is now expired, we will leave you to read these at your leisure. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

After a unanimous vote of thanks to the Chairman had been passed, the debate closed.