

John Speed Field

230

John S. Field
Jeffersonville
Indiana



A DEBATE,

ON

THE STATE OF THE DEAD,

BETWEEN

REV. THOMAS P. CONNELLY, A. B.,
AN EVANGELIST OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

AND

NATHANIEL FIELD, M. D.,
PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF GOD MEETING AT THE CHRISTIAN TABERNACLE IN THE
CITY OF JEFFERSONVILLE, INDIANA.

HELD AT OLD UNION MEETING HOUSE, IN THE VICINITY OF INDIAN-
APOLIS, IN THE SUMMER OF 1852.

REPORTED BY J. G. GORDON, ESQ., ATTORNEY AT LAW, AND
REVISED BY THE PARTIES.

LOUISVILLE:
PRINTED BY MORTON & GRISWOLD.
1854.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1853, by
NATHANIEL FIELD, M. D.,
In the Clerk's Office, for the District of Indiana.

Stereotyped and Printed by
MORTON & GRISWOLD,
Louisville, Ky.

PREFACE.

THE relative position of the parties to the following debate, makes it necessary that the circumstances which superinduced it should be explained. A division of sentiment having occurred in a large and respectable church, in the vicinity of Indianapolis, identified with the reformation, as advocated by Mr. Alexander Campbell, which somewhat disturbed the equanimity of some of the preachers in that connection, who, like their great leader, oppose every thing as speculative and useless that does not accord with their views, a proposition was made by the party holding the sleep of the dead, to discuss the mooted question; which was accepted by Mr. Thomas P. Connelly, an evangelist of the Christian Church, then a resident of the city of Indianapolis. Brother Nathan Hornaday, on behalf of that part of the brotherhood holding my views of the dead, addressed me on the subject, requesting me to meet Mr. Connelly, as the defender and exponent of their views. After mature deliberation, I consented to do so. My letter of acceptance was forwarded to Mr. Connelly, who then opened a correspondence with me on the subject, which resulted in an agreement to discuss the proposition presented and elaborated in the following pages.

It was my desire to make the discussion cover the whole ground of difference, and, therefore, I tendered the following issues, viz:

1. *Man, by creation, or by virtue of his union with the first Adam, is immortal.* Mr. Connelly taking the affirmative, Dr. Field the negative.
2. *When man dies, he falls into an unconscious state until the resurrection.* Dr. Field the affirmative, Mr. Connelly the negative.
3. *The punishment of the wicked will be endless suffering.* Mr. Connelly the affirmative, Dr. Field the negative.
4. *The kingdom of God promised to the saints in the Old and New*

Testaments, is yet future, and will not be set up and organized until the second advent of Christ. Dr. Field the affirmative, Mr. Connelly the negative.

5. *All that the saints ever will inherit, will be given to them on this earth, which is destined again to become a paradise, and be the everlasting abode of the redeemed.* Dr. Field the affirmative, Mr. Connelly the negative.

For good reasons, I need not mention, all of the propositions were declined, except the second, which was so modified as to give Mr. C. the affirmative.

By this arrangement, the debate was narrowed down to a single question, rather too isolated for the edification of a church divided in sentiment on several collateral questions; nevertheless, the discussion unavoidably took such a direction, that some light was elicited on the general subject of life and death. In the whole, I am satisfied it will prove beneficial, and deeply interesting, at this particular juncture, when the popular mind is so much excited by the delusions and vagaries of modern spiritualism. It cannot be said that the state of the dead is a matter of no importance. Daily observation and experience contradict the assumption. The peculiar character of the age in which we live, the morbid appetite for the marvellous, and the extravagant love of excitement, so rife in society, civil and religious, render a theological work of this kind both appropriate and opportune. To the student of the Bible, and, indeed, to every one desirous of correct information in regard to the state of the dead, and other kindred topics, it will be found to be a book of real practical utility.

Its publication has been delayed much beyond the time in which I supposed it could be got through the press; but in consequence of very bad health, which prevented me from superintending the business, it was postponed.

All the speeches have been revised by the parties, and therefore, receive their hearty approval. Mr. Connelly, living at some distance from the place of publication, has not been able to read the proof-sheets of his speeches; but especial care has been taken to preserve conformity to the manuscript he furnished, and no changes have knowingly been made.

Mr. Connelly and myself, it is supposed, belong to one and the same church or ecclesiastical organization. This is a mistake. We once did; but to relieve the minds of the ministry of the reformation,

so called, who were greatly troubled at the idea of being responsible for the views already hinted at, and to avoid contention and strife, not only for the views themselves, but for the liberty of speech, I came to the conclusion, some time ago, to take an independent stand and teach the scriptures, constitute churches, and advise and assist in the management of their temporal and evangelical affairs, without regard to my former connections and associations. By this step, I not only avoided the denunciations of the ministry of the reformation, who, from being the avowed champions of liberty and free discussion, have suddenly become the advocates of proscription and gag-laws; but placed myself in a position favorable to a *true and progressive reformation*. Not an imperfect and restricted one, meted and bounded by the views and authority of one man, but by the *Bible itself*. My present position is not only promotive of a reformation of progress, but of union and co-operation for evangelical purposes, with all who practically and sincerely adopt the Bible alone as their creed. The church at Jeffersonville, of which I have the oversight, occupies broad and liberal ground, on which they can consistently invite all genuine and consistent advocates of *reform* to meet with them in labor and fellowship. It is their aim to practice what they profess — not only to *say* that all men are free to read and think for themselves, but to *allow them to do it*.

I invoke for this work a calm and unprejudiced perusal, as embodying all the arguments of any importance on both sides of the question. Mr. Connelly has done his proposition full justice; and if he has not succeeded in proving it, it is not because he lacked ability. He is a logician and an orator, and I do not believe that there is any man in Indiana, who could have managed his cause with more adroitness, or acquitted himself with greater credit.

November 7, 1853.

N. FIELD.

RULES OF THE DISCUSSION.

FIRST. It shall commence at 10 o'clock A. M., and close at 4 P. M. of each day, allowing an interval of two hours for refreshment.

SECOND. The parties shall be limited to half hour speeches.

THIRD. The speakers will observe towards each other personal respect and Christian courtesy in conducting the discussion. As their object is the discovery and dissemination of truth, they will cherish for each other that charity which is the bond of perfection.

FOURTH. The debate will continue from day to day, until the parties are satisfied that the arguments on both sides are exhausted.

FIFTH. During the discussion, there shall be no public expressions of the feelings and opinions of the auditors in regard to the question in debate.

L. H. JAMESON,
W. G. PROCTOR,
JOHN HADLEY,

Moderators.

Time of meeting: Friday, August 27, 1852.

DEBATE ON THE STATE OF THE DEAD.

MR. CONNELLY'S FIRST SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS:—

For the first time in my life, I stand before a popular audience as a debater to contend for one of the great truths of Christianity. And I need not suggest to you, that our efforts, made in the right spirit and understanding upon such subjects, may not be in vain, for every question tending to enlighten our understandings in relation to the nature and destiny of man, is eminently worthy of our attention. Such is the subject, for the discussion of which we are now convened.

It may not be amiss, however, to say in the outset, that, in order that we may profit by this discussion, truth should be the only object of both speaker and hearer. We should look at every thing said, seriously, candidly, earnestly. We should be attentive, that we may know the meaning of what is said, and that we may learn what the word—the standard to which we all desire to conform in our faith and practice—teaches. Actuated by such desires, it is hardly possible that we should part without being profited by our meeting. But if we desire victory, rather than truth, the establishment of a favorite opinion; rather than the true import of the word of God, I need

not say that no good result may be expected to follow our efforts on this occasion, for such a disposition is utterly opposed to the spirit of truth.

We all agree, that the word of God is truth, and that that word is found in the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. I expect to appeal to them in support of the proposition I have undertaken to defend, and my opponent will no doubt make a similar appeal.

There is no question between us as to the truth of the scriptures. On that point we are agreed. Our only controversy is in reference to what the scriptures do really teach. And while I will quote scriptures to prove my proposition, and my brother will quote other scriptures to show the reverse, it will not prove that these scriptures contradict each other, but only that one or the other of us does not rightly understand them. To overcome any mis-apprehension on such seemingly conflicting passages of scripture, is the object for which we should both labor. And to harmonize such scripture it will not do to put a forced and unwarrantable construction on either, but one that will readily harmonize with the context of each passage. Having said this much by way of introduction, I will now proceed to the development of my proposition, which reads as follows: viz:—

“The scriptures teach that when man dies his spirit remains in a conscious state, separate from the body until the resurrection.”

Before entering upon the discussion, it may not be amiss to define the terms of the proposition, as a correct understanding of them is essential to an understanding of all the arguments that may be adduced, either for or against the proposition. I shall then give you the sense in which I employ the terms of the proposition. *Man* is

a being distinguished by reason in whom matter and spirit are united. *Spirit*, is the immaterial intelligent part of man. *Consciousness*, possessing the power of knowing one's own thoughts. To die, to cease to live, the result of a separation of the spirit from the body. That we assume nothing in these definitions will appear as we proceed.

Having thus briefly defined the terms of the proposition before us, I will in the next place state in a plain and comprehensive manner the main points embraced in the proposition one by one. This will enable us to bestow proper attention upon each, and facilitate our understanding of the whole. First, then, *I will endeavor to show that at death there is a separation of the spirit from the body.*

In proof of this I call your attention to the following passages of scripture. “Yea, surely God will not do wickedly, neither will the Almighty pervert judgment. Who hath given him a charge over the earth? or who hath disposed the whole world? If he set his heart upon man, if he gather to himself his spirit and his breath: all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust,” Job xxxiv, 12, 17. You perceive, that in this scripture it is distinctly stated, that in death there is a separation of the spirit from the body. If he (God) set his heart upon man and take his *spirit*, his flesh returns to the dust. The spirit is taken by the Creator while the body goes to the dust. Again: “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it,” Ecc. xii, 7. Here, also, we have a clear distinction between the spirit and the dust or body; and it is affirmed that while the one in death returns to the earth as it was, the other goes to God who gave it. This was spoken by Solomon after he had

reviewed all the vanities and follies of earth, and had seen them all terminate at last in dust. He says this separation occurs when the silver cord is loosed, the golden bowl is broken, the pitcher is broken at the fountain, or the wheel at the cistern, and consequently at death.

Again. "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said thus, he gave up the ghost," Luke xxiii, 46. This is the language of the blessed Saviour, as he hung upon the cross, when he was about to give up his life for the sins of men. He *commends his spirit* into the hands of his Father, making no mention, no allusion, whatever, to the body. It does not claim his care. Surely it would have been otherwise, if the body had been the man proper. But to the same effect is the following scripture: "And they stoned Stephen calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," Acts vii, 59. How similar this language to that of the dying Saviour! Stephen here petitioned him in whom he trusted, for whose cause he had labored, and for which he was about to die, to receive his spirit. If the body was the man, and all die together, and lose consciousness in death, why did he not say, Lord Jesus, *receive me, or my body*. On any other hypothesis than that for which I contend, the language here is inexplicable.

Again. "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also," James ii, 26. James manifestly shows in this statement, that the body is dead only as separated from the spirit. I know the Apostle is here speaking of faith. But in order that he might make the great and important truth, that faith is dead, ineffectual, without works, stand prominently before the minds of those whom

he addressed, he adduced this familiar fact as an illustration. And the fact that he thus familiarly employs this figure, clearly implies that that fact, from which the figure is deduced, was a part of the faith of the Christians whom he addressed. Had it been otherwise, the language would have been without meaning to them. Hence we must understand the Apostle as illustrating a doctrine not understood by those to whom he was writing, by one they did understand and believe, and from which they could derive a correct notion of the one he was endeavoring to teach, and this shows that my position was not only a part of his own faith, but the faith of the Church, at that time.

These scriptures, then, we think, very distinctly and conclusively sustain the position, that death is a separation of the spirit from the body. We, therefore, repeat it, as a truth standing out prominently in the scriptures, that death is only a separation of body and spirit; from which it clearly appears that spirit and body, though united during life, are distinct in their natures and tendencies. We have given the several passages of scripture on which we rely as proof of this position in advance, that the brother may have a fair chance to meet and examine them, and show, if he can, that our conclusion is not legitimate.

I affirm, in the second place, *that personality is attributed to the spirit in the scriptures*. In proof of this position, I beg leave to cite the following scriptures: *First*, Eph. vi, 12, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places;" or as Macknight properly renders this passage, "against wicked spirits in the heavenly regions." You perceive, my friends, that spiritual existences are clearly recognized, and that personality is

distinctly attributed to these spirits, in the language just read, as also consciousness, but of this in its proper place. *Second*, Heb. i, 7, "Who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire." We present this passage with this thought, that spirits are sometimes employed by God as his messengers; and that this is a clear recognition of personality as an attribute belonging to spirits.

We will now introduce a passage to show that the term spirit is applied to man before death: 1 John iv, 1, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world." It is here conceded, as intimated before, that the term spirit is not here applied to disembodied spirits, but to spirits united to the body before death, and means man. In the next place, we will give a scripture to show that the same term is applied to the *dead*: 1 Pet. iii, 19, 20, "By which he also went and preached to the *spirits* in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." This is evidently spoken of the antediluvians, who are dead, and are indisputably spoken of as proper personalities. And as they are denominated spirits, and as we have shown that the spirit is separated from the body at death, they must be disembodied spirits. Again, having shown that the term spirit is applied to man while living, and that the spirit is separated from the body at death, and that the term is again applied to the dead, it follows that the spirit, whether in or out of the body, is the man proper; for the term spirit is never properly applied to that which has no spirit, and consequently cannot apply to the body.

It is not contended that Christ preached personally to these spirits in the prison to which they are confined, but that, when they were in the flesh, he preached to them by the Spirit, through Noah, while the ark was preparing. Here, then, the term spirit is applied to men who were once alive—to men who lived before the prophets and before the flood, but are here spoken of as spirits in prison, in the days of the Apostle Peter. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S FIRST REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS:—

I am happy to find that my friend and opponent, considers the question we are about to discuss, both interesting and important. He thinks it worthy the attention of every lover of truth; and hence, he can with propriety, contend for his proposition as embodying one of the great truths of Christianity. It is not often that we meet with gentlemen holding his views honest enough to admit that the question before us is of any practical utility. On the contrary, they have treated it, or professed to treat it, as unprofitable and vain;—as a mere philosophical speculation, hatched in the imagination of some moon-stricken visionary, whose object was to gratify a morbid appetite for the marvelous, or to acquire notoriety. How often has the state of the dead, and man's final destiny, been treated with contempt or neglect, as untaught questions beyond our grasp or comprehension? And yet strange to tell, the great leader and oracle of "the current reformation," so called, wrote an extra of *forty pages on the Life and Death question*. This extra, replete with sophistry, and as dogmatical as any of the decretals of the Council of Trent is regarded by him and his followers as an unanswerable and final settlement of the questions involved in the nature and destiny of man! Every conclusion or opinion at variance with his own, is a vain and foolish speculation, a mere "notion" of no earthly value! But when he discusses

these untaught questions, he makes them as clear as a sunbeam!

I repeat, then, I am glad to hear my opponent say, that the question under discussion is one of great importance. What can be more important, my friends, than the origin, nature and destiny of man? How can we understand the plan of salvation without knowing who is to be saved, and what we are to be saved from? How can we understand and apply a remedy, if we know nothing about the constitution of the patient or the disease? In order, then, to understand the system of human redemption, we must understand *man*. We must study his nature, his constitution, his moral and physical condition. We must ascertain what he lost by the fall, into what circumstances and misfortunes it placed him, and what would have been the result, had not God provided a remedy for him. This knowledge, indispensable to a clear perception, and a proper appreciation of the gospel of our salvation, is what I desire to see developed in the progress of this debate.

With these introductory remarks, I will proceed to notice my friend's definitions of the terms of his proposition.

"Man," he says "is a being distinguished by reason, in whom matter and spirit are united." From what, let me ask, is he distinguished by these peculiarities? I suppose he means from the inferior animals. But how and where does he learn this distinction? That man is a being distinguished from the inferior animals by *superior* reason will not be denied, but to say that the attribute of reason is possessed by man only, is contrary to fact and scripture. I know, my friends, that according to the philosophy of this world, reason is denied to the inferior animals, and all their actions are ascribed to an attribute called *instinct*.

But the difference between instinct and reason has never been explained to my satisfaction. If observation and the Bible are to be consulted, it is evident, that the difference between man and other animals, is not in the exclusive attribute of reason possessed by man, but in the *superiority* of it. His organization is in every respect superior; hence the superiority of his mind. In this respect, however, there is as much difference between men as there is between the lower order of animals. The gradations from a Homer, or a Newton, to an idiot, are as regular and well marked as they are from the orang-outang to the animalcule. Knowledge is attributed to the ox and wisdom to the fowls of heaven, in the Bible, and it will be conceded I presume, that these are peculiarities of mentality. Facts are stubborn arguments, my friends, and you that have witnessed the astonishing feats of the inferior animals in obedience to the teachings of man, cannot doubt the fact that they are endowed with reason. Were it not so, how could they be taught to fear and labor for man?

Another item in this definition of man, is, that in him there is a union of matter and spirit. This is also considered by my opponent as a distinguishing peculiarity of his nature! Suppose I prove from scripture that the inferior animals have spirits as well as man? What then? Why that in this respect there is no difference between them. My opponent will not deny that beasts have spirits. Why then does he assert that in this respect there is a distinction? His definition is as applicable to the horse as to man. What, then, becomes of his philosophy based on it? His definition of spirit, if true, would be the proof of his proposition. If, in the course of this discussion, he prove that the spirit of

man is an immaterial and intelligent entity, when separated from the body by death, his proposition is fully sustained. But here we take issue, and await his proofs.

Conscious, or consciousness, he defines to be "the power of knowing one's thoughts." Whether it is knowing, or the *power* of knowing our thoughts, is not material to the question. In either view of the attribute it is an evidence of rationality and of living personality. If he prove that the spirit of man after death possesses either thought or the power of thinking, he has gained his point. We need not, then, spend time in examining the metaphysical subtleties involved in this definition.

Death, he defines to be the cessation of life, the result of a separation of body and spirit. This is a vague definition, but contrived so as to be in harmony with his proposition and the arguments to be adduced. Webster defines death thus: "That state of a living being in which there is a total and permanent cessation of the vital functions, when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action." This definition, simple as it is, is in strict accordance with the laws of life, and the concurrent testimony of observation and facts. Then why not adopt it, as there is nothing in the Bible to contradict it? In proof of the correctness of his definition of death he quotes Job xxxiv, 14, 15, which reads as follows: "If he set his heart upon man; if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." This, he assumes, teaches the separation of the body and spirit in death, and thence he infers the separate existence of the spirit after death. Now, I affirm, that this passage simply states the fact, that when the spirit is taken from man he perishes; without so much saying one word about

the separate existence of the spirit after death. Notice particularly, my friends, the language of the text. "If God set his heart upon *man*," who is man? My friend says a compound of matter and mind. Who returns to dust? *Man*—this compound of matter and mind. Then, what remains to think and to feel? Besides, all scripture must be made to harmonize; for we are taught that no scripture is of private interpretation. By which I understand that no one passage must be separated from its context or relation to other passages on the same subject, and interpreted without reference to its agreement or disagreement therewith. The context and other similar scriptures must be consulted, and especially all similar passages in the same author should be carefully compared with that under consideration. In other words, no single passage of scripture is to be so construed as to destroy the harmony of the whole. Bearing this rule in mind, let us proceed to notice some scriptures referring to the same subject as that under discussion, and see how they harmonize with my friend's interpretation. Job xiv, 10-12. "But man lieth and wasteth away, yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth, and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." Does this look like a survival of the conscious and intelligent part of man? Who lies down and rises not? *Man*. Not his body merely, but the man proper, who my friend says, is the spirit, the intelligent and conscious *thing*. Is there any intimation here of an intermediate state of consciousness? None whatever. But this is not all on the same subject, by the same inspired writer. In chap. iii, 11-16., he asks,

"Why died I not from the womb? Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly? Why did the knees prevent me? Or why the breast, that I should suck? For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept, then had I been at rest with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver, or as an hidden untimely birth, I had not been, as infants which never saw light." Does this look like living after death? Certainly not. Had Job died at birth *he* would have *slept*. *He* would have been as though *he had not been*. This cannot refer to his body, for he uses the pronoun *I*, signifying himself—the man proper.

The passage quoted by my friend, from Ecclesiastes, xii, 7, "Then shall the dust return to the dust as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." If my friend intends to prove by this a separation of body and spirit at death, it is conceded; but, if he understand it to mean that the spirit continues as a conscious, intelligent entity, I deny it. It manifestly does not prove that when the spirit returns to God, it there enjoys a separate, conscious, and intelligent existence. It proves too much for the purposes of my friend; for what it asserts, is true of the spirit of every man, or man in a general sense—the good and the bad, the just and the unjust. And does the gentleman affirm that the spirits of all men return at death to their Creator? We should like to be informed on this point. As before remarked, however, the passage proves too much for his argument; and therefore proves nothing at all. But as we shall have occasion to notice this passage again, we shall pass it by for the present. Again: Solomon says, Eccl. iii, 18-21, "I said in my

heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see, that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other, so that man (in death) hath no pre-eminence over a beast; for all is vanity. All go to one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of a man, that goeth upward, and the spirit of a beast that goeth downward to the earth? It is the opinion of some critics, that there is an inaccuracy in the translation of the last verse. Martin Luther, I believe, translates it thus: "Who knoweth *whether* the spirit of a man goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" This agrees with the preceding verse, which declares that they all go to one place, and that place is the *dust*. Humiliating thought! However mortifying it may be to the pride of man, in the matter of death, he is, in consequence of sin compelled, like inferior animals, to suffer and return to dust. But it is the glorious hope of the resurrection, that gives man a pre-eminence above them. *That* hope does not animate the beast. He dies to live no more forever. Not so with man. He has hope in his death of deliverance from the bondage of corruption. Again: Eccl. ix, 5, 6, "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy are now perished, neither have they any more a portion forever, in any thing that is done under the sun." I suppose my friend will admit that love, hatred and envy are passions peculiar to the intellectual and moral constitution of man. If *they* perish, must

not that constitution perish also? Besides, it is affirmed the dead know not any thing. Which cannot be true, if the intelligent and thinking part—the man proper—survives death.

I come now to notice the remarks of my friend, on the dying words of our Saviour, and of Stephen—the former found in Luke xxiii, 46, and the latter in Acts vii, 59. The strength of the argument here rests upon the import of the word spirit, which will be examined in due time. Nothing, however, is here affirmed of the consciousness of the spirit after death, and during its separation from the body. Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and then fell asleep. Who fell asleep? Stephen's body? No: but Stephen *himself*. The passage from James ii, 26: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." This proves nothing, as it is here employed as an illustration, and not as an evidence of the doctrine my friend advocates. He may, however, say, that its employment as a figure, implies that it represents an existing fact, and that the idea thus represented is the separation of spirit and body in death. This would be a fair conclusion, but it adds no strength to his position. And even suppose it granted,—what follows? Why, plainly, no conclusion incompatible with the doctrines I advocate.

I come, in the next place, to notice the gentleman's second position, which is that *personality is applied to the spirit in the scriptures*.

In support of this position he cites Eph. vi, 12, which reads as follows: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Now, I really desire to know

if my friend believes that the *spiritual wickedness* here spoken of, really does mean the spirits of dead men. There is plainly no ground in the text for such an inference to rest upon,—not the slightest intimation of it in the Apostle's language. Nothing but a forced and unnatural interpretation could wrest such a meaning from the passage. Indeed, it is a mere assumption, supported by no shadow of proof. If we must go beyond the text for its meaning, why not assume that the powers here alluded to, are wicked angels? That position would be much more reasonable than that of my friend. They are spiritual beings. But how or where do we learn that they are the spirits of dead men? Not till after the resurrection do we find the term *spiritual* applied to men; and it is then employed in direct relation to the preceding state of mortality. Thus, the Apostle speaking of man, says—"It is sown a *natural body*, it is raised a *spiritual body*; it is sown in *weakness*, it is raised in *power*; it is sown in *dishonor*, it is raised in *glory*." It is here manifest that after the resurrection, the subjects of that change will possess bodies purely spiritual, and wholly different from our present bodies, which are mortal and perishable. But all this is aside from the true meaning of the text now before us. The Apostle is plainly alluding to the opposition, which the church then encountered from evil disposed, wicked men who had been elevated to high places in the church, or in the civil governments under which Christians lived, and under the evil administration of which they suffered. This view will be fully established if we take into consideration the fact, that the term spirit is often applied in scripture to persons and men. The passage to which our attention has been called, is 1 John iv, 1: "Beloved believe not every spirit (person),

but try the spirits (persons) &c. Every spirit (person) that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God." The context shows that these spirits are false prophets and false teachers.

In this passage the Apostle manifestly alludes to men when he employs the term spirit. He cautions the disciples, not to believe every spirit,—i. e. every one who might profess to be a prophet,—but to try the spirits; for many false prophets had even then gone out to deceive and destroy the church.

The passage which my friend introduces from 1 Pet. iii, 19, is explicable on the same principles of interpretation, which I have applied to other texts. It reads thus: "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which were sometime disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water." Now it is not intended that the Saviour went to Hell to preach to these spirits. The gentleman will not take that ground. However fanciful and strange the doctrines inferred from this passage have been heretofore, he will not go that far. He has too much caution for that. Mr. Ferguson, of Nashville, Tennessee, has made it the foundation of some wonderful conjectures. With these examples before him, I trust my opponent will not fall into similar absurdities.

The plain meaning of the passage seems to be this— that in the days of Noah, our Saviour, while the ark was preparing, preached to the spirits, or the persons who are now in prison. [*Time out.*]

MR. CONNELLY'S SECOND SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

THE brother objects to my definitions. This is as I expected, for I well knew that the terms of my proposition in their common and accredited meanings, were at war with his whole philosophy. They are "more fanciful and metaphysical, than scriptural." You, my friends, will be better able to determine of that matter, after you see my success in establishing them *by* the scriptures. He doubts my definition of man, because he thinks it may apply with equal propriety to the inferior animals. But why does he call instinct reason? Reason, according to Dr. Webster, is that faculty of the mind, by which it distinguishes truth from falsehood, good from evil, &c. Instinct is a power of mind by which animals are unerringly and *spontaneously*, directed to act without deliberation or experience and without having any end in view. Thus you perceive that his objection to my definition, arises from confounding terms which are in their meaning and application, entirely distinct. A very fruitful source of error and difficulty throughout his entire system of philosophy. He objects to my definitions of spirit, 1st, "Because," he says, "immateriality is nothing and hence can neither be conscious or intelligent." Here again he assumes a definition for immateriality in which he is not sustained by any reputable authority, human or divine. Here again he confounds the terms, matter and substance. By matter is understood that which is visible or tangible,—hence appreciated by the senses. By substance is understood that which really exists, and is

applicable to both matter and spirit. But according to the brother's vocabulary, nothing exists that is not an object of sensation. And hence, as the Deity is not an object of sensation, he has no existence. I should not be surprised if his philosophy should lead him into atheism yet. He again objects to my definition, because it is not in the Bible. Does he intend to say by this objection, that the Bible is a dictionary, and that no word is to be used that the Bible does not explicitly define, or in a sense, not explicitly stated in the Bible! This is certainly something new. It outrages every principle of sound interpretation. It has generally been understood that the Bible was written in the popular language of the times; and is to be interpreted by the rules by which other books of the same antiquity are to be understood. But this is altogether too Ashdodical for the gentleman. He objects to my definition in the third place, because he thinks "away from *materiality*, we are lost in conjecture and thrown adrift without chart or compass on the ocean of uncertainty." That an Atheist rejecting the Bible and relying wholly on sensation should be thus confused, would not be a matter of surprise. But for a man professing faith in the word of God to be thus lost in uncertainty, on a subject that is purely a matter of faith, argues badly, both for his *philosophy* and his *faith*.

As the brother has given no reason for objecting to my definition of the word conscious, and has virtually confessed that he has no confidence in his own, we will regard him as conceding mine.

As to my definition of die or death, I think we shall be fully able to show that my friend is altogether deceived, when he supposes that the authorities are against me, and that the reverse is true that they are against *himself*.

and in my favor. He loses sight of the fact clearly recognized, both in and out of the Bible, that there are two kinds of life,—animal and spiritual, and that the definition which he quotes from Dr. Webster, evidently alludes to the state of the body when animal life is gone, as a consequence of the departure of the spirit. This will more fully appear hereafter. We have shown from various scriptures, that death is a separation of *spirit* and *body*; this position my friend has already admitted. We may therefore regard it as a settled point.

He says Job xxxiv, 14, 15, "simply states the fact that when the spirit is taken from man he perishes." Does he intend to affirm by this, that the spirit is no part of the man? If not, his remarks about a compound of matter and mind returning to dust, are without point. But we will attend to that in its proper place. The only point I wished to prove by this scripture, is that there is a separation of body and spirit at death. This he has conceded, and hence his appeal to Job xiv, 10-12, is premature and without force. To this and to his quotation from Job viii, I will attend when I come to that feature of my proposition. With reference to Eccles. xii, 7, he admits the only point I quoted the passage to prove. But again he attempts to evade the point, by asserting that this scripture does not prove a conscious state after death. The only point I designed to prove by this passage and the one in Job xxxiv, and some others, is the separation at death. In Job, we are clearly taught, that when the spirit is separated from the body it returns to dust. And here the preacher informs us that the dust shall return to the dust as it was. When shall this occur? When the silver cord is loosed, and the golden bowl at the fountain is broken. In other words at death. Some

of his remarks are so peculiar, that I must give them a passing notice. After admitting that this scripture proves a separation—he then says it proves too much, and therefore it don't prove anything with him. It does prove and it don't prove at the same time; this is surely singular enough. According to this if A should be summoned to prove that B killed C, though he might testify to the fact, positively, if he should happen to know that B had killed D too, his evidence I suppose would prove nothing. But what does it teach? That the spirits of all men, return, at death, to their Creator, he says, and asks if I believe it? to which I answer, YES; Does not the brother believe it? He next undertakes to prove that beasts have spirits. Suppose we grant it, does that prove that man has none, or that man's spirit is not separated from his body at death! How then does that militate against the position we have undertaken to establish. Whether beasts have spirits or not, is entirely aside from the subject of controversy. We might therefore admit all he has said on that point, without, in the least compromising our position. We have to do with *men*—not with beasts, and hence we are under no obligations to follow the gentleman, when he may see proper to turn aside to discuss the nature of inferior animals. We should not suffer our minds by extraneous matters, to be diverted from the question, *Is the spirit of man separated from the body, at death; and if so, does it remain conscious until the resurrection?* We affirm, and the brother denies. We shall have occasion to examine Ecclesiastes ix, when we come to show that consciousness is an attribute of the spirit. But as it is forced upon us in advance, we will now say, that he assumes that this scripture proves that there is no consciousness after death, contrary to its own

context and the evident design of the whole book. In order to see this and to get the true import of the passage, let us compare it with its own context. Begin then with verse 3: "This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all; yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead." This is entirely inexplicable on the assumption that there is no consciousness after death. For how can madness exist where no consciousness is. Again, verse 4th: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope." Hope of what, I ask? evidently hope of salvation. Hence we understand the fifth verse, "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing," to simply teach that, after death, there is no knowledge of the way of repentance and salvation; to the dead there is no preaching the gospel. Not so in life. There is hope in life, for there is still time and opportunity to prepare for death. The way of salvation is still open and eternal life attainable. At death all this ceases.

This view of the passage harmonizes with the immediate context, with the scope and design of the book. For the object which the writer had in view evidently was, to impress the mind of the reader with the thought that all earthly things were vanity and vexation of spirit, and that if, during life, there has been no preparation for death, there is no hope of life and salvation, for the means are not extended to the dead. Hence it is said, verse 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." But the brother's interpretation seems clearly to imply that man has a cer-

tain number of actions to perform, and he should therefore hurry; but why do so unless he has a fixed time to die. But I again repeat that my only object in quoting the scripture from Eccl. xii, 7, was to prove that, at death, there is a separation of the body and the spirit, without any reference to the *condition* of the spirit. That we expect to show from other scriptures.

He thinks that our argument from James ii, 26, is too far-fetched. I can account for this remark from the brother only from his inability to avoid its force. For I cannot see what other idea could be attached to the phrase "body *without* the spirit," than a separation. But does it not seem a little strange to you, my friends, that he should concede the fact of separation at death, and then continue his effort to show that the scriptures on which I rely for evidence do not teach it? It indicates that the concession has been made with some reluctance.

We will now return to our second position, *that personality is an attribute of the spirit*. This too has been virtually conceded; but still he undertakes to show that the scriptures I cite do not prove it. Let us look at them again. Eph. vi, 12, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in the heavenly regions." The brother objects to my rendering of this passage, and says there is no ground in the text for supposing the wicked spirits here are the spirits of dead men. So far as the position of personality as attributed to spirit is concerned, it makes no manner of difference, unless he can show that all spiritual nature is not the same. Hence he gains nothing by supposing them to be lapsed angels. For if beings purely spiritual do exist independent of matter, we are led irresistibly to

conclude that the spirits of men, possessing, as they do, all the essential inherent properties of spiritual beings, may exist as distinct beings, and seeming conscious of this, my friend insists that the rendering we gave this passage is wrong. We will now proceed to give some reasons for it. The passage rendered in the common version, "spiritual wickedness," is *pneumatika tes ponerias*, in the Greek, and literally means the spiritual things of wickedness. Now, I ask, what can spiritual things of wickedness mean, but wicked spirits. To see that this is not an unusual rendering of similar constructions, even in the common version, let us look at some other passages. Rom. ii, 4, "*christon tou Theou*"—literally the good things of God—rendered in the common version, the goodness of God. 2 Cor. viii, 8, "*agapes gneesion*"—literally the sincere things of your love—rendered the sincerity of your love. Many other examples might be added to these, but these are sufficient, for the present, to show that it is no uncommon thing to render a Greek adjective by an English noun, and hence show the correctness of Macknight's translation of the passage. "*Wicked spirits*" in the heavenly regions is, then, the meaning of the original. The construction of the sentence requires this rendering. The Apostle says we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against wicked spirits. You perceive that flesh and blood, and wicked spirits, are here placed in contrast, which shows clearly that he did not mean men in high office. And that we would assume nothing by regarding these wicked spirits the spirits of wicked men, I think will fully appear before we are done with this discussion.

With reference to 1 Pet. iii, 19, it matters not what curious or wonderful things have been said or written on

this passage. What if brother Ferguson has advanced some singular or even absurd speculations upon it. We are not responsible for his absurdities. The errors of men on any subject can never be regarded as a good reason why other men should not endeavor to ascertain the truth on the subject upon which they have erred. But the brother concedes that the spirits here spoken of by the Apostle are the antideluvians, and that they are now in prison. I wish this concession to be remembered; for I regard it as conceding the whole subject of controversy. For we have already shown, and he has admitted, that the spirit is separated from the body at death, and as these persons had died, and hence the separation with them had occurred, and as they are still denominated spirits, it must be to their spirits as separate existences, and not to their bodies. For there is no authority for denominating that spirit from which the spirit has departed, and the term is never so applied. And thus it follows, as I showed in the conclusion of my first speech, that the spirit, whether in or out of the body, is the man proper. This we regard as a cardinal point in this discussion, and should be kept in mind. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S SECOND REPLY.

MY FRIENDS :—

It is essential to the philosophy taught in my opponent's proposition, that he should prove that the inferior animals have no reason ; and I might add, that it is equally as important to prove that they have no *spirits*. He has not, nor will he deny, that the Bible says repeatedly that they *have* spirits ; aye, and souls too. Nor has he denied that they are said to possess wisdom and knowledge. Now, the difficulty with my opponent is this : He assumes that spirit, from its very nature, is intelligent and immortal ; and as it can and does exist separate from matter in a conscious state, if he admit that beasts have *spirits* as well as man, they must also be intelligent and immortal, and consequently exist consciously after death. I trust you all see the dilemma. Mr. Wesley and Adam Clarke, if I mistake not, perceived this result of my friend's logic, and in order to be consistent, honestly taught *the resurrection of the inferior animals!* Why does he not do likewise ?

He has given us a definition of reason and instinct. The former, he says, "is that faculty of the mind by which it distinguishes truth from falsehood, good from evil. The latter (instinct) is a power of mind by which animals are unerringly and *spontaneously* directed to act without deliberation or experience, and without having any end in view."

If this definition be correct, I apprehend he will have

some trouble in reconciling it with his proposition. For example : A being that cannot distinguish truth from falsehood, and good from evil, has no reason. Idiots, infants, and insane persons, cannot distinguish truth from falsehood, good from evil. In what respect, then, do they differ from the inferior animals, and how can they be immortal ?

But he says, "Instinct is a *power of the mind*, (mark the expression, my friends,) by which the inferior animals act." So, then, according to my opponent and Dr. Webster, they have *mind*, and that mind possesses a power or faculty of acting unerringly in certain matters ! This is strange, indeed, especially when we learn from this sage definition that they have no end in view ! Now, my friends, I submit it to you, as common sense people, if this definition does not, in some respects, contradict facts that come under your daily observation ? Do you not, almost every day, see something in the actions of the inferior animals to convince you that the philosophy of this world, which denies to them any reason at all, is vain, and worse than vain.

In his explanation of the difference between *matter* and *substance*, he says I confound the two together. He makes them quite different. My perception, I must admit, is too obtuse for such philosophical subtleties. *Matter*, he says, "is that which is visible, tangible, or appreciable by the senses." *Substance*, he says, "is understood to be that which really exists, and is applicable to both matter and spirit." This is certainly a very lucid definition of *substance*. The common sense understanding of it is, that *matter* is *substance*, and *spirit* is *substance* ; then, of course, *matter*, *substance*, and *spirit*, are essentially the same. Again, if immateriality is *substance*, and

substance is an attribute of *matter*, then *immateriality* and *matter*, so far as his definition is concerned, are the same. For remember, my friends, he says that *substance* is equally an attribute or property of *spirit* and *matter*. To sum this matter up, then, it will stand thus: *Spirit* is an *immateriality*, *immateriality* is *substance*, and *substance* is *matter*. After all, then, he is a materialist!

He says, I object to his definition because it is not in the Bible. This is a mistake. I object to it because it contradicts the Bible. I admit the Bible is not a dictionary, but nevertheless we can learn from it the *sense* in which words are used. If we cannot, then it is not a self-interpreting book.

My opponent thinks that I am premature in my quotations of scripture, to show that the spirit has no conscious separate existence after death. But I did not quote the passages, I introduced for the purpose of raising that question *now*. My object was, to show that the doctrine for which he contends must be compared with all that Job and Solomon have written; and his interpretation of particular passages shown to be consistent with the whole, or rejected as untrue. Now, these writers show no difference between the spirit of a man and that of a beast, in death; for it must be recollected that there is a great difference between the fact, that there is a separation between the body and spirit at death, and the assumed fact, that the latter exists consciously after that separation. The scriptures show, what we never denied, that the separation really does take place; but the same authors and texts clearly rebut the supposition that the spirit remains conscious after that event. How could I avoid, therefore, noticing the fact, that scriptures quoted by my friend, clearly refute his argu-

ments on the main question in controversy. That were indeed difficult.

Allow me to call your attention again to Ecclesiastes, ninth chapter. Now here it is manifest, that not the body alone suffers death—goes to the grave and corruption—but the *man*, and there “is no hope for him.” If a man survive, there is hope for him. His condition is not utterly hopeless; but Solomon speaks of the dead as having *no hope*. If the spirit existed separately and consciously, possessing the capacity to think and act, to suffer and enjoy, then there would be hope even in death. The plain inference from all this is, that at death all consciousness ceases to exist—that the dead sleep, and know not any thing. All the scriptures referred to by my friend harmonize with what I have said, and fully agree, as I shall have occasion to show hereafter.

I repeat, my friends, that when a passage of scripture is appealed to, as proof of a theory, if it contradict any material part of that theory, it proves too much. Suppose, then, that A should be summoned to prove that B killed C, and that C is concealed or buried in a certain place, and it should turn out that the body of C could not be found in the place designated, what would be the conclusion? Evidently that he is a very doubtful, if not an incredible witness. Now my friend quotes Eccl. xii, to prove a separation of body and spirit at death, which no one denies. But at the same time it is an important part of his theory, that this spirit goes to a sort of prison called *hades*, and this the text contradicts. What is the inference? Why that his theory, at least, is erroneous.

He thinks my construction of Eccl. ix, 5, contrary to the context, and the design of the book. This context is the preceding verse, and reads as follows: “This is an

evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead. For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope." (Verses 3, 4.) How this conflicts with my interpretation of the fifth verse I cannot see. But my opponent asks, with an air of confidence, "How can madness exist where there is no consciousness?" I answer, it cannot. But this is assuming that those who go to the dead carry their madness with them. The passage does not say so. It is in their hearts *while they live*, and not after they are dead. For the fifth verse declares that the dead know not any thing; and the next one says "that their love, and their hatred, and their envy, are now perished." How, then, can they have madness in their hearts, when all their knowledge and passions have become extinct?

He says the dead have hope of salvation, and hence he understands the declaration that "the dead know not any thing," to mean, "that after death there is no more preaching to them, and no knowledge of the way of repentance and salvation." But Solomon says they *know not any thing*. They have no knowledge of any thing else. Why not stick to the letter of the text? How much better it would be for my opponent, and you, my friends, if he would just quote a passage that says, in plain and intelligible language, what his proposition affirms. It would save him and you a deal of trouble, if he would give us a "*thus saith the Lord*" for it. How quickly he would end this debate. Instead of this course of disputation, once the boast and pride of his party, he is compelled to rely on inferential reasoning to prove his doctrine! A forced and unnatural meaning must be

given to certain passages of scripture, as silent as the grave in regard to his philosophical tenet.

I come now to notice his remarks on the personality of the spirit. I presume, of course, he means the spirit mentioned in his proposition, that is to say, the spirits of dead men. I would notify him and you, my friends, that there is no controversy about the personality and intelligence of God and angels. It is about the spirit of man after its separation from the body. One of his positions, subordinate to his main proposition, is, that the spirit of man is a personality. That it is in reality the man proper. Here, then, we are at issue; and as I have already said, this controversy could be abruptly terminated by producing a "*thus saith the Lord*" for this doctrine. I admit that in one sense of the word personality is predicated of spirit, but not of the spirit of a dead man. This I will illustrate hereafter.

One of his proof texts is Eph. vi, 12, on which he has offered a Greek criticism. He insists that a proper rendering of this passage proves, that there are wicked spirits in the heavenly regions, with whom Christians have to wrestle. But does it prove that they are the spirits of dead men? Not at all. Admitting, then, for the sake of the argument, that there are "wicked spirits" in the heavenly regions—in the air if you please, what of it? Does it follow that they are human spirits? He says I gain nothing by supposing that they are lapsed angels, unless I admit that all spiritual nature is the same! Here, then, he asserts by implication that all spiritual nature is the same. Therefore, the spirits of the inferior animals are in the same condition as those of men after death! Just think of it, my friends, the air you breathe is full of the spirits of men and beasts!! The countless millions

of quadrupeds and birds on which the human family have subsisted, had immortal spirits, and are now swarming in the air!!! But as I shall have occasion to notice his criticism after he shall have fully offered his reasons for it, I will dismiss this passage with the remark, that I have lying on the stand, the new translation of the New Testament, by Alexander Campbell—I call it his, because he has made so many emendations of the translations of George Campbell, Philip Doddridge, and James Macknight, that it is really his translation. I do not, however, object to it on this account. It is unquestionably superior to any translation extant. Now why not appeal to it, and thus supersede the necessity for an appeal to the Greek? Is his translation incorrect? Will neither the common version nor Mr. Campbell's answer his purpose? Are we never to have a reliable translation of the scriptures, and must we forever appeal to the Greek in discussions before a popular assembly? I am willing to risk this question on either of the translations before us. Mr. Campbell translates this passage almost *verbatim* as it is in the common version. He makes the adjective *pneumatika* qualify the noun rendered *wickedness*.

Having given you a definition of the word *death* according to Webster, I will now give his definition of the word *life*. "LIFE—in a general sense, is that state of animals and plants, or of an organized being, in which its natural functions and motions are performed, or in which its organs are capable of performing their functions."

True, Dr. Webster has given the various applications and uses of the term, philosophical, theological, civil, and metaphorical, as adopted and allowed by the popular writers and speakers of the English language; but with these uses and applications of the word, we have but little

to do. In many instances they are fanciful and unwarrantable. There are properly but two uses of words—the literal and figurative, and it is thus that we must employ them in studying the Holy Scriptures. The context and nature of the subject, and other circumstances, will always suggest to the reader when he should abandon the literal and adopt the figurative meaning of a word. It is necessary to remark, however, that words when used in a purely literal sense, often have various significations; that is to say, primary, secondary, tertiary, &c. They are applied to various things. This can always be ascertained by their *usus loquendi* in the Bible.

In support of this view, I beg leave to introduce an authority of great weight and respectability, especially with the party with whom my friend is identified. I allude to Alexander Campbell. He speaks thus in his preface to the Gospels, in his new translation, sixth edition, page 11: "The reader will please consider, when God spoke to man, he adopted the language of man. To the forefathers of the Jewish nation he spoke in their mother tongue. By his Son, and his Son by the Apostles, he spoke to every nation in its own language. When he spoke to any nation, he uniformly adopted the words of that nation, in expressing his will to it. And that he used their words in the commonly received sense, needs no other proof than this, that if he had not done so, instead of enlightening them in the knowledge of his will, he would have deceived and confounded them: than which no hypothesis is more impious. For example, were God to speak to us in *English*, and select from our vocabulary the word *death*, *punishment*, *perpetual*, and *wicked*; were he to use the last term as we use it, and annex to the others a signification different from that we affix to them, such as to mean *life* by the

term *death*, *happiness*, by the term *punishment*, and a *limited time* by the word *perpetual*; and, without apprising us of such a change in their meaning, say, "*Perpetual death shall be the punishment of the wicked*," what a deception would he have practiced upon us!" I heartily subscribe to these views, and insist that, as reformers, you started with them, you shall abide by them *now*.

Allow me now to give you the orthodox definition of the term *spirit*, which will serve to exhibit the vast difference between that sense of the term, and its primary and literal signification. It is as follows: "The *spirit* is simple, uncompounded, immaterial, indivisible, indissoluble, indistructible, intangible, without exterior or interior surface; is not extended, and can never come in contact with matter. That the *spirit*, from its essential nature, is immortal and independent of the body, and, therefore, that it can exercise the functions of life, of the understanding, affections, and will, without the concurrence of the body, and does indeed perform these functions while the body is mouldering in the dust. That the *spirit* is in a state of conscious enjoyment or suffering between death and the resurrection—the good going to paradise, or heaven, where Christ is, and the wicked to hell. That the resurrection refers only to the body, the *spirit* having never died. That the wicked, as well as the righteous, from the necessity of their own immortal natures, will never die."

After this highly philosophical definition of *spirit*, allow me, my friends, to give you the various meanings of the term as it occurs in the Bible. 1st. Its first and primary signification is *breath*, air, wind in motion, in which sense it should always be construed, if the context will permit. 2. The vital principle, or animal life. 3. Thoughts, affections, temper, or disposition of mind. 4. It is used for

the mind of man. 5. It is used for one's self, periphrastically. 6. In a few instances it is used synonymously with person. Now, I here affirm that, in every instance in which it occurs in the Bible, it is in one of these senses. Numerous passages of scripture might be quoted illustrative of these diversified meanings of the term, but I shall not consume time in reading them unless my opponent calls this statement in question. Should he do so, they shall be forthcoming. [*Time out.*]

MR. CONNELLY'S THIRD SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS:—

It would be well before we advance further, to review the ground over which we have already gone, that we may ascertain what we have gained. First, then, it is conceded by the brother that, at death, there is a separation between the body and the *spirit*; and, secondly, that personality is attributed to the *spirit* in the scriptures. Thus far we are agreed. And thus, as I humbly conceive, two-thirds of the whole proposition is established and conceded.

But the brother says he did not intend to concede that personality is applied to the *spirits* of dead men. I have no idea that he *desired* to make the concession. But he will be utterly unable to extricate himself from it unless he can show some authority for calling that *spirit* which has no *spirit*. We have asked for this several times already, and as he passed it by in silence, we again ask

where is the authority for applying the term spirit to the body from which the spirit has departed? Will it be forthcoming? We will see.

We will turn our attention again, for a few moments, to definitions. My friend has been pleased to favor us with what he calls the orthodox definition of the term spirit, as a contrast with the true primary meaning. But he does not tell us from what orthodox author he gets it. We would say to the brother, however, once for all, that we are responsible for no definitions but our own, and that we regard nothing as orthodox in definitions, that does not agree with the *standard authorities*. He next gives us some five or six definitions of spirit, claiming the authority of the Bible, which we will now examine. First, wind, air in motion, hence breath. In this sense, he insists we should always use the term when it will possibly do. But Webster says "this sense is unusual." Here the doctors are at issue. Again, we need only substitute the word *breath* in the various scriptures we have cited, to see what utter nonsense it would make. Second, life or the vital principle. With reference to this definition I remark, that *Webster gives no such definition!* He defines spirit by life only in the sense of resemblance. His fifteenth definition reads thus: *life or strength of resemblance*. But to see how ridiculously absurd Dr. F.'s definitions are, and how confused are his thoughts upon the whole subject, let us substitute the definition of life quoted by himself, from Dr. Webster, in those scriptures where he supposes it has that meaning. Luke viii, 55: And her state of animals and plants, in which its natural functions and motions are performed, came again, and she rose straightway! Eccl.: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the state of animals and plants, or organized being, in

which its natural functions and motions are performed, shall return unto God who gave it." Luke xxiii, 46: "Father, into thy hands I commend my state of animals and plants, or organized being, in which its natural functions and motions are performed." Could any thing be more absurd! And so we might show with all the rest, but you are doubtless satisfied, my friends, with this specimen. Third, "It is used for the mind of man." This definition affords him no assistance, as it only removes the difficulty one step further back. For mind, as we shall show hereafter, is an essential property of the spirit. Fourth, That the term is sometimes used for temper or disposition of mind, is not disputed. But this again only shifts the difficulty. Fifth, It is used for one's self periphrastically. Sixth, For persons. This is what we have been endeavoring to show, and as it is applied to the dead, as we have before shown, it must be to the spirits of men separated from the body, and hence only proves what my friend says he did not intend to concede. But more of this hereafter.

But let us consult Dr. Webster a little further, and see if we are without any authority for our definition of spirit. His fifth definition reads thus: "The soul of man; the intelligent, immaterial, and immortal part of human beings." And cites Eccl. xii, 7: "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Sixth definition, "An immaterial, intelligent substance." Seventh, "An immaterial intelligent being." And cites 1 Pet. iii, 19: "By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison." You can now see, my friends, whether the standard authorities are with me or my opponent.

We will next call your attention to Dr. Webster's definition of the verb die. I cannot account for brother Field's reading so much of the learned doctor's definition as he

did, and his stopping where he did, on any other ground than that he felt assured it was against him. For he read every thing but that he *should have read*. DIE — "To be deprived of the circulation of the blood, and other bodily functions, as *animals*, either by natural decay, by disease, or by violence; to cease to live; to expire; to decease; to perish." Thus far he read, and thus far it relates to animals in general. But mark what follows; "*and with respect to MAN, TO DEPART FROM THIS WORLD.*" This, you see, is the only clause in the definition applicable to the question in debate. Why, then, was it omitted. The gentleman has told you that we must take terms in their primary and natural signification, whenever we can do so, without violating good sense. With this rule I agree; and insist that we shall abide by it. What then, I ask, is it that departs from this world when a man dies? Is it his body? Does that depart from the world? No; it returns to the earth as it was. Yet death is a departure from the world. If, then, the body *remains in the world after death* — and *to die is to depart from the world*, does it not follow that this departure must be predicated of something else than the body? And of what else than the spirit can it be? That leaves the body, as before shown and conceded, at death; the body remains behind in the world; hence the spirit is the being — the person — that departs from this world. This, as I have before said, my friend admits. In commenting on the third chapter of 1st Peter, he informs us that the term spirits in this scripture is equivalent to *persons*. If so, then, it follows that that something which has departed from the world is the *person*; and as it cannot be the *body*, which we have shown does not leave the world at death, it *must be the spirit* — the *immaterial, intelligent part of those antediluvians*.

Our attention is again called to Eph. vi, 12. He informs us that *spiritual* here qualifies wickedness. It is made to do so in the King's version, I know, but it does not in the original. *Pneumatika* is of the neuter gender, accusative case, plural number, and hence cannot qualify *ponerias*, which is of the feminine gender, singular number, and genitive case, without violating some of the plainest rules of the language. Hence we do not, as the gentleman asserts, make an adjective bestow personality upon a noun; but simply show that an adjective is here used for a noun, as Greenfield states on this passage, and, as we have already shown, is the case with Rom. ii, 4, and 2 Cor. viii, 8, to which we might add many other similar cases.

The gentleman seems to regret exceedingly that an appeal should be made to the Greek. Does he mean by this to endorse the common version as correct? It would seem so — he says it will suit him very well; and then we have Mr. Campbell's version, with which he is well pleased, and asks, with some astonishment, shall we never have a reliable version? Shall we never have any thing settled? That that is a mere appeal, "*ad captandum*," for effect, to prejudice your minds against a fair investigation, is evident from the fact that the translation of the text does not please him, and hence this appeal to Campbell's version. Had he not better appeal at once to the original? Why does he not, instead of such "*ad captandum*" appeals, show that my criticisms are not correct?

It follows, then, as we have shown, that the spirit is separated from the body at death, and that personality is applied in the scriptures to spirits thus separated; that spirits exist after death, distinct from the body.

We shall proceed, then, in the third place, to show that consciousness or intelligence is an attribute of the spirit.

In support of this position we cite Matt. xxvi, 41, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the *spirit* indeed is *willing*, but the flesh is weak." A plain distinction is made in this scripture between *flesh* and *spirit*. And an unmistakable recognition of intelligence as belonging to the spirit. Again, Luke i, 46, "And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." That the term spirit does include the body and soul is evident from the fact that the term soul occurs in the same sentence. But I quote this scripture merely to prove consciousness of the spirit, which it clearly shows.

To the same effect is Romans i, 9, "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers." Here the Apostle regards the spirit as that with which he served God, or as that which serves God, and it must, therefore, be intelligent and conscious. Again, 1 Cor. ii, 11, "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God." In this passage the Apostle declares that the spirit of man, resident in the body, is the intelligent knowing principle; yea, more, the *only* intelligent principle—no man but the *spirit* knows the things of man. Just as no man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God. I regard this passage as conclusive. And had I no other proof to this point, I might rest the question here in the fullest assurance of success. To say spirit here means mind, affects not my argument, as I have shown it removes the difficulty only one step back, unless it can be shown that the mind is not inherent in the spirit. Hence the gentleman may call it mind, or whatever else he pleases; it is the *only*

conscious, knowing principle in man, and it is distinct from the body—and the Apostle calls it the *spirit*. And besides this, intelligence is never attributed to the body. Again, 1 Cor. xiv, 14, "For if I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." In this scripture, the Apostle regards the spirit as praying, and, therefore, as intelligent and conscious. The thought before the Apostle's mind we understand to be simply this. If he prayed in a language that was not understood by those who heard him, it could communicate no knowledge to the hearer, though his own spirit being engaged in prayer, might profit by it. Again, Gal. v, 17, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Here, again, a clear distinction is made between the flesh and spirit. They are placed in distinct contrast with each other, and their different tendencies pointed out. I now call attention to Phil. i, 21. But before I read, that I may fix your mind on the point in the text, I ask leave to submit the following question: Who is the "I" of whom the Apostle speaks, as living in the flesh? But let us read, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and be with Christ, which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide, and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith: that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again." Here the Apostle speaks of an intellectual, intelligent identity—personality—that may either reside in the flesh or depart out of it.

And further, his language evidently shows that to abide in the flesh was to remain with the brethren; and, consequently, to depart from the flesh was to leave them — to be absent from them. Now, if this intellectual identity is not the spirit, there is no meaning in the passage. This text, then, embraces my whole proposition — the separation, personality, and consciousness — all. The argument from this text I regard as irrefragable, and one my friend will *never* be able to *refute*. The same fact is taught in Job xix, 26, "And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh I shall see God." Here, again, an intellectuality — personality is regarded as residing in the flesh, which is unquestionably the spirit.

[*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S THIRD REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS:

My friend seems to attach considerable importance to certain concessions which he says I have made. Now, suppose, I have conceded that there is a separation of body and spirit at death, does it hence follow that the spirit after death is a living, intelligent, personality? Certainly not. If it will help his cause any I will also concede that at death there is a separation between the body and the sight, hearing, its vitality, its sensibility, — does it follow that they are personalities too?

I have said that in some instances the word spirit is synonymous with the word person. Now for the proof. "Beloved believe not every spirit, (person) but try the

spirits (persons) whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world — every spirit (person) that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit (person) that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God." 1 John iv. 1-3. In this passage it is evident that the false prophets who had gone out into the world were called spirits. We often use the word in a similar sense in our common parlance. Such expressions as "turbulent spirit," "refractory spirit," "restless spirit," and "ambitious spirit," are of frequent occurrence. But I will give you another example of the import of this word in the scriptures: "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 (person) nor by word, nor by letter as from us as that the day of Christ is at hand." 1 Thess. ii, 1, 2. The apostle cautioned the church of Thessalonica not to believe what certain persons might teach on the exciting subject to which he referred.

In this sense of the word spirit, personality is predicable of it. So of the word soul, which in a number of instances means person. I presume my friend will not deny that dead bodies are sometimes called souls. For example: — "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (dead body in the grave) neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." See Ps. xvi, 10. There is a pretty general agreement among commentators that this is the sense of this passage. My friend has admitted that *living persons* are called spirits. Now, the question is, do the scriptures furnish any authority for calling *dead* people spirits? If they do, then the difficulty about the "spirits in prison" vanishes at once. Bear it in mind my friends, that I have adduced examples of the use of the word spirit in

the sense of *person* — a living person. My friend assumes that spirit can be predicated only of personality. Then, it follows, that whatever is a personality may be called a spirit. Is, then, a dead man, or a dead body if you please, ever spoken of in the Bible or treated as a personality? Let us see. In the 11th chapter of John we have an account of the raising of Lazarus after he had been dead four days. When our Lord approached the dwelling of his bereaved sisters he asked "Where have ye laid HIM? They say unto him, Lord, come and see. Jesus wept. Then said the Jews, behold how he loved HIM. And some of them said, could not this man, who opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even THIS MAN should not have died? John xi, 34-37. Here we have an illustration of the personality of a dead man—that part of him too which lies in the grave. Though a mass of putrefaction, he is still called a *man*. What will my opponent say to this? But again: Acts ii, 29, "Men and brethren let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that HE is both dead and buried, and HIS sepulchre is with us unto this day." David *himself*, not a *part* of him, is here said to be dead and buried—in HIS tomb at Jerusalem. Many other examples might be given going to show that dead bodies, just as we see them after the breath has left them, are personated by all the personal pronouns in our language. Even in the very first chapter of the Bible we are told that Adam was a man before he was endowed with vitality. After he was formed God breathed into HIS nostrils the breath of life and MAN (mark the expression) became a living soul or living person. So it seems he was really and truly *man* before he drew his first breath or saw the light. According to the doctrine of my opponent, Adam was no man at all until the breath of life was imparted

to him, at which time the man proper entered the body! Neither was Lazarus in the grave, but in the heavenly regions perhaps: hence if his doctrine be true our Lord should have said "Where have you laid his body"?

These points being established, we are better prepared to examine minutely my friend's proof texts with regard to the spirits in prison and also in the heavenly regions. 1 Peter 3, 18-20, "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit—by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, this is, eight souls, were saved by water." These spirits, my friend says, are the disembodied spirits of the antediluvians. Then they cannot be the wicked spirits mentioned in Eph. vi, 12, with whom the Apostle wrestled, for they are, according to my friend, in the heavenly regions—going at large. There is something here I wish him to notice particularly. Spirits in prison cannot annoy the living—they cannot be flying about in the air—or engaged in pugilistic contests with men in the flesh. But who are these spirits in prison? In order to decide this question, let us look at another passage in this epistle of Peter. In the next chapter he says: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For, for this cause was the gospel preached also TO THEM THAT ARE DEAD, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." 1 Pet. iv, 5, 6. This is acknowledged by commentators to be a text of considerable ambiguity. But whatever may be its meaning, it certainly does not mean that the class of persons referred to are now living.

On the contrary, the Apostle asserts that *they are dead*. They were dead when he wrote; but they had heard the gospel in their life-time. When? In the days of Noah. There cannot, I think, be a rational doubt that these dead persons are the antediluvians who resisted the preaching of God's Spirit through Noah. And when we take into consideration the fact that the inspired writers use words with great latitude, there is nothing absurd in supposing the phrase "spirits in prison" to mean *dead men in their graves*. I say this is neither absurd nor unnatural. I have shown that dead men are personalities; and that the word spirit is used in scripture in the sense of person. Hence there is no difficulty in reconciling the text with the unconscious sleep of the dead.

Let us now examine Eph. vi, 12. My friend is determined to draw us into the Greek. He is not satisfied with either the common version or Mr. Campbell's, so far as this text is concerned. Neither of them exactly favor his theory. Very well. If we must appeal to the Greek, let us have the Greek without addition or modification. Before we end this discussion, he will find the Greek fatal to his cause. What if I admit the correctness of his criticism? Will it prove his point? Suppose that "*ta pneumatika tes ponerias en tois epouraniois*" is properly translated "wicked spirits in the heavenly regions"—how does this rendering tally with his doctrine? Does he not teach that the disembodied spirits of wicked men, aye, and of saints too, are in hades? Are they not, according to his faith, down in the earth—in a sort of prison? How, then, can they be in the heavenly regions? Is hades above as well as below the earth? It is a little strange that these wicked spirits have so much liberty—seeing they are in prison. It would seem that they had

liberty to roam over the earth and to obstruct the ministry of the gospel. Paul had to contend with them as well as the rulers of this world. Upon the hypothesis that my friend is correct in his critique on this passage, it is a little singular that it is not so rendered by Mr. Campbell, in his new translation.

The phrase "*ta pneumatika tes ponerias*" is literally *the spiritual of wickedness*. *Pneumatika* being an adjective, qualifies some noun understood. What noun is the most suitable and most in accordance with the sense of the original, is a question for translators. You may supply the sense by the noun *things* if you please, or any other noun of the neuter gender; because as my friend has shown *pneumatika* is of the *neuter gender*, plural number. Of course, then, the noun understood should be neuter gender also. For the adjective being of the neuter gender cannot qualify a noun in the feminine, such as *ponerias*. You see then, my friends, into what difficulties he involves himself by an appeal to the Greek. The adjective does not and cannot qualify a personality at all, and the translators of the King's version well knew it. So did Mr. Campbell, and, therefore, his rendering is the same as theirs with a slight difference. Mr. Campbell uses the word "*regions*" and the King's translators the word "*places*," as the noun understood and qualified by the adjective *epouraniois*—neither of which are in the original. As already remarked, the sense must be inferred by the translator, and the noun most in harmony with the subject should be selected.

There is a fact in connection with the matter that should be borne in mind, that words in all languages are often used in a figurative sense. Heaven being above us naturally enough suggests to the mind the idea of height

or elevation, hence the rendering in our common version of *epouraniois*—high places. But, waiving this consideration, there are some parallel passages that will aid us in coming at the meaning of the text before us. I shall quote, first, Eph. i, 3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ—*culogia pneumatike en tois epouraniois Christo*—in the original. Here, then, is a passage illustrative of what is meant by heavenly places—church places, privileges, membership, communion and such like are evidently meant. But, lest this should not be satisfactory, I will give you another—see Eph. ii, 6, "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places (*tois epouraniois*) in Christ Jesus." I would remark that the King's version and Mr. Campbell's coincide perfectly in the translation of these texts. There is as good reason for rendering the word *epouraniois* in these instances by the words "heavenly regions," as for the rendering in Eph. vi, 12. But the translators well knew that it would not do to make the Apostle say what is not true—that *we are sitting together in the air or above the clouds!* But suppose, for the sake of the argument, I should admit that *ta pneumatika tes ponerias* means wicked spirits, what would he gain by it? Nothing at all. I have proved, and he has conceded, that spirit is sometimes used in scripture to signify a person, a man in this life. There would be no difficulty, then, in explaining this passage to mean wicked persons in the Church—in such places as *we* are said to occupy. The Apostles not only contended with human governments, and wicked rulers in the State, but with dishonest and hypocritical men in the Church—in its offices and places of trust.

To prove the personality of the spirit after death, my friend quoted in his first speech Heb. i, 7. I must confess that I am somewhat surprised, that one professing to be a Greek scholar should introduce this scripture for such a purpose. A correct rendering of the original will show how irrelevant this text is to the matter under discussion. It is as follows: "Whereas concerning the angels, he says, who makes winds his angels (messengers) and flaming fire his ministers."

My friend asks me to state from what author I obtained what I called an orthodox definition of spirit. In reply I would remark, that although it is not found in any lexicographer, yet it is the metaphysical and popular understanding of the word. Such are the ideas attached to it by the philosophers of the day. Will my opponent deny that I have fairly stated the orthodox faith in regard to its nature and properties? I think not.

He has tried to make one of my definitions of spirit appear very ridiculous, but when the fact is noticed, that it is not the definition, but one of the definitions of the defining word that he has held up to ridicule, the fallacy will be easily detected. One of my definitions of spirit, is life in its common acceptance; not in all its different significations. Apply this meaning to it in the passages he quoted to exemplify its absurdity, and see if it is not appropriate. Luke viii, 55: "And her spirit (or life) came again and she arose straightway." Is there any thing absurd in this? Again: Ecc. xii, 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (life) return unto God who gave it." Luke xxiii, 46: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (life.) Of like import is the language of Stephen. Paul says, we are dead, and our *life* is hid with Christ in God. There is nothing

more natural than that a dying saint should commend his life to God, who has promised to restore it in the resurrection, henceforth to continue forever.

My friend complains that I did not read all of Webster's definition of death; but omitted the very part which should have been read. Before we proceed any further in this discussion I must make a remark or two in regard to lexicographers, whose definitions my friend seems to regard as infallible. As etymologists or philologists they may be trusted; but when they undertake to give you the various conventional meaning of words among the popular writers of the day, orators, poets, theologians, and philosophers they cannot be depended on. Words, in the lapse of time, change their meaning; and therefore the necessity of recurring to their history in order to ascertain in what sense they were originally employed. This, my friend knows, is the proper way to arrive at the primary and biblical meaning of words. The Bible is a book of great antiquity, and it will not do to settle its doctrine by the loose and latitudinous meaning of words as defined in our modern dictionaries. The right way, my friends, is to trace the word through the scriptures, and ascertain its *usus loquendi*, or the use the inspired writers made of it. This is a reliable mode of coming at the mind of the Holy Spirit. It is making the Bible explain itself—just what my friend and his party once said ought to be done. [Here the doctor read from Webster's definitions of the word spirit, immateriality, die, &c., showing thereby that even Mr. Connelly would reject some of his definitions.]

I now proceed to notice his quotations, to prove the consciousness and intelligence of the spirit. We wish you to notice, however, that these scriptures one and all

are as silent as the grave in relation to the consciousness of the spirit after death. They apply to the living, and if they teach any thing at all in regard to consciousness, it is while the spirit is in union with the body. Man is a compound being. He possesses an intellectual, physical, and moral nature. He has a body, soul and spirit, which the Apostle prays may all "be preserved blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." See 1 Thess. v, 23. Now, the simple question is, do any of these constituents of his organism survive death and continue conscious and intelligent? Has my friend quoted a single passage of scripture explicitly affirming such a doctrine? He has not. And it must now be apparent to you all, that he does not expect to prove it by direct evidence; but by mere inference! Many passages are pressed into his service in no wise pertinent to the subject in debate, and by a forced construction, if not perversion, made to favor his views. Is this one of the boasted achievements of "*this reformation*." After all said and done against the sects, for *inferring* their doctrines, has it come to this, that the "reformers" are compelled to do the same? So it seems.

It is not requisite that I should notice all the passages my friend quoted, but only two or three by way of showing how utterly futile and baseless must be a doctrine that has to be inferred from such authority. The first I shall notice is Phil. i, 21-23,— "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. For if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose I know not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and be with Christ which is far better." My friend wishes to know who is the "*I*" in the text. Suppose I admit that it is Paul—what then? Why

that the personal pronouns apply to the man proper and not to a part of him or an attribute of his nature. This is what I maintain and it corroborates my argument on the personality of the body after death. To illustrate this point I will quote another of my friend's texts. Luke 1, 45: "And Mary said MY soul doth magnify the Lord, and MY spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." In return I ask who is the *my* in the text? Mary, of course. Here, then, is a personal pronoun in the possessive case, standing for the name of the possessor. The things possessed are the soul and spirit. So, then, the soul and the spirit cannot be Mary. My friend saw this difficulty, and provided against it by saying that the term spirit includes the body and soul. This is all assumption, my friends, but suppose we admit it, — what is the conclusion? Why that as Paul meant his *spirit* when he used the pronoun *I*—for that my friend says is the man proper — therefore, when he desired to depart, he must have expected to take body and soul with him! Not very bad logic after all — inasmuch as it proves that the whole man, spirit, soul and body, goes to heaven at the same time.

But again: 1 Cor. ii, 11, "For what man knows the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God."

Here you perceive that my friend is met by the same difficulty. The spirit of man is said to be in HIM — that is, in the *man*. How, then, can the spirit be the man, and how can it comprehend the soul and body? Now look at the analogy. Is the Spirit of God different from God, and could it exist consciously and intelligently separate from God? I speak with due reverence — if it

were possible for God to die — could his Spirit survive? Thus you see, my friends, that the scriptures quoted by my friend are against him when critically examined.

[Time out.]

Mr. CONNELLY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

I regret that my friend seems so much confused. For if you have been able to determine the point in his reasoning, your powers of discrimination, are better than mine.

We will, however, review his speech, before we advance, and see if we can understand it. If you will accompany me, you will, perhaps, be compensated, if by nothing else, by the discovery of a very peculiar species of reasoning, to which, the brother is evidently indebted, for his singular conclusions. He asks, if his concession, that there is a separation of body and spirit at death, proves the spirit to be a living, intelligent personality after death. In answer to this we remarked, that it proves just what the scriptures, which we have quoted on that point, proves: that there is a separation of body and spirit; that they are entirely distinct; and that their tendencies and destinies are also distinct.

Mark then, my friends, that this point is gained; and you will see how beautifully it harmonizes with his next position.

He next shows, by repeating some of my proof texts, what I had before shown, and what he had conceded, that personality is predicated of the spirit. Perceiving,

however, that this truth, which he has so reluctantly, though justly admitted, is fatal to his whole scheme, as well as to his entire system of faith, he endeavors to escape its force, by an attempt, so absurd that it borders on the ridiculous, to show that the body, though a mass of putrefaction, is the *spirit*!! According to his logic, the *body* is the *spirit*, and the *spirit* is the *body*, they are separated at death; and yet they do not separate at all — but all becomes a mass of putrefaction together! How intelligent, how clear, what argument can resist *such* a conclusion! But seriously, is it not a matter of grief, my friends, that a man possessing the powers for usefulness, that are accredited to Dr. Field, should suffer himself to be led into such absurdities, by a system which seeks to degrade man, who was made a little lower than the angels, to a level with the brute?

But his reasonings are not less singular than his conclusions. He represents me as assuming that spirit, is only predicated of personality. (Which is the very reverse of my position.) And then concludes, that whatever is a personality may be called a spirit. He then asks, "is a dead man or a dead body, spoken of in the Bible, or treated of as a personality?" And then reads the conversation of the Saviour, with Mary and Martha, concerning Lazarus, placing great stress on the word *him*; he also reads Acts ii, 29, emphasizing the words *he* and *his*, with all his strength; and triumphantly asserts, that many other examples might be given, going to show, that dead bodies just as we see them, after the breath has left them, are PERSONATED by all the *personal pronouns* in the language!

The fact then that personal pronouns are used with reference to the bodies of dead men, is incontrovertible

evidence to his mind, that they are persons. Can you believe, my friends, that Dr. Field, the champion of unconsciousness, *claiming* to be a classical scholar, is sincere in making this argument? If so, what may a lifeless system of unconsciousness, not lead a man to do? But does he suppose, that this community, and those who may afterwards read this discussion, are so illiterate that they will not be able to detect its absurdity?

His argument is this, that what the personal pronouns apply to, are personalities, that the personal pronouns are applied to the bodies of dead men, therefore they are persons. Let us try this argument a little further. The personal pronouns are used for the names of animals of every description, in the scriptures as well as in all other writings, consequently, according to the Doctor, *all animals* are persons! This proves what I before asserted, that his system degrades man to a level with the brute— makes him only an order of beasts. But worse still. The personal pronouns are used for the names of things inanimate, as well as for the names of men and beasts. Therefore, *all inanimate things* are persons! And as he affirms, that, whatever is a personality may be called a spirit; consequently all inanimate things are spirits. Hence the Doctor's horse is a greater spirit than the Doctor himself, being larger; and for the same reason, his house is a greater spirit still. This, my friends is surely too spiritual, if not for the Doctor, at least for this age. And this, ridiculously absurd, as it is, as the sequel will show, is the legitimate result of his theory — that all is matter. I would here ask the Doctor if God is matter?

For the sake of those who are not acquainted with the use of personal pronouns, I will make a few remarks, before I dismiss the Doctor's argument. The word noun,

is a name applied to a class of words, which includes the names of all things, whether animate or inanimate. Persons, as used by grammarians, shows the relation of the noun or pronoun to what is said in discourse, that is, it shows whether the noun or pronoun is represented as the speaker, the spoken to, or spoken of. The word pronoun, as its composition indicates, includes a class of words, which stand for nouns, to prevent the too frequent use of the same word, five of which by their form show the person of the nouns for which they stand, and are for *that reason* called personal pronouns. They do not then show that the nouns for which they stand, possess the attributes of personality; that must be learned from other considerations. They simply show whether the nouns is the speaker, the spoken to or spoken of, and hence the Doctor's assumption that the bodies of dead men are persons, and therefore spirits is without any authority under the broad canopy.

We will next examine the definitions of the words, personality and person. Webster, with whom all the authorities in the language that I have seen, agree, defines the word personality thus, that which constitutes an individual a distinct person. Person he defines thus: "an individual human being possessed of body and soul." This evidently applies to human beings before death. But he adds "we apply the term to *living* beings only, possessed of rational nature. A body, when *dead* is not called a person!" So the Doctor's position, that *dead bodies* are persons, outrages both common sense and language. For where there is no rationality there is no personality. Again, Webster quotes from Locke, the following which applies directly to the point before us,— "A person is a thinking, intelligent being."

Hence, when it is conceded that personality is predicated of the spirit, my whole proposition is virtually conceded.

Having laid the foundation in the bundle of absurdities, which we have just exposed, he has at length, given us the meaning of the phrase, spirits in prison. He says, it means "*dead men in their graves*," that is, *dead bodies*. for in his view man is *all body*. But what evidence does he give that this is the meaning of phrase? Hear it, oh! ye incredulous, and no longer resist its force. He says "There is nothing absurd in *supposing* it!" But why this *supposition*? "The inspired writers used words with great latitude!" To a mind under the influence of such logic, what could be unnatural or absurd! He quotes the fifth and sixth verses of the fourth chapter, to prove, the *antediluvians are dead!* But why this effort does any one deny it?

Does the fact that they are dead aid him in any way? Not in the least; unless he can show what his argument assumes, that to die is to lose conscious existence. This however he has not done, nor can he show it, if his own existence depended upon it. You cannot fail to perceive, that his main objections to my position have their foundation in appropriating unauthorized meanings to words, and I doubt not that his discussion will clearly demonstrate that his entire system is sustained by the same means; and he intimates that the inspired writers pursued a similar course, for he says, they "used words with *great latitude!*" What could a man not prove, having this license.

I have defined death to be a separation of body and spirit. Now the question is, is this definition correct? is it sustained by the authority? If it is, then his objections

with his whole theory fail, if not, then my proposition is not true. To the law then, and to the testimony, for if we speak not according to these, there is no light in us.

Webster says, to die is "*with respect to man, to depart from this world.*" Now apply this definition of this standard authority, to the antediluvians—"the spirits in prison," and my position follows beyond all question. They all died—departed from this world, not their bodies, for they returned to the dust as they were—but the spirit, which returned to God who gave it. We would again ask the brother for some authority, for calling that *spirit* from which the *spirit has fled*. But the doctor thinks the lexicons are not to be depended upon. I knew he would dread these authorities, although he appealed to them this morning with so much emphasis, as "*standard authorities.*" But why has his confidence so failed in them this afternoon? Simply, because they are against him. It is the business of lexicographers to give the accredited meanings of words in the times and places for which they write, and that they have done so with the words now in dispute, my friend *dares* not deny; hence, if these words do correctly represent the original terms, the meanings of these words, as given by the lexicons, are the true ones; the context and circumstances determining which definition is to be preferred. I am unable, however, to please the brother. When I appeal to the lexicons, they are unsafe, and when I appeal to the original, then I ought to take the translations as they are. In this, however, I am not disappointed, for he evidently came here predetermined not to be pleased. But let us see if my definition is not sustained by the *scriptural* use of the word. Re-examine, then, those scriptures cited to prove a separation of body and

spirit at death, in connection with the following language of Peter: "Knowing that shortly I must put off this, my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover, I will endeavor that after my decease, that you may always have these things in remembrance." 2 Pet. i, 14, 15. Nothing is plainer, I think, than that the apostle here uses the term *decease*, which is but another term for death, and the phrase *put off this my tabernacle*, as representatives of the *same thought*. Consequently, death with him is a putting off the body—a separation of body and spirit—my definition precisely.

Our attention is again called to Eph. vi, 12. He says, I am determined to draw him into the Greek. He dreads the Greek, and he dreads the English, and I should not be surprised if he should dread his own positions before the discussion closes.

But why this cant about the Greek, and Mr. Campbell's translation in one breath, and about an appeal to the original, in the next? Does he intend to indorse the common version and Mr. Campbell's both? I would ask what reason have the king's translators or Mr. Campbell given for their rendering of the phrase in dispute? or what reason has the doctor given in his defence of it? None whatever. Yet we dare not depart from it, because the king's translators, Mr. Campbell, and *Dr. Field* have all so decreed. We will presume, notwithstanding, to prefer the rendering given by Macknight and others, for the reasons given in a former speech, which I need not now repeat.

But then he asks, if the correctness of my criticism be admitted, that the phrase means "wicked spirits in the heavenly regions," how does this rendering tally with my doctrine? I answer precisely; and that when we need the

doctor's aid in expounding our doctrine we will call for it. We would remark, however, that we understand the word *hades* to mean the unseen state without any reference to up or down, hence his difficulties exist only in his imagination. But notwithstanding all his Greek lore, it seems that he cannot yet understand that I do not make *pneumatika* qualify *ponerias*, but render it as a noun; hence his difficulties exist again in his own Greek learning.

Were it not for the strange things the doctor has already developed, we should be somewhat surprised at his course, with regard to this text. He admits all we introduced this text to prove, and then labors with all his might to show that it does not prove what he has admitted. Hence failing to set aside my position on the phrase *pneumatika ponerias*, he endeavors to show, that *epouranois* means the church, and for this purpose he cites Eph. i, 3, and ii, 6. His argument then, is this, that the same word should always be supplied after this adjective, and thus virtually affirms that this adjective can qualify but one noun, let the context be what it may. Hence he thinks that if it means church or church privileges in these two scriptures, it must therefore mean the same in Eph. sixth chapter; the inconsistency of this argument, will appear if we examine the various connections where this word is found. A single example may suffice for the present, Eph. iii, 10: "To the intent, that now unto the principalities and powers in (*epouranois*) heavenly places might be known by the church, the manifold wisdom of God." The word church or church privileges could not be supplied here, because by the church the wisdom of God is to be known unto those in the heavenly regions. So in the sixth chapter the context will not allow the church to be supplied nor men in the flesh to be meant. For flesh and blood, and those

"wicked spirits" are placed by the apostle in clear contrast with each other. Will the doctor please inform us what there is in the Greek text of Heb. i, 7, that requires *pneumata* to be rendered *winds*?

He admits that his orthodox definition of spirit, is not in the lexicons. Strange that all the lexicographers should omit the popular orthodox meaning of the word!

He complains that I ridiculed one of his definitions of spirit; he told us that one of Webster's definitions of spirit was life, the vital principle; and then read us what he called the common acceptance of life; which as I showed makes nonsense of those scriptures where he substitutes life for spirit. But I again demand some evidence that the word spirit means life in its common import? What author has ever so used the word. I deny that it has any such meaning in the language; hence he has no right to substitute it for spirit, unless he can show from some reputable author that it is so used, or that these scriptures are incorrectly rendered; and should he do this, it would not help him any. For what is life? It is the opposite of death, which I have shown is a separation of spirit and body. Consequently life is a state where these are united. This agrees with the definition of Webster, corroborated by all the authorities of the language. He says "in man that state of being in which soul and body are united;" this substituted for spirit, will be no less ridiculous than the other. Life and death then are not qualities, as the theory of the doctor assumes, but simply modes of being. We will now return to our argument.

We had just quoted Phil. i, 21-25, and asked what that is, that might depart from, or remain in the body, if not the spirit, the intelligent, conscious part of man. To which the doctor thus replies: "Suppose I admit that it is Paul, what

then? why that the *personal pronouns* apply to the man proper, and not to a part of him or an attribute of his nature." Will he inform us what he means by an "attribute of his nature?" His position then stands thus, the personal pronoun stands for "the man proper;" the man proper is Paul, and Paul is the body; for he says "this is what he maintains, and that it corroborates his argument on the personality of the body after death, (a clear concession that he believes man is all body). Hence the doctor thinks that when Paul *departed from the body he took the body with him!* How can such logic and philosophy be resisted!

But he is still greatly troubled with personal pronouns. He knows of no way by which personality can be distinguished but by their use; and how could he when he knows of no distinguishing characteristics of person. I hope, however, that my remarks on the use of these pronouns will be of some use to him. To which I will now make an additional observation. The pronouns, as well as the nouns for which they stand, sometimes apply to the whole being in its present organized state; while by the use of other terms the writers show the nature and use of the distinct parts; note Luke i, 45; 1 Cor. ii, 11; 2 Pet. i, 14; which have already been quoted, as examples. This fact will at once remove all the difficulties, the doctor has labored so hard to involve them in, and will also show their relevancy to the question in debate; the doctor's declaration to the contrary notwithstanding. For in these scriptures, the inspired writers have shown, that the body is merely the *tabernacle* or *dwelling place* of the spirit and that the spirit is the intellectual intelligent part. Hence wherever intelligence is found we know the spirit is alluded to. With these facts before us, we will call your attention again to Phil. i, 21-23. Here are three things clearly pre-

sented: first, something to depart *from*, which is the flesh or body; second, something to be present *with* when away from the body — that is the Lord; third, something to be thus present and absent at the same time; that is evidently the spirit, and alike intelligent and conscious whether *in* or *out* of the body. Consequently a clear proof of my proposition.

To the same effect is the following scripture: "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven! If so, that being clothed we shall not be found naked.

"For we that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the spirit.

"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (For we walk by faith not by sight.) We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord.

"Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent we may be accepted of him." [*Time out.*]

Dr. FIELD'S FOURTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS —

I wish you to remember that I am the respondent in this discussion, and am under obligation, by polemic rules, to follow the affirmant, in his course of argumentation. He has undertaken to prove a certain proposition, and my business is to test the soundness of his arguments. Logically speaking I have nothing to prove myself, but rather to *disprove* what my friend may adduce in support of his doctrine. There is, therefore, no propriety in his calling my views — “*philosophy*.” I did not come here, my friends, to build up or defend any system of philosophy, moral or natural; but to see that my friend does not make void the word of God by his traditions. If there is any thing in the range of our conceptions, entitled to the name of *philosophy*, it is a theory of human nature unknown to scripture. As I have repeatedly said, no “thus saith the Lord” can be produced for the doctrine advocated by my friend. He is arguing a question outside of the Divine Record. It is truly an untaught question; hence, it must be sustained by inferential reasoning, and not by positive declarations of scripture.

I do not, as my friend has stated, reject the authority of dictionaries, and dispute all the definitions which conflict with my views. By no means. He misunderstands me on this point. I have said, and I here repeat it, that as philologists or etymologists, the student of the Bible may depend on them. They *are* authority, but not to the extent that my friend supposes. If I wish to ascertain the modern import of a word, as settled by the

popular writers of the day, conventional agreement, or custom, I appeal to lexicographers. In such cases, and for such purposes, they are trust-worthy. But in a theological discussion, when it becomes necessary to ascertain the meaning of a word, two or three thousand years ago, we cannot rely on our English dictionaries. The word must be traced through the Bible, and its meaning decided by the context, and various other circumstances connected with its use.

It is admitted by my friend that it is a common practice to speak of dead men as dead persons. So it is, and it is this common practice that obtains in the Bible, which speaks of things just as *we* speak of them. If it is a common practice *now*, why may it not have been so *then*? But we are again reminded that Dr. Webster is against this use of the word. This is unfortunate, but still it does not follow that the writers of the New Testament were as restricted and punctilious in the use of words as Dr. Webster. He asks me where I find in the Bible an example of a dead body being called a *person*. I might answer this question by asking another. Where in the Bible does my friend find an example for calling the spirit of a dead man a *person*? I have showed that dead men are addressed as persons — all the personal pronouns are applied to them — more than can be said of the spirit — either before or after its separation from the body. Take the case of Jairus' daughter, to which my friend has referred. Luke viii, 55, “And *her* spirit came again, and *she* arose straightway.” Here this maid while dead is personated by the appropriate pronouns; but not so of her spirit. That is not mentioned as a personality at all; but as something different from her. If this is not proving that dead bodies are personalities,

then there is no meaning in the words *her* and *she*. At all events it proves that the spirit was not the maid — neither *her* nor *she*.

I do not see how my friend could have inferred from anything said by me, that I consider the common version faultless. That it is imperfect no scholar will deny. But that every item of Christian faith may be deduced from it, is acknowledged by all sects and parties. True, there are many inaccuracies in the translation, but in the main it is correct and reliable. So far as the present controversy is concerned, it is sufficiently plain and perspicuous. If, however, my friend, Mr. Connelly, is not willing to risk his cause on it, let him take Mr. Campbell's new translation. In the discussion of the question before us, our appeals are mostly to New Testament authority, and I should suppose that he would greatly prefer this translation to the common version.

But we are told that Paul did not wrestle with *flesh* and *blood*; hence, I am mistaken in supposing that wicked spirits in high places, were bad men in the church; because, says my friend, men in the church are flesh and blood! This apparant difficulty is easily solved. The apostle alluded no doubt to the Grecian games, from which he drew the illustration. The Christian warfare is not carnal or fleshly — it is not a *bodily* or *physical* contest in which we are engaged — but a *moral* contest. On the side of the gospel was arrayed the apostles and all the saints throughout the world. On the side of the opposition, the civil rulers and powers of this world, and even wicked men in the most elevated and important places in the Church. All this is plain and intelligible to one not biased by a "spiritual system" at war with the simplicity of the gospel. Principalities, earthly

powers or governments, the ignorant and benighted Pagan-rulers of this world and wicked men in the church are all in the same category, and were terrestrial in their nature and location.

Our attention is again called to Phil. i, 21-24. This is one of the strongest passages in the Bible in support of my friend's doctrine. It should, therefore, be carefully examined. In morals as well as physics, if a well ascertained fact contradicts a theory it must be false. Suppose for example that I were to frame a theory of the earth, and teach that it is a plane — instead of a spheroid, and from its edges the waters on its surface rolled off in a vast cataract. I might reason very plausibly in support of this theory, and even make converts to it. But suppose the fact is discovered that the earth has been circumnavigated — what would my theory be worth? Just so in morals or religion, if one passage of scripture positively and unequivocally contradicts a theory it is false and worthless. Let us then look at a few facts which must be harmonized with my friend's interpretation of the text under consideration. *First* — It must be harmonized with a well known fact in the typical institutions of the Jewish religion. The high priest of the Jewish nation, once a year went into the most holy place with the blood of the offering, and made an atonement for the people. The subordinate priests officiated in the first tabernacle, but never entered the second. Neither priests nor people were permitted to enter its sacred precincts. But into this second tabernacle went the high priest not without blood which he offered for himself and the errors of the people. See Hebrews ix, 2-7. While the high priest was within the second veil — in the holiest of all, the Jewish congregation stood without waiting for his

return. He was required to be properly attired before approaching the mercy seat. After having performed his sacerdotal functions, he came out of the most holy place, and blessed the waiting congregation of Israel. Now, carry out the analogy in the antitype. Jesus Christ is the high priest of the Christian congregation. He has gone into the most holy place of the true tabernacle—into heaven itself to appear in the presence of God for us. Paul speaks of us as “waiting for the Lord from heaven.” A member of the great Christian congregation can no more go where he now is, than a member of the Jewish congregation could approach the high priest while within the second veil in the performance of his duty. Here, then, is the first difficulty in the way of the popular mistake that we go to heaven at death. The old Jewish tabernacle with all its accompaniments, priesthood, worship, &c., was “a pattern of things in the heavens”—a figure of the true tabernacle; and while Christ continues a high priest within the veil, we cannot personally approach him. I invoke the special attention of my friend, Mr. Connelly, to this fact.

Secondly—It is positively declared by our blessed Lord himself, that “no man hath ascended up to heaven, but the only begotten Son of God, who came down from heaven.” Again, he said to his disciples before his death, that whither he went they could not come, that so far from their going to him at or before death, he assured them as the ground of their comfort, that *he* would come again to them. That his absence was necessary that he might prepare a place for them, and *come again and take them to himself*. In the second chapter of the Acts, Peter stated that David had not *ascended into the heavens*, but was there in his sepulchre at Jerusalem.

Thirdly—God has highly exalted his Son, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities, thrones and dominions. See Eph. i, 20, 23. In 1 Tim. vi, 16, “That God only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no *man* can approach unto; whom no *man* hath seen nor can see.”

Fourthly—Our Lord himself says, Rev. iii, 21, “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Notice the fact, my friends, that Christ is seated on his *Father's* throne, not on his own. The saint cannot, then, hope to be *personally* with him while he continues in that relation to his Father.

Here, then, are four facts presenting, as I conceive, insuperable obstacles in the way of my friend's theory. I hope he will meet and dispose of them scripturally and logically. If he do not, all his expositions of other parts of scripture, not explicitly affirming the doctrine of his proposition, must be regarded as erroneous, and that they admit of an interpretation in unison with these facts. Having premised these things, let us now analyze this controverted text. In the first place, let it be noted that the apostle does not affirm that death would be gain to *him*. *Secondly*—He does not say that he expected to be present with the Lord *immediately* on his demise; and *Thirdly*—He says nothing about his spirit at all. And certainly a cause must be hard pressed for support, when it has to depend on proof texts, in which the thing to be proved, is not even mentioned! There is another fact worthy of notice in connection with this subject, and that is, that Paul represents himself as being in a strait—undecided as to which would be preferable, to depart and be with the Lord or abide with the brethren. Now, if

death was gain to him, in that it placed him *immediately* with Christ, then it would seem that there would have been no hesitancy, or indecision in the case. To understand what the apostle meant by his death being gain, we should read the whole chapter, and especially from the twelfth to the twentieth verse, from which you will learn, my friends, that his death would have been gain to the *cause of Christ*. He was willing either by life or death to *magnify Christ*, or to promote his cause. I would further remark that such expressions as "present with the Lord," do not necessarily mean a *personal* presence with him. We are told that "we are buried *with Christ* in baptism wherein also we are risen *with him*." Col. ii, 12. We are also said to "suffer *with him*," to be dead *with him*, &c. Now, I presume, no one will argue that there is a personal proximity in these cases. Is it necessary with those idiomatic examples before us, to give an interpretation to Paul's language contradictory of well established facts and his general teaching? We should take care that we do not in our interpretation of the word of God make an isolated text clash with others so plain as to be unmistakable. For instance: the apostle Paul teaches, that without a resurrection of the dead "then all who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." This would not be the case if there is in man an immortal, intelligent and an imperishable spirit, which at death ascends to dwell *personally* with Christ. Again, he asserts, that it was no advantage to him to suffer for the religion of Christ, if there be no resurrection. Upon my friend's principles, there would be an advantage in it, whether the body was raised from the dead or not. If the spirit can exist consciously and happily without the body, where is the necessity for its

resurrection? Will my friend tell us? Of the same import is the teaching of Paul in the eighth chapter of Romans. He there speaks of himself and co-operants in the ministry as "groaning for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies." In view of the event he says, "We are saved by hope." Here it is evident that Paul did not expect to be with Christ personally or to receive his reward until the resurrection. So I teach, and so many of the most pious people in this country believe.

There are a few points yet to be noticed in my friend's last speech. He has given you an explanation of the pronouns. He tells us they are applied to the inferior animals, and even to inanimate objects as well as man. This is exactly what I have contended for, and this fact has been strenuously avoided by him. By figure of speech, which we call personification, things without life are made to speak. Trees, hills, floods, dead people, Abel's blood, and a host of other objects, are personified as possessing life and intelligence. *Pronouns* like the nouns for which they stand, have all these qualities, gender, number, case, and person. The personal pronouns are applied to living beings generally. Whether or not it is proper to ascribe personality to beasts, depends, according to my friend's logic, on the question as to their rational nature. But one thing is certain, and it deserves particular notice, and that is, that after death, the personal pronouns of the masculine and feminine genders, are still applied to both men and women. Now, if the body is not the man proper — dead, or in a state of suspended animation, and if the man is really gone from this world to another, the body ought to be denoted by a *pronoun* in the neuter gender. Instead of that, however, they are still used in reference to Lazarus, David, and others, as though they were

living. We are told that *David* is both *dead* and *buried*. See the second chapter of Acts. The personal pronouns are still applied to these dead men as though they were alive. This is all I contend for and this being true, there is nothing strange or absurd in speaking of dead men as personalities. And as I have shown, the word spirit and soul are both used in the sense of person, or the man as we see him, the difficulties with regard to "the spirits in prison" are easily solved.

He says the application of the personal pronouns to dead bodies is no proof of their personality. Will he tell us, then, what it does prove?

While such expressions as the following abound in the scriptures, my argument based on the use of personal pronouns, cannot be refuted by a resort to the grammatical rules governing them. Another sample or two of these expressions and I will dismiss this part of the subject. In the eighth chapter of Acts, we read that "devout men carried *Stephen* (not his remains) to his burial." The angel told the women, who visited the sepulchre, that Jesus was not there, that he had risen, and then requested them to come and see the place where *the Lord lay*. This is enough to show that my view of this matter is perfectly tenable.

My friend manifests considerable surprise at the remark that the inspired writers used words with great latitude. He is the first man I ever heard deny it. I do not say, nor did I mean to say, that they used words in a *contradictory* sense, but in *various* senses. The same word in the Bible often has several meanings. This is all I meant, and it cannot be denied.

For the purpose of proving that *epourainois*, translated heavenly places, means something more than church

places. Eph. iii, 10, has been quoted; let us read it: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." In Alexander Campbell's new translation, the word "principalities" is rendered *governments*. The context of this passage will throw light on the apostle's meaning. In the seventh and eighth verses he speaks of his mission to the Gentiles, and says that the object of his preaching was "to make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery" namely, the calling of the Gentiles to the fellowship of the gospel. Then comes the text under consideration. Now, notice my friends, that these governments and powers are to be taught by the *church*, the manifold wisdom of God. They unquestionably have some connection with the church here. If they are located in the air or region above us, what have they to do with the church, and how can they be instructed by it? But now the question presents itself; are these governments, and powers *in* the church to be benefited by its teaching? That they are, I think you will see by reading 1 Cor. xii, 28: "And God hath sent some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, (power to work miracles and heal,) helps, *governments*, diversities of tongues."

The principal difficulty in this interpretation, is the word *heavenly*. I cannot perceive why the church may not be called a heavenly institution.

My friend inquires what I mean by an attribute of Paul's nature. I answer, qualities that belong to or are peculiar to his organization, such as wisdom, intelligence, memory, love, &c.

He says, that I assume that man is all *body*. In

reply to this, I remark that while man lives, he is so constituted that his material organization, eliminates mind, thought, reason, and all other mental manifestations. When dead, however, all these developments cease. He is then all matter. As the Psalmist says, "his breath goeth forth in that very day, his thoughts perish." Ps. 146.

He charges me with degrading man to the level of the brute. Not all of them by any means. Many men, however, are not much wiser, and multitudes more vicious and degraded than the inferior animals. Peter called certain men in his day, "natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." How does my friend like this?

[*Time out.*]

SECOND DAY,
Saturday morning, 10 o'clock. }

Mr. CONNELLY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

AFTER the usual preliminary exercises, Mr. Connelly rose and said :

BRETHREN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS :

Through the kind providence of our heavenly Father, we have been permitted, after a night's rest, to meet again for the purpose of resuming our investigation of the question now under discussion, and before I proceed in the prosecution of my argument, allow me to solicit your patient and prayerful attention to such matters as shall be submitted to your reflection. It is for each and every individual in this large and respectable audience to decide for himself, on which side of the question in debate, the truth lies. It is your duty to ponder the evidence, and say whether one of the most consoling articles of our faith, is a mere conceit or a delusion, as my opponent would have us believe, or whether it is one of the items of revealed truth.

There is but little in my friend's last speech that I need notice, except what will be fully answered as we advance with our argument. We will, therefore, proceed and notice his difficulties and objections, as we go along.

We concluded our last speech by a quotation from 2 Cor. v, corroborating our argument on Phil. i, 21, 22. You cannot, my friends, fail to perceive that the apostle has the same train of reflections before his mind in this

passage, that he had, in that quoted from the first of Philippians.

Here he regards the *body* as the *home*, the *dwelling place* of the saints, and that while they remained in the body, they were absent from the Lord. He also declares his preference to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. The same three things, then, are presented here that we have seen recognized in Phil. i, 21, 22, and in the same conditions; *viz*: the body—the Lord, and the something that lives in the body here,—which leaves the body when present with the Lord. What is that something that may thus live in the body or *out* of it, if not the *intelligent, immaterial* part of man—the *spirit*, which as we have shown, leaves the body at death? These scriptures can admit of no other interpretation consistent with the context, than that I have given them. If the doctor has another we will expect him to shed some light on the subject. Here, then, are facts, not mere *inferences* which prove my proposition in defiance of all effort to evade their force.

The doctor has spent a large portion of his speech in arraying what he regards facts insuperable according to my interpretation; which he asks me to dispose of scripturally and logically. Well, if I show that his facts, when admitted, do not militate against my interpretation of these scriptures, or the theory for which I contend, they will be answered sufficiently scriptural, and logical.

What then, are his facts, and what do they teach. *First*. As the Jewish institutions were types of the Christian, and as Christ has entered the holiest of all—has gone into heaven itself, a member of the great Christian congregation can no more go where he now is, than could a member of the Jewish congregation approach

the high priest while within the second veil. This the doctor says “is the first difficulty in the way of the popular mistake that we go to heaven at death.”

Secondly. That “it is positively declared by our blessed Lord himself, that no man hath ascended up into heaven, but the only begotten Son who came down from heaven; and that Christ said to his disciples that he would come again and take them to himself.” The third and fourth facts are of similar import.

What then do these facts prove? That man is not admitted to his final reward until after the resurrection. This I heartily believe, and consequently admit. But how this conflicts with my proposition, I confess I am not able to perceive. The question is not whether man goes to his final reward as soon as he dies, but that the spirit remains in a conscious state, separate from the body until the resurrection. Will the doctor be so good then as to show us how the fact that man is not rewarded until the Lord comes, proves that there is no *intermediate state* of consciousness: or that the saints are in no sense in the presence of the Lord, until they are received into those heavenly mansions?

This array of facts is only an attempt to draw us off from the question in debate, in which he shall not succeed.

But, again, he calls upon us to note that “Paul does not say that death will be gain to *him*.” Well, what if he does not say so, does that prove that he did not expect to depart from the body, and be with Christ at death? But he does say “to die is gain.” To whom, I would ask; not to the saints; for he says it would be more needful for them, that he should remain in the flesh? To whom then is it gain, if not to Paul? But again, the doctor says, we should note that Paul “does not say

that he expected to be with the Lord *immediately* on his demise." Does he then take the position that Paul did not expect to be with the Lord until the resurrection? If this is not his position, there is no point in his array of facts, and the emphasis placed on *immediately*. Well, let us note the doctor's positions on this text, and try his skill at reconciling difficulties. He says Paul is the body, and that he will not be with the Lord, until the resurrection; and then body, soul and spirit, will go to heaven together. Now we wish the doctor to solve two difficulties for us, growing out of these positions. *First*—If man is all body, how can he consist of soul, body, and spirit? or are the soul and spirit parts of the body? and if so, what parts of the body are they? *Second*—If soul, body, and spirit are present with the Lord together, how could Paul be *absent* from the body when *present* with the Lord. For if there is any meaning in language, the apostle teaches that, when *present* with the Lord, in the sense of these texts, he expected to be *absent* from the body. Hence, unless the doctor can harmonize these contradictions, his positions are contrary to the scriptures, and these texts left with all their force in favor of my proposition. But he says the apostle says nothing about the spirit at all; and concludes that a cause must be hard pressed, when it depends for evidence, upon texts, where the thing to be proved is not mentioned. But is this true? Not at all. As will be evident when we remember that the spirit as I have shown, is the only intelligent part of man, which the doctor has not denied; and that here is an intelligent rational identity, which may reside either *in* or *out* of the body. Hence, though the name is not given, the thing is so perfectly described, that it cannot be mistaken. For if this is not the spirit, will the

doctor please tell us what it is. I am sure, my friends, that you all would be edified, as well as myself with the information.

To the same effect as the texts quoted from Phil. and 2 Cor. fifth chapter, is the following, found in the twelfth chapter of 2 Cor. beginning at the second verse: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether *in* the body or *out* of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven." We need only remark, that this text is inexplicable on any other hypothesis than that, for which I contend. If the apostle had understood that man is all body, as does my friend, there can be no meaning in his words at all.

I will now introduce a few texts where the term *soul* is used. But before I read them, I will remark that the term soul as also the original word of which it is a translation, has three distinct meanings in the scriptures. It sometimes means the person as in this life; it sometimes means life — animal life — this is its general sense, and in a few texts it means the intelligent immaterial part — and is in this sense synonymous with spirit — hence the fact that the word has other meanings than that attached to it in these texts, is no evidence that the sense in which we use it is incorrect, unless it can be shown that the meaning we attach to it will not agree with the context. We make these remarks here to prevent any unnecessary dispute with regard to this word, so that we may come at once to the texts to which your attention is now called. We will first read Matt. x, 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

Language could not make a clearer distinction in any-

thing than is here made between body and soul. And as I conceive can only be made to harmonize with the position for which I contend. For if man is all body, as the doctor affirms, whoever could destroy the body could destroy the soul. Whereas the Saviour clearly shows that the soul survives the power of such as can only kill the body.

We will next call your attention to Rev. vi, 9-11: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the *souls* of them that were slain, for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: And they cried with a loud voice saying, How long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were should be fulfilled."

The text is too clear and pointed for its force to be mistaken or evaded. It proves my proposition, not by mere inference, as the doctor would make you believe, but by positive declaration. For here we have those who had been slain whose souls after death are represented as distinct personalities, not by the *personal pronouns*, as the doctor represents personalities, but by the *distinct personal characteristics*, — conscious intelligence manifested by crying to God, and asking intelligent questions and receiving replies from the Lord. We repeat, then, that language cannot be found more clearly declaring conscious intelligence *after death and before the resurrection*, and consequently in the *intermediate* state between death and the resurrection. But what meaning has the text according to the doctrine of my friend — that man is all body—

that he becomes a *mass* of *putrefaction* together, and has no more conscious existence.

I will next call your attention to Luke xxiv, 38, 39. The language of our blessed Redeemer to his disciples who were much affrighted as the Lord appeared to them while conversing about his resurrection, and supposed they saw a spirit. But let us read: "And he said unto them why are you troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh, and bones, as ye see me have." This is a very important declaration not only because it comes from the Lord himself, but because it recognizes the existence of separate, disembodied spirits, not by *inference*, but by a plain statement of facts.

This doctrine has been believed from the earliest ages — it was by nearly all in the days of the Saviour, and by the most learned and pious since that time — it was believed by the apostles, and clearly indorsed by the Saviour himself in the text now before us. For if there is no such thing as disembodied spirits, as the doctor affirms, would he not rather have said, Why are you troubled? why do thoughts arise in your hearts? there are no such things as spirits. But instead of doing this, he partially describes a spirit; and thereby declares the existence of separate spirits. For can you believe my friends, that the Son of God would thus describe to his disciples that which does not exist? Does Dr. Field believe that the meek and adorable Saviour, in whose mouth guile was never found — who sent his Holy Spirit to the apostles to guide them into all truth — would thus *confirm* them in *error* by describing that which does not exist? I envy not his credulity who can so believe.

I perceive that I have but a minute or two more time. Hence I will not now introduce another text in proof of my proposition, but will employ the time in submitting to the doctor a few questions, to which we invoke his special attention. I hope he will answer them distinctly, without any equivocation; of this, however, we will see. First, as a spirit has not flesh and bones, is it *material* or *immaterial*? Second, Are the angels who are all ministering spirits, *material* or *immaterial*? Again, is God whom the scripture declares to be a spirit, *material* or *immaterial*? [Time out.]

DR. FIELD'S FIFTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS —

Every science has its technicalities, which are the appropriate signs of the ideas and principles embodied in it. Words are the currency of thought, and it is fair to presume that words and phrases not used in conveying a knowledge of a science or art, have no corresponding ideas therein. Just so with the Christian religion, the science of eternal life. It has its peculiar technicology, representing its great truths and principles. Words and phrases foreign to the record have no ideas corresponding to them in it. Now, if this be a correct criterion, where, let me ask, in the inspired writings, do we find such words and phrases, as "immortal soul," "never-dying soul," "deathless spirit," "the death that never dies," "immateriality," "conscious state of the dead," &c? They are not there, and hence, it is fair to presume that the

ideas attached to these philosophic terms are not there either.

I shall commence my reply to my friend's last speech by noticing Matt. x, 28, and Rev. vi, 9-11. You will observe, my friends, that the word spirit is not mentioned in either of these texts. His proposition affirms nothing with regard to the soul. But if it is his wish to so modify it, as to make it embrace the soul, I certainly have no objection to it. From the circumstance of his introducing these scriptures, I suppose, as a matter of course, that he considers the spirit and soul one and the same thing. In his next speech I wish him to settle this matter.

There are certain facts in connection with this passage in Matthew, which should be considered. *First*—It is declared in the text, that the soul is *destructible*. "God able is to destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell." This shows that the popular ideas of its nature are incorrect. *Secondly*—The word *psuche* rendered soul in the twenty-eighth verse, is, in the thirty-ninth verse twice translated by the English word *life*. Now, why is it that the translators made this difference? There was as much propriety in translating the word *psuche* by the word *life* in the twenty-eighth verse as in the thirty-ninth. The truth is, my friends, the word means the same in both cases; but the probability is that they were tinctured with my friend's views, and so translated the twenty-eighth verse as to favor the idea of an indwelling, immortal something in man, that survives the death of the body.

I will give you what I consider a common sense interpretation of this text, which will harmonize it, not only with the thirty-ninth verse of that chapter, but with numerous other passages of scripture diametrically

opposed to the common understanding of its meaning. Taking it for granted that the word *psuche* in the twenty-eighth verse means *life*, I would paraphrase it thus: "Fear not them that kill the body, or take away your present life, — but are not able to kill the soul, or the life to come, — but rather fear him who is able, after the resurrection, to destroy both future life and body in hell." That this is not a forced construction, is evident from the fact, that our Lord speaks of what God is able to do after the resurrection. For he speaks of the destruction of soul and body simultaneously; and as the body cannot be destroyed until after it is raised from the dead, the conclusion is inevitable that our Lord had no idea of teaching any thing in regard to the intermediate state. The utmost that men can do is to deprive us of temporal life, after that they have no more that they can do, they cannot reach our eternal life, which God will bestow upon the martyred saint in the resurrection. But we are told to fear God who can make a final end of our being here and hereafter. But like all the other texts quoted by my friend, it says nothing about the consciousness of the spirit after death. It is not a "*thus saith the Lord*," for the doctrine of his proposition.

Let us now take a look at Rev. vi, 9-11, which reads as follows: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long, O Lord, holy and true, doth thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should

be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." I shall not occupy your time in discoursing on the symbolic character of this book; suffice it to say, that John had a prospective view of the history of the church, to the close of the gospel dispensation. Events were presented to his mind, centuries in the future, as though they were then transpiring. He had a series of visions and the imagery was in the highest degree glowing and impressive. Things animate and inanimate are made use of for purposes of illustration. Things having no life are introduced into the dramatic scenes of this sublime book, to instruct the reader in some historic truth. The seals under the opening of which certain occurrences took place, are symbols of the hidden providence of God. These seals cover the whole fortunes of the church to the coming of Christ. On opening the fifth, a scene of persecution and martyrdom is brought to view, and we are forcibly impressed with the cruelty and injustice of that period, by the crying of its victims for vengeance. A critical examination of the phraseology of this passage, will convince any one that it is what we call a figure of personification. Just as Abel's blood is personified and said to cry from the ground, so these martyrs are said to cry from under the altar. It is a common thing in scripture to attribute life and intelligence to inanimate objects. For instance, Hab. ii, 11; "For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it." Also Isa. xiv, 8: "Yea, the fir-trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, since thou art laid down no feller is come up against us." Many other texts might be quoted illustrative of this fact. But as I said a critical examination of this passage will show that it does not prove the doctrine advocated by my

friend, Mr. Connelly, These souls instead of being seen in heaven, were seen under the altar, in allusion to the Jewish altar, on which their sacrifices were offered. That you all know was in this world. To suppose these souls to be in heaven, is to suppose them unhappy there; for they manifest impatience at the delay of God's retributive justice on their murderers. In God's presence there is fullness of joy. No matter how these souls were slain, if they went to heaven at death, as some people believe, and enjoyed its felicity, it is not at all likely that they would give themselves any concern about how they got there. Instead of invoking God's judgments upon their former enemies, they would forget them in the transporting rapture which would fill their minds. In this place, the word soul is used in the sense of *person*, and though dead they were made to speak by that well known figure of speech, called personification, just as "Abel being dead yet speaketh." See Heb. xi, 4. These same persons slain under the fifth seal are again seen in vision, rising from the dead at the commencement of the millennium. See Rev. xx, 4. John saw them reigning with Christ a thousand years, and says explicitly that they were "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God." He calls this the first resurrection. It could not have been a resurrection of the spirit or soul, in the sense in which my friend uses it, for that according to him never dies. It must then have been the body that was raised, or the person, another proof that dead bodies are souls or persons.

My friend says that he does not maintain that Paul expected to go to the personal presence of Christ at death. This is certainly an important concession for him to make, seeing he laid such stress on the words "*present*."

with the Lord." He knows, my friends, that Paul could not go to the place where Christ is without falsifying the word of God. He must find some other meaning, then, for the expression, "absent from the body and present with the Lord." I want him to say, when he rises again, where Paul went at death? Will he locate the spirits of the dead? Tell us where they are?

At present, I can only briefly notice 2 Cor. v, 1: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This is a highly metaphorical expression, and ought never to be quoted to prove a doctrine that has no better evidence to rest on. A strict construction, such as my friend gives it, subverts the whole doctrine of the resurrection. For it would seem from this isolated verse, that the moment we die, we receive our spiritual body or our house from heaven. What then becomes of the body put off at death? It cannot be needed, inasmuch as we have the one from heaven. But, my friends, there is no necessity for giving this passage such a construction as will contradict other texts, more intelligible and literal. Read the fourth verse, and you will see that Paul's ideas must have been different from my friend's. "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be *unclothed*, but *clothed* upon, that *mortality* might be swallowed up of *life*." Here is the secret, after all. The apostle desired a change of *nature*, instead of death. He longed to be made immortal. He had no desire to be *unclothed*. Why? Because he could not appear in the presence of the Lord in a disembodied state. But, as I shall likely have to refer to this again, I dismiss it for the present.

I must now notice 2 Corinthians xii, 2, 4: "I knew a man" says Paul "above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth;) how he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

It will be recollected, that my friend defined death to be a separation of body and spirit, or perhaps it was said to be the result of the separation. You see at once the difficulty into which he is involved. It is this:—If Paul's spirit left his body and went to paradise, then he must have died, and when it returned there was a resurrection!! Is there a man in this assembly so silly as to believe this? I think not. There is another difficulty in his understanding of this vision, as Paul himself calls it. As already shown, it is impossible for any one to enter the third heaven or the place where Christ is. The reasons are obvious and they cannot be denied. Into that place, then, Paul could not have gone except in vision; and that I apprehend is all he meant, saving that the vision or revelation was so made known to him that his bodily senses had nothing to do with it. John, while on the isle of Patmos was caught up to heaven, saw and heard marvellous things, some of which he was not allowed to write, but it was all in vision. No man will pretend to assert that John was taken up bodily or that his spirit for the time being left his body.

I repeat again, that my friend admits that my facts prove, that man is not admitted to his final reward until the resurrection, but still he contends that between death and the resurrection the apostle Paul, and indeed all

saints are with Christ in some sense. I want him to tell us in what sense they are with him, and *where* are they with him. I know that the question is not whether man goes to heaven or not at death, but as the *Lord* is in heaven, and no one can be *personally* present with him without being there, then if Paul is not there, of course he is not *personally* present with him. But we shall probably hear something which will enlighten us on this subject.

He has asked several questions, some of a metaphysical character, such as, how a man can have a body, soul, and spirit if he is all body—whether the soul and spirit are parts of the body, and if so, what parts. Now, what have such questions to do with the proposition in debate? I have not denied that man has a spirit or a soul, but whether they are parts of his body or something different from it has nothing to do with the question, — *Do any of them continue alive and intelligent after they are separated by death?*

Man is unquestionably a material being. He was made of the dust of the earth, and when he dies he returns to dust. Whatever may be said of his spirit, his life, his intelligence or what not, they are in the condition they were before he became a living soul or person. Man, alive or dead, is just what we see him, no more nor less.

He says he has shown that the spirit is the only intelligent part of man, and that I have not denied it. Well, suppose he has. Then I ask, does this *part* of man continue alive after the *man himself* is dead? A part of a thing is always less than the whole—of course, the spirit of man being only a part of man, is less than the man himself; hence, I teach that when man dies all his *parts* die. This is as true as that God made the world.

My friend has told you that the word soul has three distinct meanings—and in one of these meanings it is synonymous with the word spirit. Then this point is decided.

He says that personality is not represented by the personal pronouns, but by distinct personal *characteristics*, such as crying to God, asking questions, and so forth. Then Abel's blood must have been a personality, for it cried to God from the ground. So of many other things inanimate, proving what I have before said, that the figure of speech called personification is of frequent use in scripture, and on that principle I explain some of my friend's proof texts.

The fact that our Saviour said to his disciples, that a spirit had not flesh and bones as he had, no more proves that he indorsed the prevalent ideas in regard to spirits, than does the fact that he did not condemn the doctrine of a transmigration of souls, prove that he indorsed that doctrine also. The question was asked him with regard to a certain blind man, whether *he* sinned or his parents, that he was born blind. Here is an intimation of the existence of that superstition among them. They assumed that the man *might have sinned* before he was born! This is perhaps a greater absurdity than some of their notions about spirits, yet our Lord did not set about correcting their mistake on the subject.

That the doctrine is one of great antiquity will not be denied. It doubtless had its origin in the remote ages of Persian philosophy. It is to the Magian religion and not their own, that the Jews were indebted for their views respecting the soul, its pre-existence, transmigration, &c. But what error is not ancient, and once of general belief? How long has it been since nearly all Christendom believed

in transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints, infant baptism, and many other errors equally as absurd?

I am requested to say whether God and angels are material or immaterial. It is a matter of no importance to me to know or decide that question, seeing my friend considers *substance* a property of *immateriality*. Himself being judge, then God and angels have *substance*. It does not follow that because God is invisible, therefore, he is not materiality in some form which may very properly take the name of spirit. While in this state our bodies—material as we all admit—are said to be natural. After the resurrection they will be *spiritual*. Electricity is invisible, yet it is matter so highly attenuated as to pervade the most compact bodies. [*Time out.*]

MR. CONNELLY'S SIXTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS—

Before we advance, we will notice a few things in the doctor's former speeches which have been rather passed over. In his first speech in the afternoon on yesterday, he quoted the language of David, cited by the apostle Peter in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," and says it means, "Thou wilt not leave my dead body in the grave," &c. This he supposes I will admit to be the correct meaning, and affirms that this is the meaning assigned to it by commentators generally. We must inform the gentleman that he is altogether mistaken in

his supposition—that we admit no such thing. And will the doctor name some reputable commentator that so understands this text? But suppose the commentators have all given it this interpretation, what evidence has been given that it is correct? What evidence has the doctor given, or what can he give that this is the true import of the text? We would like for him to *try* his skill at least, or we must reject his interpretation. In order to prove the same point, viz: that there was nothing pertaining to the Saviour, the Son of God, but what was in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea while he was under the power of death, he quoted in his last speech yesterday evening, Matt. xxviii, 5, 6, “And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye, for I know that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the *place where the Lord lay*,”—emphasizing the phrase *see the place where the Lord lay*, with great power. Thus arguing that, because the name is applied to the body, the Saviour was all flesh and all in the grave. For if this is not his position fairly stated, my mind is too obtuse to see any point in his reasoning, and I hope he will try to bring it to such a focus, that I may be able to get a view of it. We need only examine these texts together to see how utterly groundless and absurd his positions upon these scriptures are. And for this purpose we will again call your attention to Acts ii, 25–31. We will first read the text and then call your attention to the particular points which we wish you to notice. And as this is an important text, we invoke your candid and earnest attention as we read: “For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore did my heart rejoice,

and my tongue was glad; moreover also, my *flesh* shall rest in hope; Because thou wilt not leave my *soul* in *hell*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; Thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak to you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his *soul* was not left in *hell*, neither did his *flesh* see corruption.” We have read this, in order that you might see the argument of the apostle, which is, that David did not speak of himself, but being a prophet, and knowing that God had promised to raise up Christ, of the fruit of his loins according to the *flesh*; and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ that his *soul* was not left in *hell*, neither did his *flesh* see corruption. The first fact as set forth in this text, to which we invite your attention, is, that Christ was the seed of David only so far as the *flesh* is concerned. This, however, according to Dr. Field, was all of him; but more of this directly. The Lord, our Saviour, had a spiritual nature, as well as the seed of David, as will be seen by the following remark from the apostle Paul, in Romans i, 3: “Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the *seed of David according to the flesh*; and declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness,” or, as rendered by Macknight, and indorsed by Mr. Campbell, to whose translation our attention has been so often called, and in perfect harmony with the original

text, "Descended from David as to his flesh, and constituted the Son of God with power, as to his *holy spiritual nature*." Here is a spiritual nature distinct from the flesh, which was before Abraham, which was in the form of God, conscious and intelligent, glorified with the Father before the world was. This spiritual nature left the body at death, as the following will show: "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend *my spirit*." Luke xxiii, 46. And after the spirit had departed, the *body* was laid in the *grave*. Let us read the 52, 53 verses of the same chapter: "This man (meaning Joseph) went unto Pilate and begged the *body* of Jesus. And he took it down and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in a stone, wherein never man before was laid." Again, verse 55: "And the women also which came with him from Gallilee, followed after and beheld the sepulchre, and how his *body* was laid." These scriptures need no comment, for if they do not teach that the spirit and the body of the Saviour were separated at death, and that the *body* only was laid in the grave, then language could not be so used as to express these thoughts. But let us return again to Acts ii. The Apostle as clearly distinguishes between *soul* and *flesh* in this text as he has in the ones we have just quoted. His *soul* was not left in hell, neither did his *flesh* see corruption." It is evident that the terms *spirit*, *soul*, and the phrase *spiritual nature*, as used in these texts are representatives of the same thought. They set before our minds that which was with the Father before the world was, which left the body at death and went to *hades*—*the unseen*—while the body was laid in the grave. The term hell in Acts iii, is a translation, though

a very erroneous one, of *hades*, the original word, which means *unseen*, and is the word uniformly used in the scriptures to denote the state of the spirits of men after they leave the body, and where they remain until the resurrection of the dead; as did our Lord until he burst the bars of death—conquered death and the unseen state—obtained the keys of death and *hades*, and thus rose a victorious conqueror—having power to open and none could shut, and to shut and no one could open.

But let us see if we can, in any way, solve the insurmountable difficulty presented by the doctor. "Come, see the *place where the Lord lay*." You perceive my friends, that the difficulty here presented, is founded on the assumption that the Son of God was all body—all the seed of David. And he insists that this must be true, because the name Lord is applied to the body. Now, suppose we should grant this for the accommodation of Dr. Field, what then? Why we would deny thereby the divinity of the Son of the Highest, as clearly as does the doctor's position, unless he can show that *flesh* is *divine*. And is it possible that he believes this! There is no way of avoiding this conclusion either logically or scripturally without abandoning the premises on which it is founded. And are you prepared my friends, to yield up that consoling reflection, found in the proposition I am defending, which has been believed by the most learned and pious of all ages, and which is so clearly taught in the many scriptures which I have adduced, and as you will perceive by many more yet to be presented, for positions which not only level man with the brute, but which bring the Holy Saviour to the same common level, and presents our Heavenly Father in the singular attitude of declaring to the world that he has given a

divine being as an only Saviour, who had been glorified with him before the world was, and calling upon us to believe this in order to salvation, when he had only given one all body—simply a child of David.

But how can we explain the fact that the term Lord is applied to the body, on my position that there was a spiritual nature resident in the body? The solution then is this. The Lord was manifested to the senses of man only by or through the body. Hence as man was accustomed to look at the body animated by the spiritual nature, which resided in it for the time, and which was the Divine Being, and as the body was still before the mind, by association of thought, it was perfectly natural to speak of it as they did; not because it was really so, but only so in appearance, just as we now speak of the bodies of men after the spirit has gone. This is evident from the fact that they did not always speak of it in this way, but as we have shown from Luke they sometimes spoke of it as the body of the Lord. But the facts, as already shown, that there was a divine nature, which left the body at death, and that the body only was laid in the tomb, forever settles the matter. Does Dr. Field believe that there was any part of the Lord buried but his body. The same reflections that we have made with reference to the Saviour, will explain how it is, that the names David and Stephen, as also the pronouns of the same gender, as the persons for whose bodies they stand, had when alive. There is nothing more natural than to speak of the dead in this style, by those who believe the doctrine on this subject for which I plead. The doctrine was believed then, and the style of speaking of them which is current now was also current then. And it would be just as rational to conclude that the doctrine is not

now believed, as to conclude it was not believed then; especially when we remember that the apostles spoke and wrote in the popular style of the times. But in this objection the proverb, that a drowning man will catch at straws, is fully verified.

The doctor's position with regard to the phrase, heavenly regions, sufficiently refutes itself.

Our attention is again called to Matt. x, 28. The doctor asks me to say if I understand that soul and spirit mean the same thing. I have sufficiently explained that already; these terms, as I have stated, are different in their general meanings. But in a few instances, the term soul is synonymous with spirit, this has not been denied, and I presume will not be by my friend Dr. Field.

It will only be necessary to state the doctor's positions on this text in order to their refutation. He says the word soul here means life; and in his common sense view, he says it means life to come. Well, if this is the correct import of this word, it will harmonize with the text when substituted for the word *itself*. Let us try it then, and see: "And fear not them which are able to kill the body and are not able to kill the life to come, but rather fear him that is able to destroy both life to come and body in hell." Whoever is not able to see the absurdity of such a reading is not to be reasoned with. If it were not for the sake of the case, Dr. Field himself would surely be ashamed of such a jumble of words without meaning. What can the phrase "*kill life to come, and body in hell*" mean. I hope the doctor will explain. His substitute then will not do. And how in the name of all reason can such a bundle of nonsense as his position makes of this text, prove that the commonly received interpretation which I have given of this text is incorrect. He says

the soul is destructable, grant it. But will he tell us how the fact that God is able to destroy the soul, proves that the word *soul* in this text does not mean the immaterial part of man distinct from the body as I maintain? His objections then do not affect the point, and consequently the text stands with all its force for my proposition. His criticism on Rev. vi, is as pointless as that on Matt. x. He soars away in a cloud of symbolic mist, and endeavors to draw a veil of figures before our minds, that we may lose sight of the point submitted. In this, however, he shall not succeed. He says my position is incorrect, because the spirits were not in heaven, but under the altar. The question is not whether the spirit goes to heaven immediately when man dies, but that it is in a conscious state separate from the body, between death and the resurrection. Here a clear distinction is made between the souls and the beheaded, he did not see the beheaded, but the *souls* of the beheaded. By the one term man as in life is presented, by the other the conscious intelligent personality after death; but before the resurrection. But the doctor says the word soul here means person. Then the text would read "I saw the persons of them that were slain," &c. The term person in such a construction is *never used* only where the *living body* is meant, I challenge the doctor for a single example in the whole range of language, where the phrases, her person, his person, their persons, the persons of them, &c., are found with any other meaning than that of *living body*; unless he can do this his position utterly fails. For I need not tell you, my intelligent friends, that it would be ridiculous nonsense to talk about the *living bodies of the slain*. Let him come right up to this point like a scholar, or abandon his position, and cease to outrage the language, by using

words in senses and constructions contrary to all its laws. And in any other sense of the word person, which the context will justify, it fully sustains my proposition, for I have showed again and again, that there is no personality without rationality; if then, the word *souls* here means persons in that sense there is no need of the doctor's figurative personification. This text then is irrefutable evidence of the truth of my proposition. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S SIXTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS—

In this discussion, you doubtless perceive that there are many collateral questions and minor issues, to be settled, which have a relation to my friend's proposition. We have already spent a good deal of time in the investigation of minor points, which must be harmonized with the main question, or with my views of the state of man between death and the resurrection. I go, friends, upon the principle that truth is perfectly consistent with itself in every minutiae. No two truths in nature or revelation will conflict in the slightest degree. Sift them as you will, analyze, compose and decompose them, and they will still agree. The whole fabric of truth is, in all its parts, completely harmonious and symmetrical. Under this view of truth, I take it that the slightest appreciable discord between a proposition and its proofs, or the proofs themselves—any disagreement between facts and the premises, arguments, and conclusions of a proposition, is evidence that something is wrong. All must coincide as

truly as the terms of a geometrical problem and the demonstration, or it must be taken for granted that there is an error somewhere. It may be in the proposition, in the premises, or the reasoning. My friend, Mr. Connelly, has set out to prove the conscious and intelligent existence of the human spirit after death. All the conclusions, then, of his logic must agree with his proposition. Every minor proposition, argument, and deduction must also have a logical connection with the major one. This, I hope, will satisfy you that my course on this occasion is in strict conformity to logical rules and the duties of a teacher of the Christian religion. I came here to do my duty in laboring to disabuse your minds of an error, that disparages some of the most important truths and promises of the gospel. Though long taught and believed, it has no higher claims to credence than many others of equal antiquity. Its antiquity and popularity are no arguments in its favor. Error of all kind, has been popular and has been consecrated by time and learning. The spirit of research and investigation peculiar to this age of improvement, is destined to work as great changes in the opinions of mankind, as in their institutions.

A large portion of my friend's last speech was devoted to a discussion of the words of David, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." I said "soul in hell" here meant "dead body in the grave." From this criticism of mine, he has drawn some strange and unwarrantable conclusions, well calculated to shock your sensibilities and impress your minds unfavorably with regard to my views. Because I said just what the narrative says, that they laid the *Lord* in the tomb, and *Stephen* in his grave, he

would have you believe that I represent our Saviour as all body or flesh, and thereby degrade him to the lowest scale of being! This is truly a horrible picture to present to an audience unaccustomed to hearing any thing at variance with the popular views of Christ. To relieve your minds, my friends, of all uneasiness on this subject, allow me to say that I do not teach that our Lord was only flesh, but that he was divine, and that his divinity, which was with the Father before the world was, did not go into the grave. His divine nature could not die. But all theologians teach that he also had a *human* nature, which did die. I hope this will relieve my friend, as well as yourselves from misapprehension of my views touching the divinity of our blessed Redeemer.

But let us come to the point in hand — the import of the phrase "*soul in hell*," which my friend says is the "*spirit in hades*." He says hell is an erroneous rendering of *hades*, which denotes the unseen state of spirits separated from their bodies at death, and where they remain until the resurrection. If I understand him, he assumes that Christ had, in addition to his divinity, a human body and soul; the body died, the soul did not. Having, then, arrived at his idea let us examine the matter *in extenso*. You would do well, my friends, to read the whole of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, from which I will quote but one or two verses: "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his *soul* an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his *soul* and shall be satisfied; . . . therefore, will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; *because he hath poured out his*

SOUL *unto death.*" What will my friend do with this scripture upon his principles? Here is a positive declaration that our Lord's soul, be it what it may, was made an offering for sin, and died. As certain as ever a lamb was slain upon a Jewish altar, just so certain was our Lord's soul subjected to death for the sin of the world. It is useless to deny this, unless it can be shown that this prophecy does not apply to Christ.

But let us examine Acts, the second chapter, in which Peter refers to the sixteenth psalm. My friend thinks the question settled by the marked distinction made between *flesh* and *soul*. But let us see. I will read several verses and then you will be able to judge whether the context confutes me or not: "For David speaketh concerning him, (Christ) I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved; therefore, did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also, my *flesh* shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my *soul in hell*, neither wilt thou suffer thine *Holy One* to see corruption; . . . therefore, being a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, he would *raise up Christ* to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the *resurrection of Christ* that his *soul* was not left in hell, neither did his *flesh* see corruption. This Jesus hath God *raised up*, whereof we all are witnesses." What is there in all this opposed to my criticism? Nothing whatever, except the distinction made between the *flesh* and *soul*. And is there not also a more palpable distinction between both of them and *Holy One*? It is a bad rule that will not work both ways. If *flesh* and *soul* are different in this place because of the distinction, is not *Holy One* also different from

them both? According to his reasoning, there was nothing about our Saviour incorruptible except the human soul! Instead of that resting in hope, it was the *flesh* that is said to rest in hope. You see, my friends, what difficulties present themselves upon my friend's views of this passage of scripture. But there is another which I must notice. He has repeatedly quoted the dying words of the Saviour — "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Yet he really teaches that the Lord's spirit went to a place called *hades*, which according to the views of Alexander Campbell and his church generally, is a subterranean receptacle for the spirits of all men good and bad! He affirms one thing about the Lord's soul and Isaiah another; which will you believe?

As if confident of victory here, my friend calls upon me to produce a respectable commentator that ever assented to my interpretation of the phrase "*soul in hell.*" Well, I will try. Thomas Scott, in his commentary on the sixteenth psalm, tenth verse, speaks as follows: "Many learned men interpret the two clauses of this verse ('thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption') to mean exactly the same thing; referring both of them to the body of Christ laid in the grave, and before it saw corruption." Bishop Pearson says, "it appears that the first intention of putting these words into the creed, (an ancient creed called the Apostles creed) was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave." Witsius says, "that Christ descended into hell, the place of torment, is nowhere expressly affirmed in scripture, nor in the most ancient creeds. The creeds which mention the *descent* were generally silent with regard to the *burial.*"

Dr. Smith renders the first clause of this verse (tenth verse:) "Thou wilt not leave my life in the grave." Kinnicott translates it, "Thou wilt not abandon my life to the grave." Morrison says, "hell here simply denotes the grave—the place of the Redeemer's sepulture; and that *my soul* was intended to designate that life which actually expired on the cross." Professor Bush says, "*soul in hell* here denotes dead body in the grave." Is my friend now satisfied that I have a respectable commentator with me on this subject? Here is an array of authority that no man will gainsay. They fully sustain the view I take of this passage. The word hell, as it occurs in the sixteenth psalm, tenth verse, is *sheol* in Hebrew, and literally means the grave. In Numbers ix, 6, we read of "certain men being defiled by the dead body (*Greek* dead soul) of a man, that they could not keep the passover." Again, Numbers iv, 6: "All the days that he separateth himself unto the Lord, he shall come at no dead body." In the original it is *dead soul*. These are only a few examples of this application of the word soul. And now, I ask, what is there unreasonable or unscriptural in my interpretation of David's words? Nothing at all.

The objections offered to my paraphrase of Matt. x, 28, do not make it as nonsensical after all, as my friend would have you believe. Even according to his caricature, it would not be so bad. But what has he gained by it? Nothing. He has not denied that the same word *psyche* rendered *soul* in the twenty-eighth verse, is in the thirtieth rendered *life*. Besides, he has acknowledged that the soul is destructible; of course, *mortal*.

How often must I remind my friend that in prophecy and symbolic language where the figure of personification

is used, it is not necessary for the thing personified to be really alive, in order to its speaking and acting. It is sufficient that it is so in the imagination of the writer. Webster, who is very high authority with my friend, says: "Personification is the giving to an inanimate being the figures, or the sentiments, actions, and language of a rational being."

My friend makes large draughts upon me for Bible examples of certain forms of expression, which, if I mistake not, he has manufactured for me. Hitherto, I think I have been tolerably prompt in complying with his demands, and shall try to continue so, whenever I feel obliged by controversial rules to do it. Every thing, assumed on my part, has been fully sustained. I have probed my friend's logic with a view to detect its fallacy, and I do not feel at all surprised at his finding fault with the instrument. Right or wrong, he is determined to rejoin to every thing I say, instead of bringing forward "a thus saith the Lord" for his doctrine. Let him proceed in his line of argument, and at his earliest convenience read in the Bible where it says, "the dead are conscious." [*Time out.*]

MR. CONNELLY'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

FRIENDS AND BRETHREN,

Having been refreshed by a little recreation and the bounties of heaven, we are again assembled to resume the investigation of the question in debate. And I fully concur in statements made by my friend, Dr. Field, that

all truth is harmonious; hence as we have done in the past, we shall continue in the future to show that my proposition harmonizes not only with the texts I quote to prove it, but with the general tenor of all revealed religion.

We call your attention then to Luke xvi, 19, 31, "There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple, and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy life time, receivedst thy good things and likewise Lazarus evil things. But now he is comforted and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they who would pass from hence to you, cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. And he said, nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, if they

hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

You cannot fail to see that this text embraces my whole proposition. For whether it is a parable as some believe, or a matter of history as is maintained by others, is a matter of no consequence. If it is a historic fact, then it needs no comment. If a parable, the scene is laid among the dead, and must be understood as presenting things as they are. Conscious intelligent existence is here clearly recognized. Indeed there is no other intelligent view that can be taken of this passage. Man's ingenuity has been taxed to find another consistent interpretation of this text, but without success. The doctor may have something new, perhaps his figure personification may help him, but we will see.

Having submitted this text for your consideration, I will review the doctor's proceedings, and see if his objections have all been met. He complains that I notice his objections. It would, no doubt, be preferable to him, if he could be left undisturbed in visionary and random excursions in biblical criticisms. We cannot consent, however, to extend his license beyond the laws of reason and language, he must not complain, therefore, if we do take a little time to expose the absurdity of his positions and objections,

He says my proposition virtually denies a resurrection. Why? because it asserts conscious existence after death. This objection has been sufficiently answered already, by the facts already established, that death is a separation of body and spirit, and that the resurrection is per consequence a re-union of the spirit with matter, or if the expression would be any better understood, as the body is of the earth, a part of what we call physical nature, the resur-

rection is a re-union of the spirit with this nature. Hence, the fact that the spirit is conscious in the separate state, certainly cannot prove they will not again unite. As this objection with a large number of the doctor's difficulties are founded in the assumption, that death is a cessation of consciousness, we call upon him to make good his position, for surely if this is not done, his objections fall. What authority then has the doctor for such an assumption? What author, human or divine, has so declared? And though he has not dared to make even an *attempt* to show that this assumption is authorized, he gravely tells us that my position according to his baseless assumption, denies a resurrection of the dead. But the doctor should have first pulled the *beam* from his own eye, before attempting to take the *mote* from ours. Let us see, then, who it is that denies the resurrection of the dead. He has said that man is just what we see, dead or alive, no more and no less. According to this, then, there is nothing which enters into the composition of man's nature that cannot be seen; hence man is all *body, dead or alive*. This, then, goes to the dust as it was. There is nothing that can be seen or recognized as man, any more than the dust of the ground. Man, then, is organized matter according to the doctor; and consequently when he is disorganized, the man ceases. There is dust but no man. So there was dust before man was created at all, but no man. It took a creation to make man out of dust at first. And as he has returned to the dust as it was, it must take a creation to make man out of dust again. Hence, it is a *new creation and not a resurrection*. This is infinitely worse than the old heathenish doctrine of transmigration of *souls*, it is a transmigration of *bodies*,—bodies made into *other bodies*. And this agrees precisely with his critique

on 2 Cor. v. He says Paul simply desired a change of nature, that is according to the positions as just stated, he wished to be somebody else. But not *immediately*; he wished to be nobody awhile, and *then* somebody else! O consistency when wilt thou return to religion!

We will next call your attention to the views of the Saviour, — the Son of God — expressed in his last speech, contrasted with what he had said before. To prove his unwarrantable and absurd position, that dead bodies are persons, he called upon us to note the expressions, "*come, see where the Lord lay,*" not a part of him, he says — not his remains. This as I have shown denies the divinity of the Son of God. But he now tells us that he believes Christ had a divine nature which did not go into the grave. This much then is right; I am glad to see the doctor make some little advances to the truth. For he, of course, yields his first position. He has not even *attempted* to show that my conclusions from his premises were not just, though, as he says, presenting a horrible picture indeed.

But let us pursue him upon this point a little further. He says I assume that Christ, in addition to his divinity had a human body and soul. Now, I would remark emphatically, that I assume no such thing. I stated distinctly that, the word *soul* as used by David and Peter with reference to the Saviour and the word *spirit*, as in the phrase, "Father, into thy hands I commend my *spirit*," and the phrase, "*Holy spiritual nature*," are representatives of the same thought, and all refer to the divinity of God's Son our Saviour.

He next quotes Isaiah, fifty-third chapter, as a parallel text, understanding the term *soul* to be used in the same sense in both texts. Of course, then, he understands that when it is said of Christ that *he hath poured out his*

SOUL *unto death*, it is *only* declared that *he poured out his BODY unto death*. Consequently, when it is said, "*Christ died for our sins*," "*Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the sufferings of death*—that he by the grace of God should taste *death for every man*"—that in all such expressions the BODY only is meant, for he says, "*his divine nature could not die*. But only his *human nature died*." So, then, we have only a human sacrifice—A HUMAN SAVIOUR. Hence, what we are required to believe as the great facts of the gospel, by which we shall be saved, that Christ died for our sins, that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, is all a delusion. He only sent down a *human body* to death, and brought it back to redeem us!! And why would not the body of Abel or of Isaac, nay, why would not the sacrifices on a Jewish altar have done as well? O, my soul, cease to wonder at the perversity of human speculations! Perhaps the doctor can now see whose principles are involved by his proof text. I have said enough on this subject to expose the absurdity of the doctor's positions on the phrase, "*thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*." But to show the *presumption* of the man, I must call your attention to his array of commentators—Scott, Bishop, Pearson, Witsius, Dr. Smith, Kennicot, Morrison, and *Professor Bush*. A mighty array of names, truly. But strange to tell, not one of the whole number except *Bush* indorses the doctor's position. The doctor says the phrase means, "*dead bodies in their graves*." But what say his array of authors? Morrison, Kennicot, and Dr. Smith all render the term soul, *life*. Witsius and Pearson say it *appears* that it was the first intention in putting these words into some the ancient creeds, to denote the burial of the Saviour. Scott

says many learned men refer both these terms to the *body*; so you perceive none of these commentators endorse the doctor's views, but simply speak of some learned visionaries like *Professor Bush*, who have taken that view of the text. And who is *Professor Bush*? A learned man it is true, but one of the greatest visionaries of the age, who, I believe, has adopted the visions of Swedenborg; who believes that Christ has come the second time, that the resurrection and judgment are passed, and, perhaps, that the *world is at an end*. A respectable commentator, with Dr. Field.

I will notice his remark on the mortality of the soul, in its appropriate place.

He says that it is not necessary where the figure personification is used, for the thing personified to be really alive in order to its speaking and acting. Well, who *ever* believed that it is? My position is, that the figure personification cannot be used where there is rationality. Hence, he has missed the point in my argument on the sixth of Revelations, altogether. I will again state it: Personality, as the doctor concedes, is here attributed to the souls under the altar. There is no personality without rationality. The figure personification, cannot be used where there is rationality. Therefore, his whole scheme of disposing of this text by the use of this figure of speech fails, and the text is, with all its force, in favor of my proposition.

I believe, I have noticed every thing in the doctor's speech that needs attention at this time, and as I have a few minutes more to occupy, I will call your attention to another proof text, Luke xx, 37, 38: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of:

Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: *For all live unto him.*"

This is the language of our blessed Saviour to the Sadducees, who, like my friend Dr. Field, denied separate spiritual existence, and per consequence, a resurrection of the dead — denying a resurrection evidently on the ground that there was nothing to be raised. The Saviour understanding the foundation of their doctrine, in meeting the difficulties, the insurmountable difficulty in their views to a resurrection, directed his argument to the foundation, to the grand error, and proves, by an appeal to Moses that there is something to be raised.

His argument, then, seems to be this:—Moses has declared that God is the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is *not* the God of the dead, but of the living; and, therefore, there is something to be raised. And anticipates the objection that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead, by declaring that *all live unto him*. This is, they are dead to us it is true, they have put off their tabernacle, they *have gone out of this world*. But they are alive to God. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S SEVENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS —

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke sixteenth, has been brought forward. I wonder that it was so long delayed; for it is generally the first thing appealed to in support of my friend's doctrine. This, my friend says, embraces the whole of his proposition. I

am glad to hear it. This fact will, perhaps, considerably abridge the discussion. If he should fail here, however, it is useless to go any further in quest of evidence, as it embraces the whole of his proposition. To his explanation I offer the following objections — 1st. It pre-supposes that the righteous and the wicked are rewarded at death, — contrary to what he has already asserted. 2. It is said that these persons had their material organs with them — *eyes, tongue, fingers*, and so forth; the rich man is in a flame of fire, and begs for water to cool his tongue; he saw Lazarus *afar off* in Abraham's bosom, not Lazarus' *spirit*, as my friend would infer. 3. It is expressly stated that the rich man was *buried*, and in hell he lifted up his eyes. It would seem that it was subsequent to his burial, at least, that he went to this place of torment. My friend makes it before. 4. Between the parties there was an impassable *gulf*, rendering it impossible for the good and bad to approach each other. This cannot be in the intermediate state, or in *hades*, as my friend understands it; for according to his views in that state or place they are all together! A gulf could be no barrier in the way of disembodied spirits. It is also evident from the parable that no communication can be made from the dead to the living without a resurrection. Here, then, are certain facts attesting the existence of these two persons in their *bodily* state. Unless he can show that a spirit has fingers, eyes, tongue, and other material organs capable of being tortured by fire, and of being relieved by water, his interpretation of this parable must be erroneous.

I stated that his explanation of 2 Cor. v, 1-4, would subvert the doctrine of the resurrection; and he retorts by charging such a result on my views. He says

resurrection is a re-union of the spirit and the body. The word resurrection, signifies a raising to life again something that was dead. Now, he contends, that the man proper never dies, hence there is, on his principle, no resurrection of the man at all!! The most that can be said of this re-union, is a change in the mode of existence. According to him, Jesus did not rise from the dead, but only his body! He teaches that the body is nothing but a covering or clothing of the real man, which is laid aside at death. We might just as well assert that when a locust or a butterfly leaves its chrysalis, that it rises from the dead, as to maintain that when man comes back from *hades* in search of his body, he rises from the dead. Taking off and putting on your coat, is as much a resurrection as the re-union of body and spirit, so called by my friend.

He asks, what authority I have for saying that death is a cessation of conscious existence. I answer, the Bible, reason, common sense, and universal observation. He asks again, and again, what authority I have for saying this and saying that. Why does he not demand authority for believing that I exist, or that two and two make four?

My saying that man is just what we see him, he thinks has placed me in a terrible fix. By this postulate, he says I will reduce man to dust and then he is no longer man, and when the resurrection comes to pass, there must be a new creation. He cannot see how God can re-organize him and restore his identity. The resurrection we all know is a great mystery, so says Paul, and whether it can be explained on philosophical principles or not, it is nevertheless true that man dies and will rise again; I mean the man proper. But what is there in the conclusion which my friend has drawn contrary to

God's word? Does not God say, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return?" Is not this true of man, as we see him with all his intellection? Is it not declared by Daniel and the Saviour, that the saints of God are sleeping in the dust of the earth, from whence they will come forth in the resurrection? What is the use of quibbling on a matter so plain as this?

He denies that Christ had in addition to his divine nature, a human soul, and yet he charges me with depreciating the value of his death, because, as he says, I believe that nothing but his body died. Now, does he believe that his divinity died? I presume not. Then, according to his own logic, nothing but the body died, hence, he is guilty of the very thing he charges on me, of teaching that there was nothing but a *human sacrifice for our sins!!* Upon his principles, in order to give the Saviour's death its due value, more than the body must die; and, as he had no human soul, therefore, to make it more than a human sacrifice *the divinity must die!!* What a conclusion! But this is not all. He says that the word *soul*, used by David and Peter, is equivalent to the word *spirit*, which our Lord commended to his Father, and means the divinity of the Son of God. Then, when our Lord died, he commended to God his divinity — of course, it did not die, nothing but the body did, and after all, according to his showing, we have nothing but a human sacrifice for sin!

I must confess, however, that this is the first time I have ever heard any one deny that Christ did not possess the entire nature of man. That his divinity is denied, we all know, but I never heard his humanity denied before. The honor of this discovery has been reserved for my friend Mr. Connelly.

He quibbles about the sense in which the word *soul* is used in Isaiah fifty-three; but has he denied that it *died*? He has not. Whether it there means the body or the life, or both together, is not important to the point in dispute. I have showed that whatever it is, it died, and was buried; and afterwards raised; and this stands uncontradicted.

He speaks rather contemptuously of my commentators, especially of Professor Bush. You will recollect my friends that he challenged me to produce a respectable commentator who concurred with me in the interpretation I gave to the phrase, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." All I intended by mentioning the name of Thomas Scott, was to show that *he* acknowledged that it was so understood by many learned men. As to the others, I gave their comments, and whatever may be the character of Professor Bush for orthodoxy, I presume he will admit that Pearson, Witsius, Smith, and Morrison are respectable. There is not perhaps in America a better Hebrew scholar than Professor Bush; and the fact that he is a Swedenborger—a spiritualist, even denying the resurrection of the body—makes his testimony in this case more credible. He believes in the separate existence of human spirits, just what my friend is now trying to prove, but with all his attachment to that idea he gives an honest explanation of the phrase, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," which, he says, means dead body in the grave. The Professor, I am sure, cannot be suspected of any partiality for my views.

We are again told that it is necessary to personality that there be rationality, and that a thing cannot be personified unless it be rational. Then Abel's blood must be rational, for it is personified; so are trees, hills, and

other inanimate objects. I am surprised at this statement, after the admission that all inanimate objects are personified. But it seems my friend is determined to have the last word on every point, no matter how often he is driven from it.

He has introduced another proof text, Luke xx, 27-33. That you may understand this evidence, I will read the whole of it: "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection, and they asked him, saying, master, Moses wrote unto us, if a man's brother die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were, therefore, seven brethren; and the first took a wife and died without children. And the second took her, and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also; and they left no children, and died. Last of all, the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection, whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering, said unto them, the children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, but are as the angels of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but the living; for all live unto him."

With text and context now before us, notice the following facts: First, The question here is not about an intermediate state, but about a *resurrection* state. Second, It is well known to you all that the Sadducees did not

believe in either. Had our Lord taught that there was a separate state of spirits between death and the resurrection, is it not probable, yea certain, that they would have asked him whose wife the woman would be in the intermediate state or in the spirit world? The very form in which they put the question proves demonstrably that our Lord taught that future life depended on the resurrection and not on an immortal nature in man. Third, The Sadducees not only denied the resurrection, but they also denied the separate existence of human spirits, the very doctrine for which my friend is now pleading. The Lord gently reproved them, not for their unbelief in the conscious existence of human spirits after death, but for denying the power of God, or the possibility of a resurrection — see Mark xii, 24. The stress of the argument here is on the declaration "that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." On this, it is assumed that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are alive because God is their God. Then it was useless to say any thing about their resurrection as a *sine qua non* to this fact. Their resurrection was the very thing to verify this declaration. This was the question at issue between our Lord and the Sadducees. The very fact that God is the God of the living, and that he is the God of these patriarchs at the same time, makes it necessary to raise them. For if he did not, he would be the God of the dead. Therefore, in view of the resurrection, they are prospectively spoken of as not only being alive, but actually raised. The present tense of a verb is often used to denote an event yet future, in order to show its certainty. Numerous examples can be given of this form of speech; and if required, I will produce them:

I have said, my friends, that the construction given by

my friend to second Cor. v, 1, subverts the resurrection of the body that dies. In Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, he has fully presented this subject, and has shown clearly that without a resurrection of the body that dies, there is no future life. And that the whole man is corruptible is evident from the fact that he alleges that incorruption and immortality are *put on*, not *received back*, or *into*, as would be the case on my friend's principles — see verse fifty-three. Here it is apparent that there is a change of *nature* taught. Mortality *puts on* immortality, or as Paul says in his second letter, *mortality is swallowed up of life*. When this happens, death is swallowed up in victory. According to Paul, immortality is bestowed on the righteous in the resurrection, not before. Therefore, until that glorious time, we must remain under the dominion of death. We cannot, as some people imagine, sing the victor's song at death. It is then that we are conquered by the last enemy, whose power can only be destroyed by our Lord Jesus Christ. I would like to know how my friend reconciles his theory with what Paul says about a corruptible something putting on incorruption, and a mortal something putting on immortality. What is it that is said to be mortal? Whatever it is, mark it my friends, it simply puts on a quality or an attribute. It does not re-unite with something from which it had been separated, called an immortal soul.

In this chapter, Paul represents the dead in Christ as being asleep, and if not raised from the dead, they have forever perished. I say again, this could not be upon the supposition that man by nature has an immortal soul, or never-dying soul, as Plato taught. A resurrection of the dead body is of no importance to a soul that can live

"unhurt amid the war of elements, the wreck of matter, and crush of worlds." The doctrine which I am combating is a figment of heathen philosophy, and is, beyond all doubt, a vain, a foolish speculation.

That man is to all intents and purposes mortal, and at death will fall into an unconscious state, I will now proceed to show from the word of God. This state is called a sleep, because from it there will be a waking up. But the second death is never called a sleep, because from it there is no waking. The first text I shall submit to your consideration is, Rom. i, 23, "And changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four footed beasts, and to creeping things." Here man is contrasted in this particular with his Creator, and declared to be corruptible. In the new translation, the Greek adjective *phtharton* is rendered by the word mortal, and *aphtharton* by the word immortal. This is correct. They made a likeness of mortal man and worshipped it instead of the immortal God, who is blessed for evermore.

Job iv, 17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" Now, neither justice nor injustice, virtue or vice can be predicated of the body. It must be of the intellectual and moral nature. Hence, according to the text, the man proper is said to be mortal.

Again, we read in 1 Tim. vi, 16, "That God only hath immortality." No man or angel by nature is immortal. It is a quality or attribute communicable from God to his creatures. By grace it is bestowed on the righteous in an appointed way and time. Angels who kept their first estate have obtained it, and in the resurrection those who sleep in Jesus will also receive it, and be in that respect equal to the angels. [Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

I am sorry that my friend Dr. Field is so much disturbed at my exposing the absurdities of his objections to my propositions. He has been so long accustomed to make bold assertions, and to assume unwarrantable and unauthorized positions undisturbed, that he thinks it strange that he is not allowed to run to the same excess; complaining that I reply to every thing he says, and am determined to have the last word. I would be glad to sympathize with him in his troubles, but can give him no comfort. Before the authorities he must come. But I call again and again for authority for this, and authority for that. So I have, but as you will bear me witness, I have called in vain. How presumptuous I am, that I should call upon the great Dr. Field for the proof of any thing he says! For his assertions are as plain as his own existence, or that two and two are four. Who could stand against such authority? All this may answer the doctor very well, but I am greatly mistaken in the intelligence of this community, if his *ipse dixit* will be sufficient authority here.

Hence, if he will pardon us, we will still examine his positions, and call for some evidence as we go along.

He says his authority for regarding death a cessation of conscious existence, is the Bible, reason, common sense, and universal observation. But will Dr. Field allow us to ask him where in the Bible it is so declared? And is it not entirely unaccountable that this common sense fact, founded on universal observation, has never

been expressed by any authority under the heavens either human or divine? If it has been so rendered by authority, let the doctor produce it. For I am sure that would be better received than his assertions. But our attention is called to Rom. i, 23, Job iv, 17, 1 Tim. vi, 16, to prove that man is mortal and that at death he will fall into an unconscious state. Why should he spend his time in proving that man is mortal? Has that ever been denied? Have I not conceded that in the very structure of my proposition. The question then, is not whether man is mortal or immortal, but that when man *dies* his spirit remains in a conscious state, separate from the body until the resurrection. The texts he quotes, proves that man is mortal—no one disputes that. But what does mortal mean but subject to death? And what is death? A separation of body and spirit, as we have shown—abundantly shown—from various texts. Hence, these scriptures quoted by the doctor, give no intimation of unconsciousness in death. This phrase is not in all the Bible. Hence, according to the logic of my friend, the thought is not there. This is singular logic, it is true, but peculiar to Dr. Field. You can perceive then, my friends, that I hazard nothing in admitting what I believe, that man dies—the whole of man. He does not cease to be conscious, but *dies*. This view of the subject, which I have maintained from the beginning of this debate, which, as you see, accords with the authorities of our language, as well as its usage, and also with the Bible, will at once remove all those difficulties which the doctor has tried to throw around the resurrection, and will explain too, those scriptures quoted from Genesis and Daniel. The body which was made of dust, returns to dust, but the spirit dies to the body—departs from this

world—returns to God who gave it, who retains it in *hades*, the unseen state, until the resurrection. This view will also explain the death of Christ, not the humanity only, but Christ Jesus our Lord and Saviour, who was glorified with the Father before the world was. His body was laid in Joseph's new tomb. His spiritual nature went to the regions of the dead, obtained the power of death—the keys of death and *hades*. The power to open and none could shut, to shut and none could open. But he says, I deny the humanity of Christ. This deserves no reply, as it was evidently made merely to fill up the time. For it must appear singular enough to you, my friends, that the doctor will charge me with denying the humanity of Christ for saying he had a human body, when he maintains that the body is all there is of man. I would say once for all, then, that I believe that Christ died for our sins; not the human nature only; but human and divine nature both. He did not cease to be conscious, but *died*.

He charges me of speaking contemptuously of his commentators. I only showed that none of them but *Bush* agreed with Dr. Field, and that the Professor was too great a visionary to be relied upon. But the doctor says this makes his evidence in the case the more creditable; that is, the greater visionary, the better authority, with Dr. Field. This, I reckon, will not be questioned by the doctor's acquaintances.

We are again called to notice the doctor's figure personification. He cannot see the difference between personality and the figure personification, consequently, he thinks that, if rationality is essential to personality, Abel's blood, trees, &c., must be rational, because they are personified. This is equalled only by his position

that the personal pronouns are applied to inanimate things by the figure personification: I fear we shall soon be constrained to think the doctor himself is here by personification.

Let us next notice his remarks on Job iv, 17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God." He says that neither justice nor injustice, virtue nor vice, can be predicated of the body very well. That is all true enough. But what are justice, injustice, virtue, vice, &c., predicated of then? He says of his intellectual and moral nature; but what is his intellectual and moral nature? He told us yesterday that while man lives, he is so constituted that his material organization eliminates mind, thought, reason, and all other mental manifestations. According to this, man's intellectual and moral nature are only the eliminations of his material organization. Hence, man is neither vicious nor virtuous, saint nor sinner. These are predicated only of the eliminations of his material organization; they are predicated only of what man shows off. This is surely the most profound discovery of the age.

We are again told that my interpretation of 2 Cor. v, 1, subverts the doctrine of a resurrection. And the apostle's remarks in the fifteenth chapter of 2 Corinthians are cited as evidence. This I have sufficiently answered, and I would not advert to it here, but for the additional statement that the apostle here teaches corruptibility of the whole man. He insists upon this, because the apostle here says this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. Assuming that as the apostle means the spirit, on my position on the fifth chapter of 2 Cor. when he speaks of being clothed upon with that house which is from heaven. And as the

apostle in the twenty-fifth chapter of first Cor. uses the phrase *put on*. This mortal must *put on* immortality. He must mean the spirit then, also. To expose the fallacy of this position, we will give a few facts: First, the terms mortal and corruptible, as well as the original words, of which they are translations, are adjectives. And as all adjectives must agree with some noun, either expressed or understood, and as the noun is not expressed in this text, it must be understood. Second, when the man in his present organized state is meant, the original word is *anthropos*. The different parts are expressed by the words *soma*, (body) *psuchee* (which is variously rendered by the words life, mind, heart, and by metonymy for that which has life, a living being or individual, hence, when it means the man, it always means the *living* man) and *pneuma* the spirit. Now, the question is, which of these words should be supplied in the text. To aid us in determining this, we will give a third fact. Greek adjectives are distinguished by gender as well as the nouns, and are required by the principles of the language to agree in gender with the nouns which they qualify. Hence, we cannot supply *anthropos*, man, because it is masculine, and the adjective is neuter, nor can we supply *psuchee*, because it is feminine, and the adjective will not agree with it. The context will not allow us to supply *pneuma*. *Soma* (the body) then, is the only word that can be supplied in this text that will accord with the context and the principles of the language. His conclusion therefore, is founded in his own imagination.

Dr. Field—I can find other nouns beside *soma* to suit the adjective.

Mr. Connelly—Try it, then.

Dr. Field—I will, in due time.

We will now notice the doctor's difficulties with regard to the condition of the rich man and Lazarus. He has presented what *he* calls four facts attesting the existence of these persons in their *bodily state*; he has not told us however, whether it is before or after the resurrection. Will he shed some light on that subject? But let us attend to his facts. First—He says my interpretation pre-supposes that the righteous and wicked have gone to their final reward. This pre-supposition is no doubt very clearly before the doctor's mind, but I doubt very much whether it can be seen by any one else, and he has not told us how it is to be perceived. Is it because Lazarus is happy and the rich man is unhappy? Then, the fact that the righteous and wicked are in different conditions in this life, must pre-suppose that they have gone to their final reward already. Second—It cannot be the spirits of those persons; because they are represented as having material organs, such as eyes, tongue, fingers, &c. According to this logic then, God is not a spirit, for he is represented in the scriptures as possessing all these organs, "whose *eyes* are over the righteous, and his *ears* are open to their prayers." The scriptures indeed, abound in expressions where these organs are regarded as belonging to God. Hence, it would seem that though the doctor will not answer my question directly, whether God is material or not, still he believes he is. This accords precisely with his position that to be immaterial is to be nothing. Third—It is expressly stated that the rich man was *buried*, and in hell he lifted up his *eyes*." And does this prove that he was *unconscious* or in a *bodily state*!!! But the doctor says he went to torment after his burial. Well, that is my position, Dr. Field's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. Fourth—Between the

parties is an impassable *gulf*, that is all true; but will my friend show how the fact that the wicked cannot become righteous, or the righteous unrighteous after death, proves there is no intermediate state of consciousness? These objections, then, are only imaginary, and do not in the least militate against my interpretation of this important text. Will the doctor please tell us in his next speech what he understands the meaning of the text to be?

Having thus disposed of the doctor's objections to my argument on Luke xvi, I will examine his remarks on Luke xx, 27, 28. Are you able, my friends, to discover any thing in the context as repeated by the doctor, that militates against my argument on it? Did I not state distinctly that the question was with regard to the resurrection, and that they denied the existence of separate spirits; which was the foundation of their difficulties on the resurrection? But he says that they would not have asked any thing about the resurrection if the Saviour had taught a separate state. If this objection has *any thing* in it, it is this: That the Sadducees wished to ask the Lord something, and as Jesus taught nothing else, they had to ask about the resurrection rather from necessity!! But he says the whole passage is prospective, and proposes to show numerous examples where the *present* tense of a verb is often used to denote action yet future, in order to denote its certainty. We will all be edified by his effort I have no doubt. The *present* tense, and even the past is sometimes used in prophetic style for the future. But will Dr. Field affirm that the declaration of God to Moses at the bush, which is quoted by the Saviour in Luke xx, is a prophetic declaration? We will see. And unless he can establish that point, his whole scheme of interpretation

on this text, fails. We will wait to hear from him again on this subject, and proceed to some other texts, Luke xxiii, 39-43: "And one of the malefactors which were hanged, railed on him saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us. But the other answering, rebuked him saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus, Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S EIGHTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS —

The doctrines advocated by my friend, on the subject of life and death, are essentially the same as those of Emanuel Swedenborg and Prof. Bush. Upon his principles no man ever did or ever will really die. A mere change in the mode of existence is all that *his* death amounts to. Man no more dies when he throws off his material body, than does the locust when it throws off its shell. With as much truth may it be said of the locust, the dragon fly, or the butterfly, when they leave their chrysalides, that *they* die, as it can be said of man that *he* dies when he "shuffles off this mortal coil." I take you my fellow-citizens to be a reflecting people; and that you will not lay aside common sense in order to accommodate your religious principles to a figment of heathen

philosophy. According to my friend's views, death is nothing more than a separation of the man from his dwelling place called sometimes a tenement of clay, a clog, a mortal coil, &c. The body is not the man, but an incumbrance of the man. The spirit and that only, is, according to his views, the man proper. Thus you see, my friends, that it can no more be affirmed of a man that he dies when he leaves the body, than it can be said of you that you die when you walk out of your houses. Will my friend say that the locust dies when it separates from its aurelia? He certainly will not. The presence of the locust gives vitality to its chrysalis; but when detached from it, this external covering perishes; hence, according to my friend, the very utmost that can be said of the death that *he* contends for is, that only a *part* of man dies, and not the man himself. Upon his principles, death is an improved state of existence. As the butterfly ascends from its chrysalis in an improved and more beautiful form, so man rises from his body in a condition better adapted to thought and enjoyment. This is precisely the doctrine of the Swedish Baron. It follows, then, as a corollary from these premises, that there is no such a thing as a resurrection. His proposition should have been framed thus: When a man vacates his earthly house of clay, he goes to the spirit land where he continues in a conscious state until he is compelled to return and occupy his old house again.

My friend asks me for Bible authority for saying that death is cessation of conscious existence. I *have* given it; and I wish it to be understood, that this authority shall be an additional objection to his interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. By way of refreshing his memory, I will now present further proof

of the unconsciousness of the dead. Job xiv, 10-12. "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up; so man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more; they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." If there were no other passage of scripture on the subject but this, it is sufficient proof of the unconsciousness of the dead. Language cannot be more explicit in affirming the profound and unconscious sleep of the dead. Again, Job says, chapter tenth, that if he had died at birth, he would have been as though he had not been. He then prays for a continuance of life that he might enjoy some comfort before he went "to the land of darkness, and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death without any order, and where the light is as darkness." This does not look much like "the spirit land" of heathen mythology and modern poets. Comment on such language as this is useless. David says, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake (from death) in thy likeness." Ps. xvii, 15. Again: "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave (*sheol* or *hades*) who shall give thee thanks? Ps. vi, 5. Again: Ps. lxxxviii, 10-12, "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave (*sheol* or *hades*) and thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be made known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Again: Ps. cxv, 17, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Again, the Psalmist says, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in

the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. cxlvi, 3, 4. Again: Ecc. ix, 5, 6, "For the living know that they must die, but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." Also, verse tenth: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, (*sheol* or *hades*) whither thou goest."

I have thus summed up in a connected view, some of the evidence on which I rest the assertion that the dead are in an unconscious state, without knowledge. No sophistry can avail any thing against such declarations as these; nor can they be harmonized with my friend's explanation of his proof texts. It follows, then, that they mean something different from what he supposes; and who that reads them carefully with a view to a harmony of the Sacred Record, can fail to see that there is no absolute necessity, growing out of either the laws of language, figures, or parables, for interpreting them as my friend does.

But my friend, Mr. Connelly thinks, or pretends to think, that Professor Bush is high authority with me because he is a visionary like myself. I presume you all understood me, my friends, to say, when I quoted Dr. Bush, that he ought to be good authority with my friend, as they hold the same views of the soul, and its nature. It is plain to be seen that my friend is hard pressed for arguments. Whether I am a visionary or not, I think it

likely, that I will so sharpen *his* vision before this debate is over, as to make him see that the question, to say the least of it, has two sides to it.

With respect to man's mental manifestations being his moral nature, and capable of good or evil passions and decisions, he thinks it an absurd idea. I would ask if he ever knew a man to have reason, reflection, or any of the moral passions without a brain? Has he never seen men — living men — with diseased brains utterly unable to think? Doubtless he has. If, then, man cannot think and reason with a *diseased* brain, how is he to do it *without* a brain? If my friend's views be true, it would make no sort of difference, so far as mentality is concerned, whether a man's head is filled with brains or blood! The spirit, or man proper, capable of living and acting without the body or any of its tissues, is still in existence in full possession of all its powers. Why, then, do we not see some of the manifestations of this spiritual man when the natural man is out of fix? The very fact that man is to be rewarded for the deeds done in the body, and that the body must be punished, proves that no man can sin without a body or brain. His mind being a product of his brain, therefore, a sound and healthy brain is essential to moral or legal accountability. In the day of judgment infants and idiots, whose brains are immature and incapable of performing the function of thought, will not be held amenable to the divine law.

My friend Mr. Connelly, gives us the Swedenborg interpretation of Luke xx, 27, 20. He takes the ground that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are not only *alive now*, but actually *raised* from the dead. So far, then, as they are concerned, the resurrection is past. This was the doctrine of Hymeneus and Philetus, which Paul con-

demned as subversive of the faith of the church. He cannot get out of this dilemma while he takes the position he does. The difficulty, and the only one in the way of my explanation, is easily removed, and that without departing from the Hebrew idiom. As stated, the verb is here used in the present tense to show the certainty of a future event. The present and perfect tense are both used in speaking of future events. For example: John xvii, 4, "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." Here our Lord speaks of the work being finished, when the most important part of it was yet to be performed. For it was not until he expired on the cross that it was *really* finished. Here is an instance of a prospective event spoken of as already past. But again: "And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee." See eleventh verse. Here our Lord uses the same phraseology when speaking of his departure from the world. Again: Rom. iv, 17, "As it is written I have made thee a father of many nations before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were." Here Abraham is called a father of many nations, when as yet he had no child. Again: 2 Tim. i, 10, "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." These examples of this form of speech could be greatly multiplied. It was as easy for God to say to Abraham, I *will* make thee a father of many nations as to say, I *have* done it. But he used the past tense of the verb for the same reason that he uses the present when he speaks of the dead as being raised.

But there is another difficulty to be disposed of which

I will notice. God is said to be not the God of the dead, but of the living; therefore, it is assumed that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are now living, for God is their God. If this be the meaning of the passage, let us see how it will agree with some others: Rom. xiv, 8, 9, "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the *dead* and *living*." Here is proof positive that God is the God of the dead, as well as the living. I will now prove that Abraham is among the dead: John viii, 52, 53, . . . "Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest if a man keep my saying, he shall not see death. Art thou greater than our father Abraham who is dead? and the prophets are dead, whom makest thou thyself?" Now, how will my friend reconcile these declarations with his understanding of Luke xx, 37, 38? It cannot be done on any other principle than the one I have mentioned.

[Here the doctor spent some time in reading English and Greek definitions of the words death, resurrection, &c., pending which his time expired.]

THIRD DAY,
Monday morning, 10 o'clock. }

MR. CONNELLY'S NINTH SPEECH.

AFTER prayer by Rev. Mr. JAMESON, Mr. Connelly rose and said:—

BRETHREN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

A kind and beneficent Providence has preserved our lives through another day, commemorative of the triumphant victory of our Lord and Saviour over death. And I trust we have made a Sabbath day's journey towards the climes of the blessed beyond the tomb, and have so improved the sacred hours of that holy day, that we are better prepared to continue the investigation of our destiny.

Before we advance we would do well to review the past, that we may see our progress. I confess, however, that I am not very well prepared to do this, having no notes of the gentlemen's speeches on yesterday. [The allusion here is to the fact, that Mr. Proctor and Dr. Field had each delivered a discourse bearing directly on the question in debate.]

[Dr. Field here rose and said, that Mr. C. was misinformed. That the addresses alluded to had nothing to do with the question in debate. That he had, at the earnest solicitation of several of the leading members of the church, delivered an address on the punishment of the wicked, but was careful not to trench on the ground covered by Mr. C.'s proposition.]

The doctor closed his last speech on Saturday evening, by reading certain definitions from Dr. Webster, which have no more relation to the question before us, as must be evident to all who were present, than they have to the infallibility of the Pope of Rome. We will then call your attention, again, to the meaning of the words in dispute involved in my proposition. And it would seem, too, that this is a work of supererogation; for you, my friends, must all be satisfied that I have defined and used these terms in their popular, as well as in their scriptural meanings. And it cannot be possible that Dr. Field is so ignorant of the English language, that he does not know that I have defined and used these terms as they are commonly defined and used by the standard authorities of our language. Although he would make you believe, at least so far as mere declamation can affect your faith, that my views of life and death are wholly speculative, and contrary to every principle of common sense, and opposed to all the laws of language. But will he affirm that I have not given the definitions of the words in question as they are found in our dictionaries? Or that they are not reported in these books as they are used by the best speakers and writers in our language? Or will he affirm that these words do not correctly represent the original words of which they are translations? Come up, doctor, to these points, like a Christian and a scholar; for here is a much better chance to display scholarship than declamation. A mere school boy can quibble and declaim; and I am greatly deceived in your powers of discrimination, my friends, if you have not perceived that Dr. Field has done little more than this from the commencement of this discussion.

But let us see, again, what Dr. Webster, who is the

adopted standard of the English language among our people, says on the subject of life and death. Death, he says, is "that *state* of an animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions." But what is meant by vital functions? Vital, pertaining to, or necessary to life. Death, then, according to Webster, is that *state* in which the organs necessary to life have not only ceased to act, but have lost the power of renewed action. Life, he says, in man, (the very point in dispute,) that state of being in which the soul and body are united. Life and death, then, are states or modes of being; the one a state where spirit and body are united, the other a state where spirit and body are separated. This is evident not only from the foregoing definitions, but also from that of die, (the term of my proposition,) which, when used with regard to man, is to depart from this world. This harmonizes perfectly with those declarations of the Bible, which show that at death the spirit separated from the body, and which have been so often repeated.

My views of life and death, you perceive, my friends, is in perfect accordance with the common sense and common understanding of the entire republic of letters, and also with the Bible; and are, therefore, correct. Hence, as reflecting people, you are not under the necessity of departing from either common sense or the Bible, in order to believe them.

But the doctor says, Emanuel Swedenborg and Professor Bush believe a doctrine essentially the same as that I have just set forth. And what if they do; is it therefore false? Will he please tell us how their belief or disbelief affects the truth of any proposition; or does he affirm, that the fact that great visionaries sometimes believe the

truth, renders it false ; no matter how clearly and plainly it is taught in the word of God. So it would seem. Hence, if such men happen to believe the Bible, it must therefore be false. Strange logic this. The doctor only designed, perhaps, to bring in disrepute, by associating it with such names, what he cannot refute.

He thinks my interpretation of Luke xx, 27, 28, places me in an inextricable dilemma. And why ? Because I teach that the Saviour, in answering the difficulties of the Sadducees with regard to the resurrection, directed his answer to the foundation of their difficulty, and proved that there was something to be raised — and Swedenborg believes the dead are raised — therefore I am in an inextricable dilemma ! This needs no reply. But he says the verb is here used in the present tense to show the certainty of a future event. I have admitted that the present tense, and also the past, are, in prophetic language, used in setting forth future events ; and I also admit, that the verb *are raised* sets forth an event yet future. All this is true, but it does not touch the point in my argument on this text. My argument here is founded on the quotation from Exodus iii, 6. *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, connected with the Saviour's own statement, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him.* And called on the doctor to say, whether this quotation and declaration of the Saviour are prophetic ; and we call on him to say. Will he still remain silent ? Instead of answering this question, he gravely sets out to prove that the Saviour's declaration, that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, is not true ! This he does by showing that God is the God of the dead as well as of the living. Dr. Field and the Saviour for it, then, with

respect to this difficulty. And the doctor thinks these scriptures will harmonize only on his principles, will he try *his* skill at reconciliation in his next speech ? That there is perfect harmony in these texts, with my interpretation of them, will be evident by noting the following facts. The Saviour speaks of those who are dead to us, but are alive to God. In the other texts, God is said to be the God of the dead to us ; on the principle as stated by the Lord, that all live unto God. There is, therefore, an existing being between death and the resurrection, which lives to God, and is, therefore, conscious.

Because the body is the organization through which the spirit holds communion with external things, and by which it operates here, the doctor cannot see that man has any moral nature, except his mental manifestations. Nor can he see how he will ever be able to think without the body, because he cannot now manifest his thoughts to others without the means that God has furnished him with here. But let us look at his position again. The moral nature of man is all that is virtuous or vicious. This moral nature is nothing but the mental manifestations, and these mental manifestations are only the eliminations of the body, the organization which can be seen, which the doctor says is *all there is of man*. Hence it follows that *man* is neither virtuous nor vicious, wicked nor righteous, saint nor sinner, nor is he accountable at all. There is nothing accountable, nothing right or wrong, virtuous or vicious, but the eliminations of man. Could any thing be more absurd. And this is the way, my friends, that Dr. Field would expose a dangerous error into which we have fallen, which *he* has been pleased to denominate a figment of heathen mythology !

Having utterly failed to show that my interpretation

of the various proof texts which I have introduced is wrong, or to give any other interpretation of them, and having come here to object to my proposition at all hazards, as a last resort he sets out in his last speech to give a number of texts which he thinks teach a different doctrine, and thereby he thinks to array the scripture against itself. And suppose he should do this, would it prove that my proposition is not taught in the scripture, or would it only show that the scripture is not to be believed? But we anticipated as stated in my first speech, that this would be his course. And hence suggested in advance, that, as the Bible is true in all its parts, and as truth is always harmonious with truth, every text, whether introduced by the doctor or myself, should be so interpreted as to agree not only with its own context, but with every other text in the Bible. We will, then, before we advance with our argument, examine the doctor's texts, to see if we have pursued this course.

Our attention is first called to Job xiv, 10-13. "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he, as the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." This, the doctor thinks, is altogether conclusive of the profound and unconscious sleep of the dead. This phrase, however, is neither in this text nor any other text in the Bible, neither in form or sense. And the doctor says, where the words are not found the thoughts are not to be expected. Hence, according to *his* logic, his conclusion is not in the premises; but we will show this fact from another direction. You perceive that the stress is here placed upon the word *sleep*. Why, then, are the dead

said to sleep? He has already informed us, and correctly, too, that it is because there is to be a waking, or resurrection. Then it is not because there is no consciousness there. And will my friend, Dr. Field, affirm that there is no consciousness in sleep? There is, then, no authority under the broad canopy, for his groundless conclusion. Let us now look at his quotation from the tenth chapter of Job. "O that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me, I should have been as though I had not been." On the doctor's plan of interpretation, what Job here affirms of himself, if he had died at birth, is as true of all after death as of those who die at birth. Hence, after death man has no existence at all; consequently, all that is said in the scriptures about the dead is so much said about nothing. Or does he intend to affirm with his brother, Dr. Thomas, that infants will not be raised at all? We would like to be informed on this point. The context clearly shows Job's thoughts in this text to be this, that if he had died at birth he would have been free from all the difficulties of this life. Hence, it would have been as though he had not been at all, and not as the doctor thinks, that he would have had no existence at all. This text, then, says nothing of the unconscious sleep of the dead, or that death is a cessation of consciousness.

His quotation from Job xvii, has been answered in our remarks on Job xiv, the point being the same. We next notice the sixth Psalm. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who shall givethee thanks." This, as you perceive, is a conclusion from what has been before stated, and in reading the preceding verse in connection with this, the meaning will be plain. "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul, O save me for thy name's sake. For in death there is no remembrance of

thee, in the grave who shall give thee thanks." The desire expressed here is for salvation, in view of the fact that there is no chance of salvation in the grave; those who go to the grave unprepared give God no thanks, they do not remember the Lord, the term remembrance being used in the sense of obedience. This is again taught in his quotation from Psalm lxxxviii: "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall they arise and praise thee," &c.

And as we have shown before, the same facts are taught in Ecc. ix, that is, in the grave there is no knowledge of salvation; God's offer of salvation is not extended beyond this world. Hence, as is shown in the case of the rich man and Lazarus, the wicked have no means, after death, of changing their condition. These scriptures furnish no difficulty to my interpretation of this parable. But will Dr. Field venture to tell what it means with him.

But we must not dismiss this subject without noticing the cxlvi Psalm: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." The term thoughts in this text, as is evident not only from the word used in the Septuagint, but from the context, means designs or purposes. We are exhorted not to trust in man, for though he may design to bless us, he is destined to die, when his purposes must fail — they must perish.

Hence, not one of these texts furnishes the shadow of evidence that death is a cessation of consciousness, nor do they all together give any; they all harmonize readily with all my proof texts, and attest the correctness of my positions. Will the doctor harmonize them with my proofs on his principles? He must try his hand again.

[Time out.]

DR. FIELD'S NINTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

Before replying to my friend, Mr. Connelly's speech, this morning, I will briefly review the ground traveled over in this discussion, and see what progress has been made, and how the question stands. The proposition for debate is — *That when man dies his spirit remains in a conscious state until the resurrection.*

To his definitions I have offered several objections, especially to that of the human spirit, which he says is an immaterial, intelligent, and rational entity, capable of thinking and acting when separated from the body. The proof of this definition would be the proof of his proposition. If, however, he fail to prove that the spirit is what he represents it to be, his cause is lost.

That there is no authority in the Bible for such a definition, every candid man will admit. Such phrases as immaterial spirit, never-dying, immortal soul, and the death that never dies, are not there. They are as truly the words of man's wisdom as transubstantiation, consubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints, unconditional election and reprobation, total depravity, and scores of other Ashdodical expressions, against which he and his associates in the ministry have so loudly declaimed. For these reasons I reject the definition, and oppose the philosophy built thereon. It is true, he may find authority for his definitions in our modern dictionaries, which are nothing more than exponents of the popular ideas attached to words, but it is certain that the Bible does not use the word in the modern philosophic sense.

He defined death to be a separation of the body and spirit. This, I have shown, is a vague definition, but was so contrived to accord with the doctrine of his proposition. It is true, that at death the spirit, whatever it is, is separated from the body. The same is true of all the physical and mental manifestations, which are, one and all, the effect rather than the cause of death. As Solomon says, "When the silver cord is loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern, then shall the dust return to the dust, as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it." Here it is evident that a separation of body and spirit is the result of death, and not the cause of it.

Physiologically considered, death is that state of being in which there is a total and permanent cessation of the vital functions, when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action. To die, then, is to cease to breathe, to suspend permanently the circulation of the blood, the motion of the heart, and other physical organs. This definition is in strict accordance with the laws of life and universal observation. It is also in perfect agreement with the Bible — "His breath goeth forth, *he* (the man himself) returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish," Ps. cxlvi, 4. The intellect, mind, or thoughts, dependent on organized matter for their production and development, necessarily cease when the body dies. It is the most gratuitous assumption imaginable to say that the thoughts are the man's designs or purposes. If it were affirmed any where in the Bible that man could think after death, we might suppose this to be a mistranslation. But as it is, there is no need of this strained criticism. But the quibble is in keeping with

his views of several of my proof texts, which I shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

In support of his proposition, he first proved that there is a distinction between the body and the spirit. This I admitted; and so there is between the body and the life, and the body and the breath, the body and the soul, and between the body and its members; but does it, therefore, follow that all these things, attributes, or appendages, are personal identities, capable of thinking and acting without the body? Certainly not.

He next proved that there are spirits in existence, endowed with life, personality, and consciousness. This I also admitted; but does it follow that they are *human* spirits separated from the body? I have shown that living men in this world are called spirits, and that even dead men are called spirits. He contended that personality could only be predicated of being — rational being, and as spirit, in his judgment, is the rational part of man, it must be involved in the idea. I have shown that dead bodies are called souls, and also that dead men, just as we see them, are personated by all the personal pronouns in the English language; therefore, there is not, even on my friend's principles, any more impropriety in calling dead men spirits than in calling them souls. Spirit and soul with him are synonymous, and if it be admissible to apply the word soul to a dead man, it cannot be improper to use the word spirit in the same sense. Spirits in prison, then, are no more than dead men in prison or in their graves, held under the power and dominion of death.

Proving that there are living spirits unseen by us in the heavenly regions, or wherever he chooses to locate them, amounts to nothing. For I offset this by showing that angels are spirits, so are the demons, and the saints *will*

be when resurrected, or as stated in 1 Cor. xv, they will have spiritual bodies.

Thus far, then, he has gained nothing by his labor. Nothing short of a "*thus saith the Lord*" will establish his proposition. Let him lay his finger on the text that says the dead are conscious, — that a man may be dead and alive at the same time — and in fact know more after he is dead than when alive, and I will surrender the point. This is what he and his party have insisted on as the fair way to settle disputed doctrines and practices between themselves and the sects. It is the only way ever to bring about union among Christians; and now I call upon him once more to produce the authority, or give up his philosophical tenet of immortal soulism.

In conducting this discussion, he has, contrary to logical and polemic rules, amended his proposition, by incorporating into it the word soul, which, he says, in some places in the Bible is synonymous with the word spirit. I have allowed him this liberty for the sake of a thorough examination of every passage that could in any wise favor his views. But what has he gained by it? Nothing. For I have proved by his own quotations that the soul is destructible. On this point, however, I intend to amplify, and will place it beyond all doubt or cavil.

I have shown, that his inferences from certain ambiguous and metaphorical statements of Paul and Peter would contradict numerous plain and positive declarations of the Bible, with which he has not attempted fairly and logically to reconcile them. He may say of my proof texts that they simply mean that the dead cannot obey the Lord, that they know nothing of salvation, &c. But Solomon says "*they know not any thing,*" and, as if that were liable to be misconstrued, he has told us that their *love, envy,*

and *hatred* are likewise perished. This cannot be, upon my friend's principles, and well he knows it. Moreover, when Solomon says there is no *knowledge* in *sheol* or *hades*, he does not make any exceptions or limitations. It is sheer nonsense to say that this only means that there is no knowledge of *salvation* there. David says the dead praise not the Lord. How can this be if they are alive and in Abraham's bosom, or in a place of happiness? Will he tell us?

With this statement of the present attitude of the question, I will notice some other points in his last speech. In his remarks on Job xiv, he says that sleep is not a state of unconsciousness; and calls on me to prove that it is. Why, my friends, I scarcely think it worth while to prove a matter that every man of sense knows to be true. In sleep, when it is perfect, there is an entire and complete suspension of the intellectual operations. It is a well known fact that when we sleep soundly we have no thoughts whatever, not even a dream. Hence the rapidity with which time flits away. I see some aged persons in this congregation who have lived to their three score years, and perhaps longer. Now, if they have slept as much as the laws of health require, they have slept twenty years. This is comparatively a long time. But suppose they had slept the whole of these twenty years without intermission, it would have been no more to them than one night, provided they were in good health, and the sleep was perfect. I do not say that there is a perfect analogy between death and natural sleep, but it is the best trope that could be selected to represent it, and in regard to the suspension of intellection, the resemblance is more striking. And now, let me ask, my friends, if it is at all likely that a *dead* man knows a *great deal*, when a living

man may be in a healthy condition for twenty years without knowing *any thing at all?*

My friend, Mr. Connelly, asks me to say whether God's words to Moses at the bush, in relation to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were prophetic; I answer, no; but the Saviour's remarks to the Sadducees, "that the dead are raised," is. This is all I asserted, and I have given examples of that idiom in relation to future events.

We have heard a great deal about the authority, if not the infallibility, of lexicons. My friend has pleaded manfully for them, and thinks it very presumptuous in me to refuse implicit submission to their definitions. By way of testing his honesty, I will read him a definition of a word of great importance in his theology, and see how he will like it. We will first take Greenfield, the author of a small Greek lexicon, attached to the Greek New Testament. The word selected is *baptize* — Greek, *baptizo* — which he defines thus: To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink. This is its natural, literal, and primary meaning — but this same lexicographer says, that in the New Testament it means *to wash*, to perform *ablution*, to cleanse. Will my friend admit that *ablution* is baptism? Not he. Yet his lexicographer says it is.

Again: Let us try him by Dr. Webster. Take the same word, and how does he define it? Hear him: "BAPTISM — *the application of water to a person as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible church of Christ. This is usually performed by sprinkling or immersion.*" Again: "BAPTIZE — *to administer the sacrament of baptism, to christen!*" Will my friend admit this? Will he bow to the authority of Webster, and acknowledge that he has been doing wrong

all this time, in contending that nothing but immersion is baptism?

You see now, my friends, how much these dictionaries are worth, when they deal in theological questions.

My friend's philosophy stands on two legs — *first* — the nature of spirit; and *second* — that the spirits of the dead are alive in a place called *hades*. You will recollect, my friends, that you were told on Saturday evening, that no other noun but *soma* (body) will suit the Greek adjective, *phtharton*, (corruptible,) in 1 Cor. xv, 53. My friend stated, that when man, as originally organized, is spoken of, the Greek noun *anthropos* is used; but when the different parts are spoken of, *soma* and *pneuma*, (body and spirit,) are employed. From this you see that the *spirit* is only a *part* of the man, and not the man himself. But this, by the way. He says *anthropos* will not agree with the qualifying adjective in this verse, because it is of the masculine gender, and the adjective is neuter; *pseuche* (soul) will not do, because that is feminine; and *pneuma* (spirit) will not do, because it will not agree with the context. It is not because of the gender of this noun, but because the context will not allow it. Mark that, my friends. I should like to know, by the by, what there is in the context to preclude its use in this case. He has come to the conclusion, however, that no other noun but *soma* will do. Recollect another fact which his proposition and arguments all affirm — that the spirit is the man proper — that it is a rational, intelligent entity, which can and does live independent of the body. It must, consequently, be in the masculine gender. (Here Dr. Field, addressing himself to Mr. Jameson, one of the moderators, asked him to say what was the sign of the neuter gender in Greek. Mr. Jameson answered, "The

article *to*." Dr. Field resumed.) The definite article *to*, then, indicates the neuter gender of nouns. The signs of the genders are as follows: *Ho aner*, the man—*He gune*, the woman—*To soma*, the body. Am I right, Mr. Connelly? ("Yes," was the answer.) Very well; now let us see if we can find another noun besides *soma*, which will agree with the adjective *phtharton*, in 1 Cor. xv, 53. Turn, my friends, to Matthew xxvii, 50: "And Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up (*to pneuma*) the ghost." Again: Matthew xxvi, 41. "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit, indeed, (*to men pneuma*,) is willing, but the flesh is weak." Here, then, we discover the important fact, that spirit is a noun in the neuter gender, and no living, intelligent entity at all; and with this discovery falls one of the pillars of his theory. It is demolished beyond a doubt, and his air-castle, built upon the philosophy of spirit, tumbles to the ground. So far, then, as gender is concerned, the noun *pneuma* will agree with the adjective in question as well as *soma*. But I do not say that it is the noun there understood.

Now for the other pillar of his system. He has informed us again and again, that the spirits of the dead go to *hades*, where they are alive, some happy, others miserable, until the day of judgment. But what does the scripture say on the subject. Let us see—Rev. xx, 13: Speaking of the general judgment, when the dead, small and great, stand before God, we are told "that the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and *hades* delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged, every man according to their works." Here you see, my friends, that *hades*, like the *sea*, is a place of dead people!! Even if it were true, that human spirits go

there at death, this text settles the question as to their condition. Thus you see how completely the Greek has overthrown his doctrine of the intermediate state!! Nothing can save his cause, unless he can show that the Bible does not mean what it says. These two incontestible facts, that the spirit of man is a noun in the neuter gender, and that whatever is in *hades* is dead, must forever hang like a millstone around the neck of his system. It is impossible for him to prove his proposition while thus hedged up on every side.

If I understood him, he fully indorses the views of Baron Swedenborg, on the subject of death and the resurrection. Just what I expected. Every body acquainted with the views of Swedenborg, knows that he teaches that death is nothing but a change in the mode of existence; that when a man dies he then gets all the resurrection he ever will have, which is nothing but an exit of the spiritual body from the natural.

He explains the declaration, that Christ is Lord both of the dead and living, to mean, that he is Lord to those who are dead *to us*. That all are really now (not prospectively) alive to him. Now, just look at the sophistry here. Paul says, in the same connection, Romans xiv, 8: "For whether we live we live unto the Lord, or whether we die *we die unto the Lord*; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." Here we have proof that men *die unto the Lord*. Then comes in the passage in question: "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the *dead* and *living*." It is truly said, that there are no men so blind as those who are determined not to see.

He admits that man cannot think *here* without material organs; or, in other words, without a brain. How, then,

in the name of sense, can he think *hereafter* without a brain — when all his material organs are dead? But he makes quite an effort to manufacture something out of the idea, that thought or mind is an elimination of the brain. Upon this hypothesis, he says the guilt of sin would attach alone to the body. And what if it should? Has not the body suffered for sin since the foundation of the world? And did not our Lord bear our sins in his *body* on the tree? According to my friend, Mr. Connolly, it is all wrong to punish the body at all. The spirit being the man proper and the sinner, ought alone to suffer the penalty of the law. Instead of that it escapes, and the whole weight of punishment falls on the poor body!! It is like visiting upon a man's *house* the penalty due to crimes, instead of visiting them on *him*. It is neither more nor less than punishing the innocent for the guilty.

In his comments on the tenth chapter of Job, he comes to the conclusion that he meant, that if he had died at birth, he would have escaped all the difficulties of this life. He is compelled to give the passage this meaning, to avoid the admission that there was a time when Job did not exist consciously!! According to this logic, *there never was a time when Job did not exist!!* This kind of reasoning would prove the Persian doctrine of the pre-existence of souls. To show that Job meant no such thing, let us hear from him, as to what would have been the consequence of his death. He says, "He would have gone to the *land of darkness* and the *shadow of death*, from whence he would not return, and where the light is as darkness." But he thinks my understanding of this passage of scripture will lead to the conclusion, that after death man will have no existence at all, and that to speak

of the dead would be to speak of nothing. Not exactly. There is some difference, I apprehend, between *existence* and *conscious* existence. There are thousands of things around us, that exist without knowledge or consciousness. But he thinks that it will lead to Dr. Thomas' doctrine of the non-resurrection of infants, and calls on me to say whether I hold this sentiment or not. I answer, no. Dr. Thomas, it is true, does; but I cannot see how it can possibly result from either his or my views of the mortality of man. While on this subject I would remark, that the so called reformation preachers and editors, and Mr. Campbell at their head, have denounced and non-fellowshipped Dr. Thomas for believing in the non-resurrection of infants; and at the same time they court the fellowship of the Calvinists, who believe in the *damnation* of infants. Yes, they would fellowship the man who teaches unconditional election and reprobation, and exclude from their churches a man who teaches a doctrine far less odious and unjust. Mr. Campbell believes that infants are sinners, and cannot be saved without a change of heart; and as that cannot be effected without faith and baptism, therefore, in the next world, they will be placed under a system of moral training to fit them for heaven!! (See his debate with Rice.) The subject of infant salvation has perplexed other men besides Dr. Thomas. His explanation of the words of David, "In the grave who shall give thee thanks," and when man dies his thoughts perish, will not do. In the Hebrew, the word grave is *sheol*; in the Septuagint it is *hades*, the very place where he locates the spirits of men. If his explanation is true, the spirits of all the righteous who are in *hades* are destitute of gratitude — they don't thank God for what he has done for them!! The Psalmist says that the thoughts of a man

perish at death, and that *he himself returneth unto his earth*. The word thoughts is in the Septuagint *dialogismoi*, from the verb *dialogomai*, and is defined by Schrevelius — *reasoning, thoughts, cogitations, considerations, &c.*, but not *designs*, as you have been told. [Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S TENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

As the doctor has occupied the most of his last speech in recapitulation, there is but little in it that has not been fully met, and we are perfectly willing that an impartial public shall judge and decide as to what we have done or not done in sustaining our proposition. There are, however, a few things in his recapitulation which we must notice again, that his emphatic assertions, and his effort to create a fog, may not lead your minds away from the points that have been made.

I have been called on again and again for a text of scripture that says when man dies his spirit remains in a conscious state separate from the body. That this is merely an appeal "*ad captandum vulgas*" must be evident to all present. Does Dr. Field intend to affirm by this that there is nothing taught in the scriptures, and no proposition to be sustained by the Bible, but what is stated in so many words? If he does not, then there is no meaning to this stereotyped demand. If he does so affirm, then he confesses that his own position of death is untrue, for he knows that such a form of words as "profound, unconscious sleep of the dead" is not in all the Bible. And as I have before said, I now repeat, that such

a state is not described or alluded to in the Bible in any form of words. But that is not all. According to his logic, the scriptures do not teach that men will be conscious and intelligent after the resurrection, nor do they teach that the angels of heaven are *conscious* and *intelligent* beings. They do not even teach that God, our creator, the Father of our spirits, is a conscious, intelligent being. For such a form of words is no where used in the Bible with reference to any beings in the universe. And hence, according to this profound logic, we must conclude that there are no beings which possess these attributes! This may do for my friend, or it may answer to fill up his time in the absence of argument. But I am sure, my friends, that you, who are in the habit of reasoning on the holy scriptures, are prepared to detect the fallacy of this demand. For, as you have seen that the scriptures not only teach that the spirit is conscious and intelligent while in the body, but they show that it leaves the body at death, and they present numerous instances where these attributes are possessed by the dead. Hence the spirit is not, as my friend would have us believe, merely an elimination of the body, dependent on organized matter for existence, but an intelligent identity, whether in the body or out of the body. And its separation from the body is neither the cause nor the effect of death, but *death itself*.

He says *soul* and *spirit*, with me, are synonymous. This is all gratuitous. I have stated distinctly that the words are different in their general meanings — that they mean the same thing in a few texts only. But on this assumption he builds an argument that he will be accredited with inventing — evidently his own. He says he has shown that dead *bodies* are called *souls*, and also that dead men are personated by all the personal pronouns in the

English language, THEREFORE, there is no more impropriety in calling dead men spirits than in calling them souls!

Whether we have reconciled his texts, introduced as counter evidence, we will leave those who have heard the discussion, and those who may afterwards read it, to decide for themselves. If, however, he will point out the text on which we have failed, we will try it. He objects to my interpretation of Eccl. ix, because Solomon says the dead know not *any thing*. So he does; but they know not *any thing* about *what*, I ask? The doctor says they know not *any thing* at all, on any subject. Solomon does not so affirm. But my friend says Solomon makes no exception or limitation, to which we answer that the context, and the general tenor of the scriptures, must always limit the meaning of any remark that is found in the Bible. A disregard to this is the great source of error in the interpretation of scripture. To see the force of this, and as an expose of the doctor's remarks on this text, note a remark in the second verse, "As is the good so is the sinner, and he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath." Now, you must perceive, my friends, that this expression is just as unlimited as the remark about the knowledge of the dead; and hence, according to Dr. Field, proves that the good and the sinner are alike in every respect. This, you will say, does violence to the context, and to the general teachings of the Bible with regard to these two classes. That is all true. And it does no greater violence than the doctor's interpretation of his quotation; for his interpretation here cannot be reconciled with the various texts that I have adduced, showing consciousness and knowledge to be possessed by the dead. This the doctor knows, and consequently he has not tried,

and I will confess that I am no prophet, if he can be induced even to make the attempt.

Nor will his view harmonize with the immediate context of his quotation. To see this let us read, beginning at the third verse: "This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they *live*, and *after* that they go to the *dead*." Here it is affirmed with regard to the wicked that they have madness in their heart, not only when they live, but after that they go to the dead. How could this be if there is no consciousness there? But Solomon continues: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is *hope*"—hope of what, let me ask? Hope of remaining intelligent and conscious? "That which a man hath why does he yet hope for?" What more intelligent reply can be given than the one I have submitted—hope of salvation. While there is life there is hope; we are still surrounded with the means of God's favor to man. We should, therefore, improve these opportunities now, for soon we shall be deprived of them; death will surely come and remove us from this world, where there is no offer of life and salvation; where the wicked obey not, or remember not the Lord; where they have no portion in all that is done under the sun; where they shall be forgotten by the living; for the writer continues, "The living know that they must die, but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten, also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished, neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun." Solomon then returns to the righteous, and exhorts them to faithfulness and patience, and urges them to be instant

and earnest in doing whatever may be their duty, as we shall soon die, when there will be no further opportunities of preparing for a future life, or future blessings. "For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." The context, then, limits the meaning of this text to this particular kind of knowledge—the knowledge of salvation, or redemption.

You are all called upon by the doctor to affirm that you know nothing when asleep, but who will so affirm? Will Dr. Field himself? The very affirmation would necessarily refute itself, for it would affirm that he knows something when he knows nothing. But even if he could demonstrate that there is no consciousness in sleep, it would not affect the question, for he has conceded that the term is applied to the dead not because they are unconscious, but because there is a waking or resurrection.

The doctor admits that the declaration to Moses at the bush, quoted by the Saviour in the twentieth of Luke, is not prophetic. That it is a statement of an existing fact, that God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He is not the God of the *dead*, but of the living; therefore, as the Saviour declares, all live unto him. My argument on this text is irresistible; indeed, it is virtually conceded. The truth here declared is utterly irreconcilable with the doctor's interpretation of his own proof texts. Will he show his skill at reconciliation in this department?

My friend is still greatly troubled and perplexed with the lexicons; this, however, is not to be wondered at, as they are so decidedly against him. But how greatly has he changed since Friday morning. You remember with what confidence he called on me to come to *these standard authorities*. He, however, makes quite an effort to show my appeal to the lexicons to be as insincere as his own,

by arraying the definitions of some other words, which he supposes I do not believe. This is all gratuitous; for I repeatedly stated how these authorities are to be regarded. They report the meaning of words as used at the times for which they write. If they report the definitions correctly, we have no right to depart from them. If they have given them incorrectly, their errors can be shown by an appeal to the use of the words in the writings of those who use them. I have called upon the doctor to show that the words of my proposition are not defined by the lexicons in accordance with the use of our language. This he has not dared to do. I also asked him to show that these words do not correctly represent the original words of which they are translations. He has not even *attempted* this, and yet he continues to talk about the authorities. Of this, perhaps, we should not complain, as he must have something to fill up his time.

Our attention is again called to the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians—"This corruptible must put on incorruption," &c. Is it not a little remarkable that the doctor should represent me as saying that the Greek language has but one noun in the neuter gender.

Dr. Field. I did not say so.

Mr. Connelly. What did you say, then?

Dr. Field. I said you asserted that there was no noun but *soma* that would suit here.

Mr. Connelly. So I did, and so I affirm still. But my friend says *pneuma* will suit. Let us try it and see. I stated before that it was neuter gender, but that the context would not allow it to be used here. Let us, then, read the forty-fourth verse: "It is sown a natural *pneuma*, it is raised a spiritual *pneuma*." Is this the reading? No, my friends. This would sound exceedingly harsh and

nonsensical. "It is sown a natural body, (*soma*.) it is raised a spiritual body," (*soma*.) The body, then, and not the spirit, is the point before the apostle's mind. The doctor's effort, then, signally fails.

But his remarks with regard to the neuter gender, that the spirit is not an intelligent identity, because *pneuma* is neuter gender, are superlatively ridiculous. According to this, the Holy Spirit is not an intelligent entity, neither are angels, nor is God himself; for it is distinctly stated that "God is a spirit," (*pneuma*.) John iv, 24. The same word is applied to the angels, Heb. i, xiv. The doctor's effort here will fully explain why he so much dreads an appeal to the Greek.

We will attend to his remarks on Rev. xx, when we hear from him with regard to the rich man and Lazarus, and the Saviour and the thief on the cross.

I will now introduce an argument founded on the law of God, enacted against necromancy, but will first read a few texts in which this is set forth. Deut. xviii, 10, 11, "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer." Also Lev. xviii, 7, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils," &c. "This shall be a statute forever." Also Psalms cvi, 34-38, "They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the Lord commanded them. But were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils. And shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto

the idols of Canaan; and the land was polluted with blood." [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S TENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

Solomon says that "there is nothing new under the sun," but I must confess that I have heard something new this morning; for this is the first time in my life that I ever heard that it could not be proved from scripture, in so many words, or at least words equivalent, that God is a conscious, intelligent being!! For me to spend time in proving such a fact, would be but little less than an insult to your intelligence. Every man who has read the Bible, knows that it abounds with declarations that God "knows all things"—that he is a being of infinite knowledge, wisdom, and power—that he sees, hears, and speaks, and never sleeps, or for one moment pretermits his watchful care over the mighty works of his hands. With this abundant evidence that God is conscious and intelligent, we are gravely told that it cannot be proved!! Nor, says my friend, can it be proved, in so many words, that angels, and the saints, after their resurrection, are conscious and intelligent. What! Beings that have been seen on earth time and again—ministering to men in all ages—bearing messages from heaven to earth—and employed in executing the judgments of God against wicked nations and individuals—cannot be proven to be conscious and intelligent? Pshaw!

But forsooth, I cannot prove, in so many words, that the dead are in a profound unconscious sleep; nor have

I said that I can. But have I not proved, in so many words, that they "know not any thing"—that they have no knowledge nor wisdom in *hades*—that the dead praise not the Lord—that in *hades* they are dead, and render no homage or thanksgiving to God? Have I not proved that the *passions* of the dead are perished—that they are *asleep*? Now let my friend, Mr. Connelly, prove in words equally as clear and decisive, that the spirit of man after death *has* knowledge—that its love, envy, and hatred, have *not* perished—that the dead *do* praise the Lord, and we will not dispute about the exact form of the words. All that is necessary is to produce the statements in language of the same import.

He wants to know if I take the ground, that no proposition can be sustained by the Bible, unless affirmed in so many words. No, I do not. But I take the ground, that the proposition *itself* must be affirmed; and no matter in what words it is couched, the declarations, words, and phrases of scripture adduced in its support, must be equivalent in their meaning to the words of the proposition. Any other position than this, gives rise to all the conflicting doctrines and practices which now divide and sub-divide the Christian world. This is the ground once occupied by the church to which my friend belongs, and on this they rested the hope of bringing about a union of all sects on the Bible alone. But they have left it; and it is now their practice to *infer* doctrines like the sects; hence, the contentions and divisions now occurring among them.

For the purpose of showing that Solomon did not mean what he said, when he stated that "*the dead know not any thing*," he quotes a part of the second verse of the same chapter as follows: "As is the good so is the sinner, and

he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath." This he thinks a parallel expression, which must be understood in a restricted sense. Had he quoted the whole verse, it would have refuted this assertion. Solomon is speaking of "one event, (death,) which happens to all, to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath." Eccl. ix, 2. This passage affords him no aid whatever. In the matter of death of which Solomon speaks, there is no exception in favor of the good. The little sophism my friend erected on a part of this verse, is too transparent to deceive any one familiar with the Bible.

His comments on the third verse are equally as sophistical. He tries to make Solomon say, that madness is in the heart of men after they die. If this had been his meaning, the passage would have read thus: "Yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their hearts while they live, and also after they go to the dead." And besides, he would have taken care not to contradict himself by saying, in the next breath, that when a man dies his love, envy, and *hatred* perish. It is plain to be seen, that whatever of the evil passion of madness exists in a man's heart in his life-time, it ends at death, according to Solomon. The stress with my friend is on the word *that*, which evidently has "*while they live*" for its antecedent. If his interpretation be correct, the word *that* is wholly superfluous, as I have shown. If such logic as he has given us on this ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes is satisfactory to you, my friends, I must acknowledge that you are very easily pleased.

It is the duty of a debater to state the issues between

himself and his opponent fairly and intelligibly. I feel conscientious in saying that this has been my course during this discussion. But I regret to say, that I have observed a proneness in my friend, Mr. Connelly, to misrepresent, unintentionally no doubt, the issues and points in debate. For example: He says I have conceded that the term sleep is applied to the dead, not because they are unconscious, but because there will be a waking or a resurrection. I deny that I ever conceded, directly or indirectly, by implication or otherwise, that the dead are conscious. On the contrary, I have said that *natural sleep* is the best trope that could be selected to represent the quiescence and unconsciousness of the dead. The similitude, it is true, is not in every particular perfect, but as far as unconsciousness is concerned, the point of resemblance is appropriate; for in perfect and profound sleep a man is as unconscious, for the time being, as if he were dead.

Again: He misrepresents the issue in regard to God's declaration to Moses at the bush. I admitted that it was not prophetic; but see how ingeniously he has managed to make a little capital out of this admission. He has coupled the declarations of our Saviour to the Sadducees with what God said to Moses, so as to make it appear that all that the Saviour said to the Sadducees was said to Moses! What God said to Moses, I admit, was not prophetic; but what did he say? Simply, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." See Ex. iii, 6. Not a word here about the dead being raised, and that he was not the God of the dead but of the living. This was spoken by the Lord in his conversation with the Sadducees, by way of proving the necessity and certainty of a resurrection, as I

have already explained. These words of Christ's are prophetic in their character and meaning; and I see not how any one can doubt it, when the fact is considered, that he is declared to be the Lord both of the living and the dead. My friend may quibble about a contradiction here, but there is none, if we give the prophetic meaning to what he says in the twentieth chapter of Luke, which the context and the analogy of scripture require.

He represents me as having called on him with great confidence, in the commencement of the debate, to come to the dictionaries as standard authorities. In this he is certainly mistaken. I made no such demand on him, and expressed no great confidence in lexicographers, so far as the definition of theological terms is concerned. All this, however, has been fully explained, and needs no farther notice. I do not see that we differ in regard to the credit due to lexicographers, if his last speech expresses his views on that subject. He says he has called on me to show, that the lexicons do not define the words of his proposition, according to the use of our language. No doubt they do; but not according to the Bible use of these words two or three thousand years ago.

He says I represent him as saying that the Greek language has but *one noun in the neuter gender!* My friend must certainly have been asleep or unconscious when I made my last speech.

He says I stated that *pnecuma* would suit the adjective in 1 Cor. xv, 53. I did, so far as its gender was concerned. But I did not say that it was as suitable as *soma*, or some other nouns of the same gender. He says he stated before, that it was neuter gender. It is singular that such-a statement has escaped my notice, and still more strange that he would make it, when he has hitherto

himself and his opponent fairly and intelligibly. I feel conscientious in saying that this has been my course during this discussion. But I regret to say, that I have observed a proneness, in my friend, Mr. Connelly, to misrepresent, unintentionally no doubt, the issues and points in debate. For example: He says I have conceded that the term sleep is applied to the dead, not because they are unconscious, but because there will be a waking or a resurrection. I deny that I ever conceded, directly or indirectly, by implication or otherwise, that the dead are conscious. On the contrary, I have said that *natural sleep* is the best trope that could be selected to represent the quiescence and unconsciousness of the dead. The similitude, it is true, is not in every particular perfect, but as far as unconsciousness is concerned, the point of resemblance is appropriate; for in perfect and profound sleep a man is as unconscious, for the time being, as if he were dead.

Again: He misrepresents the issue in regard to God's declaration to Moses at the bush. I admitted that it was not prophetic; but see how ingeniously he has managed to make a little capital out of this admission. He has coupled the declarations of our Saviour to the Sadducees with what God said to Moses, so as to make it appear that all that the Saviour said to the Sadducees was said to Moses! What God said to Moses, I admit, was not prophetic; but what did he say? Simply, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." See Ex. iii, 6. Not a word here about the dead being raised, and that he was not the God of the dead but of the living. This was spoken by the Lord in his conversation with the Sadducees, by way of proving the necessity and certainty of a resurrection, as I

have already explained. These words of Christ's are prophetic in their character and meaning; and I see not how any one can doubt it, when the fact is considered, that he is declared to be the Lord both of the living and the dead. My friend may quibble about a contradiction here, but there is none, if we give the prophetic meaning to what he says in the twentieth chapter of Luke, which the context and the analogy of scripture require.

He represents me as having called on him with great confidence, in the commencement of the debate, to come to the dictionaries as standard authorities. In this he is certainly mistaken. I made no such demand on him, and expressed no great confidence in lexicographers, so far as the definition of theological terms is concerned. All this, however, has been fully explained, and needs no farther notice. I do not see that we differ in regard to the credit due to lexicographers, if his last speech expresses his views on that subject. He says he has called on me to show, that the lexicons do not define the words of his proposition, according to the use of our language. No doubt they do; but not according to the Bible use of these words two or three thousand years ago.

He says I represent him as saying that the Greek language has but *one noun in the neuter gender!* My friend must certainly have been asleep or unconscious when I made my last speech.

He says I stated that *pnucma* would suit the adjective in 1 Cor. xv, 53. I did, so far as its gender was concerned. But I did not say that it was as suitable as *soma*, or some other nouns of the same gender. He says he stated before, that it was neuter gender. It is singular that such a statement has escaped my notice, and still more strange that he would make it, when he has hitherto

contended that the spirit is the man proper—a living and intelligent personality. Now, however, since I have proved that it is a noun in the neuter gender, and thereby subverted his doctrine based on it, he very candidly, and with an air of surprise, tells us that it is even so! And by way of covering his retreat, he tells you that angels are called spirits or *pneumata*, and that God is a Spirit, and refers us to scripture to prove it! Now just notice the fallacy here. Nobody denies that God is a spirit, and that angels are also; but I deny that they are in the neuter gender. In the text to which he refers us—John iv, 24—where God is said to be a spirit, the sign of the masculine gender is used. Come, my friend, deal fairly in stating the points in dispute.

To relieve my friend of suspense, I will devote the remainder of my time to the promise made to the thief on the cross, and the rich man and Lazarus. There are several facts to be considered in connection with the promise made to the thief. *First*,—There are only two places where paradise is located—the third heaven and the new earth—see 2 Cor. xii, 2-4, Rev. ii, 7, and xxii, 14. To neither of these did the thief go the day on which he died. My friend has admitted that no one ascends to the third heaven or to the personal presence of Christ at death, and no one will contend that paradise was then, or is now, restored. *Second*,—Our Lord did not, himself, on the day of his death, ascend to heaven, or to paradise, as designated by Paul. *Third*,—the prayer of the thief was, that he might be remembered when the Lord came into his kingdom. The Lord did not, that day, come in or into his kingdom, my friend himself being judge; for he teaches, or at least his ministerial brethren do, that the kingdom did not come until the day of Pentecost, some

fifty days after the Saviour's death. And during the time he was dead they teach that his soul was in *hades*, where it remained until his resurrection. Under no circumstances, then, can it be shown that he entered his kingdom on the day of his death.

How, then, is this promise to be explained so as to harmonize with these facts. Before I give you my understanding of this promise, I would remark, that when the New Testament was written, it was not punctuated as it is now. The whole was one compact mass of words, without intervening spaces, commas, semi-colons, or periods. Its division into chapters and verses, and its punctuation, are the works of uninspired men, who, in this matter, were governed by their own taste, and the judgment of its sense. We all know that pointing a composition of any kind may very materially modify its meaning. In order to convey the meaning of the writer, the sentences should be properly divided. Misplacing even a comma may do the writer great injustice. Bearing this in mind, allow me, my friends, to premise another fact, and that is, that the word translated "To-day" is *semeron*, which has several meanings, namely, *to-day*, *this day*, *now*, *at present*. The word might have been translated by the word *now*, or *at present*, with as much or more propriety than by the word *to-day*.

The words of the Saviour, in reply to the thief, as they stand translated and punctuated in our common version, are as follows: "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." According to this arrangement of the two sentences, the idea is conveyed that the thief went with the Saviour that day to paradise, which I have shown was impossible. Let us now read it with the comma correctly placed, and you will see how easily the

difficulties I have named are obviated, — “Verily I say unto you this day, (or now—at present) thou shalt be with me in paradise.” This reading makes the matter plain, and if I mistake not, the celebrated scholar and critic, Griesbach, thus punctuates the passage. When, therefore, the Saviour comes in his kingdom, and paradise is restored, the thief will be with him.

With regard to the case of the rich man and Lazarus, we both agree that it is a parable, but differ about what it represents. I have shown that my friend’s construction of it will contradict flatly and positively many passages of scriptures, supersede the necessity of a resurrection, and a day of general judgment. In *hades*, where the parable places the rich man, there is no *knowledge* nor *device*. This, however, my friend says, means that there is no knowledge of *salvation* there. But it seems this man did know something of salvation, for he desired Lazarus to be sent to his five brethren with a warning. Here is a *device*. My friend says the dead carry their madness to *hades*; but this man is not under the influence of that passion. In *hades* they are *dead*, but this man is alive. All the difficulties growing out of the popular interpretation of this parable are removed by explaining it as do several distinguished and learned men, holding his views of the state of the dead. Among these I will mention Theophylact, Lightfoot, Adam Clarke, Dr. Gill, James Bate, M. A., rector of Delford, and some others.

Theophylact says, “But this parable can also be explained in the way of allegory; so that we may say by the rich man is signified the Jewish people; for they were formerly rich, abounding in all divine knowledge, wisdom, and instruction, which are more excellent than gold and precious stones. And they were arrayed in purple and

fine linen; as they possessed a kingdom and a priesthood, and were themselves a royal priesthood to God. The purple denoted their kingdom, and the fine linen their priesthood; for the Levites were clothed in sacerdotal vestments of fine linen, and they fed sumptuously, and lived splendidly, every day. Daily did they offer their morning and evening sacrifice, which they also called the continual sacrifice. But Lazarus was the Gentile people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gates; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, we read that it was alleged against Paul, that he had introduced Gentiles into the temple, and made that holy place common or unclean. Moreover, these people were full of the fetid sores of sin, on which the impudent dogs, or devils, fed, who delight themselves in our sores. The Gentiles likewise desired even the crumbs which fell from the tables of the rich; for they were wholly destitute of the bread which strengthens the heart of man, and wanted even the smallest morsel of food; so that the Canaanite woman, (Mat. xv, 27) when she was a heathen, desired to be fed with the crumbs. In short, the Hebrews were dead unto God, and their bones, which could not be moved to do good, were perished. Lazarus also (I mean the Gentile people,) was dead in sin, and the envious Jews, who were dead in sins, did actually burn in a flame of jealousy, as saith the apostle, on account of the Gentiles being received into the faith, and because that those who had before been a poor and despised Gentile race, were now in the bosom of Abraham, the father of nations, and justly, indeed, were they thus received.”

James Bate, M. A., rector of Delford, says: “We will

suppose, then, the *the rich man who fared so sumptuously* to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. *The poor beggar who lay at his gate*, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge. *The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table*, and which the beggar was so *desirous of picking up*, were such fragments of patriarchal and Jewish traditions, as their traveling philosophers were able to pick up with their utmost care and diligence. And those philosophers were also the *dogs that licked the sores of heathendom*, and endeavored to supply the wants of divine revelation by such schemes and hypotheses, concerning the nature of the gods, and the obligation of moral duties, as (due allowance for their ignorance and frailties) did no small honor to human nature, and yet thereby plainly showed, how little a way unassisted reason could go, without some supernatural help, as one of the wisest of them confessed. About one and the same time, *the beggar dies, and is carried by the angels* (i. e., God's spiritual messengers to mankind,) *into Abraham's bosom*; that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. *And the rich man also dies and is buried*. He dies what we call a political death. His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar son of God. The people whom he parabolically represents, are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime; and which mark may, perhaps, be their adherence to the law. Whereby it came amazingly to pass, that these people, though dispersed, yet still dwell alone and separate, *not being reckoned among the nations*, as Balaam

foretold. The rich man being reduced to this state of misery, complains bitterly of his hard fate, but is told by Abraham that he slipped his opportunity, while Lazarus laid hold on his, and now receives the comfort of it. The Jew complains of the want of more evidence, to convince his countrymen, the five brethren, and would fain have Lazarus sent from the dead to convert them. But Abraham tells him, *that if their own scriptures cannot convince them of their error, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead*. And exactly so it proved in the event. For this parable was delivered towards the end of the third year of our Lord's ministry, and in the fourth, or following year of it, the words put into the mouth of Abraham, as the conclusion of the parable, are most literally verified by our Lord's raising another Lazarus from the dead. And we may presume that the beggar had the fictitious name of Lazarus given him in the parable, not without some reason, since the supposed request of the rich man was fully answered by our Lord's raising another, and a real Lazarus, from the dead. But what was the consequence? Did this *notorious* miracle convince the rich man's brethren? No, truly. His visit to them from the dead was so far from convincing them, that they actually *consulted together, that they might put Lazarus also to death; because that, by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus*. So much for the true sense of this parable."

Dr. Lightfoot, in his exposition of this parable, says: "Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the 'rich glutton' stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity,

indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can take out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one, too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it.

"The main scope and design of it seems this — to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them — nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evinceth what it aimed at: *If they hear not Moses and the prophets,*" &c. — *Heb. and Talm. Exerc. in Luke xvi, 19.*

WHITBY. "That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: 1. Because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sherringham, in the preface to his *Joma*. 2. From the circumstances of it, viz., the rich man's *lifting up his eyes in hell, and seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom*, his discourse with Abraham, his complaint of being *tormented with flames*, and that Lazarus might be sent to *cool his tongue*; and if all this be confessedly *parable*, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the *Gemara*, be accounted history?" *Annot. in loc.*

WAKEFIELD, ver. 23, "*In the grave; en to hade*: and, conformably to this representation, he is spoken of as having a *body*, ver. 24. It must be remembered, that *hades* nowhere means *hell* — *gehenna* — in any author whatsoever, *sacred or profane*; and also, that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, (Matt. xii, 34,) and not a piece of *real history*. To them who regard the narration

as a *reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the *papists*. The universal meaning of *hades* is *the state of death*; because the term *sepulchrum* or *grave*, is not strictly applicable to such as have been consumed by *fire*, &c. See ver. 30." *Note in loc.*

Dr. ADAM CLARKE remarks on Matt. v, 26 — "Let it be remembered, that by the general consent of all, (except the basely interested,) no *metaphor* is ever to be *produced* in proof of a doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most *pointed and express evidence* on which to establish the faith of our souls."

Bishop LOWTH says — "Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of *fictional* or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

Dr. GILL makes a two-fold application, and supposes it may apply to the torment of wicked Jews after death, or to calamities that were to come upon them in this world. He says:

"*The rich man died*: It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship, and of the whole ceremonial law: a *Loammi* was written upon their church state, and the covenant between God and them was broken; the gospel was removed from them, which was as death, as the return of it, and their call by it, will be as life from the dead; as well as their place and nation, their civil power and authority, were taken away from them by the Romans, and a death of afflictions, by captivity and calamities of every kind, have attended them ever since.

"*In hell* — *in torments*: This may regard the vengeance

of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land, and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains; and the whole land became brimstone, salt, and burning; and they were rooted out of it in anger, wrath, and great indignation."

Here you have, my friends, an array of talent, learning, and piety favorable to the view I take of this parable, which all will agree, is entitled to respect and consideration. And when it is known that none of these commentators held my views of the intermediate state, but the contrary, and ranked high in the so-called evangelical and orthodox sects of the times and countries in which they lived, it is a strong presumption of the fact, that the parable cannot be interpreted as my friend, Mr. C., supposes, without contradicting other portions of scripture.

[Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

When I took my seat, I was about introducing an argument founded on the laws of God, against necromancy, or consulting the dead. I have already presented a number of texts, in which the consulting of the dead is forbidden. I will then state my argument thus: God has enacted laws against consulting the dead. He does not enact laws against non-entities; therefore, the dead were consulted in those days. This could not have been done, if man is all body, or if the dead have no knowledge

at all; or if they are unconscious. Hence God has recognized the existence of separate conscious spirits. For these laws have their foundation in the fact that they exist, and may be, or have been consulted, unless we can believe that God would enact laws, accompanied by the most awful sanctions, against that which neither has, or can have, an existence. Before we leave this point, we will call your attention to another text, which presents this matter in a very clear light, and also shows that what are called in scripture familiar spirits, are spirits of the dead. "And when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the *living* to the *dead*?" Isaiah viii, 19. This scripture needs no comment, as it clearly shows the existence of that custom against which the laws of God were enacted.

We will now notice some things in the last speech of my friend. He says that it is the duty of a debater to state the issues between himself and his opponent fairly and intelligibly. And he compliments himself for his fairness and candor throughout this discussion. It would, perhaps, have been as well if he had left that to those who have listened to him. But he complains of me for misrepresenting the points at issue. Whether his complaint is just or not, I will leave to the judgment of those who have heard us, and to those who may afterwards read the debate. But what are his specifications. First, by stating that he said sleep is applied to the dead, because there is a waking or resurrection, and concluding, therefore, that it is not because they are unconscious, from his own showing. Now, I appeal to you, my friends, one and all, to say for yourselves whether Dr. Field did not so

state when he first introduced the term from the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians. I am not mistaken in this matter, as a reference to the notes of the reporter will show, and as will be seen when the debate is published. I noted it at the time, and made some remarks about it in another speech. Of course the doctor has a right to back off from any thing that he has said, or give up any position he has taken. And would it not have accorded as well with his episode — his self-compliment for candor and fairness, to have just said he was mistaken in that statement; that he had not perceived that it refuted a large number of his proof-texts, and thus taken it back? For with that statement before us you must perceive that my conclusion is just. If sleep is applied to the dead because there is a waking, it is surely not for something else. But will the doctor permit us to ask him again, how it is known that there is no knowledge in sleep? No. It is too self-evident with *him* to admit of proof? Well, then, consciousness is the power of knowing one's thoughts; will he, then, affirm that in sleep there is no power of knowing? We will see.

Second. He says I have managed his admission that God's declaration to Moses is not prophetic, so ingeniously, as to make it appear that all the Saviour said to the Sadducees was said by Moses. It may have so appeared to him, for any thing I know; but I am sure it did not so appear to this intelligent audience. I did, however, make it appear very plainly, I think, that the Saviour's statement, that God is not the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*, is an existing truth, as literally true then as it ever will be. But the doctor says this is all prophetic, both in character and meaning. But he saw plainly that this position contradicted most pointedly what God had said

to Moses; and attempts to obscure it, by attaching to it in advance the epithet *quibble*. A beautiful illustration of that candor and fairness of which he boasts. The contradiction here is too glaring to be obscured by this epithet. Look at it, my friends. "God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," who were dead — dead to men — for they had gone out of this world. *This is an existing truth*. And yet he is their God only in prospect — prophetically. For the statement of the Saviour, that he is not the God of the dead, but of the living, the doctor says, is prophetic in its character and meaning. The dead, then, have no God yet — they have one only in prospect!

As my friend, Dr. Field, has cited no evidence of his boasted fairness in stating the points and issues in debate, but his own conscience, we will give a few specifications from his last speech. You remember that he has repeatedly called on me for an express "thus saith the Lord" that the dead are conscious; insisting that where the words are not found the ideas are not to be expected; and that this was the boasted position of my brethren. To show that this was all *ad captandum cant*, I stated that, *according to this demand*, it could not be proved that the saints are conscious after the resurrection; nor could it be proved, in so many words, that the Holy Spirit, angels, or God himself, are conscious, intelligent beings. At this he greatly wonders, and represents me as saying that it could not be proved *at all*, not even by *equivalent* words, that God and angels are intelligent beings! How could he have mistaken what I said? But he has admitted here all I wish to draw out of him by these remarks; that a proposition may be proved by equivalent words; that beings may be proved to be conscious and intelligent by being represented as acting and speaking. And

you must judge of my success in thus proving my proposition.

He says that the declarations, words, and phrases of scripture adduced in support of a proposition, no matter in what words it is couched, must be equivalent in meaning to the words of the proposition, was once the position of the church of which I am a member. So it *was*; and so it *is still*. If it will be of any benefit to my friend, I will inform him that we have not departed from our original ground on this subject, his declaration to the contrary notwithstanding.

Again. He had stated, as you remember, that the statement of Solomon, that the dead know not *any thing*, was without limitation, and consequently could not mean any knowledge of the means of salvation to the dead, as is my position on this text. To show that every expression in the scriptures must be subject to the context, and limited by it, I cited the remark in the second verse, "as is the good so is the sinner," which is as unlimited as the other, and hence, according to his statement, there would be no difference between these characters in any respect. But he represents me as introducing this to show that Solomon did not mean what he said, when he stated that the dead know not *any thing*! How *fair*, how *candid* this is. But he says if I had read all the verse, it would have explained what was meant. The necessity of consulting the context was the very thing I was trying to show, as you all understood.

He says I try to make Solomon say that madness is in the heart of men after they die. There is no effort needed on my part to aid Solomon, for he declares the fact most emphatically, and that, too, without the doctor's emendation of his language, or without any contradiction, by

stating that their love, envy, and hatred are perished, when these words are taken in their connection. Solomon closes the preceding verse by saying, that "the memory of them is forgotten;" and then continues, "also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." That is, as the context shows, no longer remembered by the living, and not as the doctor would have us believe, that these passions have no existence. They have gone from the world — they have no longer any portion forever in any thing under the sun. There is no remembrance either of themselves or of their manifestations of love, envy, or hatred, although, as before stated, these passions continue with them, at least it is said madness is in them.

We lay no particular stress on the word *that*, in this text. Indeed, the sense would be fully as clear if *that* was not used at all. But we need only look at the doctor's position on this word to see the vagueness of his conceptions of language, and his confusion at seeing his whole scheme of interpretation on this text — his main pillar — so completely thwarted.

He says *that* has the phrase *while they live* for its antecedent! Well, let us see how that will do. Every word relating to an antecedent must mean all that the antecedent means; and the antecedent may be substituted for it, and the sense be preserved. Now, test the doctor's position by these principles, and the sentence would read thus: Madness is in their heart while they live, and after while they live they go to the dead. This, as you perceive, would make utter nonsense of the whole text.

He was greatly surprised that I understood his position on chap. xv, 1 Corinthians, as representing me as holding that there was but one noun in the Greek language in the neuter gender. But if there is any other point in what

he says about the noun to be supplied, I confess I cannot see it. I had not stated that there was no other noun that would agree in gender with the adjective. But that no other noun but *soma* could be supplied, showing that some would not do without violating the plainest rules of the language, and that others violated the context. And did not suppose that any one could be so stupid as to think the point here was simply a question of gender. But in this, it seems, I was mistaken, for the doctor says, he only stated that *pneuma* would suit the adjective in gender. But note here, another proof of that fairness of which *he* is so conscious, and of which *I* am so destitute! He quoted this text to prove that the spirit is corruptible. Assuming the meaning to be, this corruptible spirit must put on incorruption. But when I showed the fallacy of this, then he only said *pneuma* would suit the adjective in gender.

He thinks it strange, that he has no note of, or does not remember my statement that *pneuma* is of the neuter gender. His memory seems to be bad. But it is stranger still, he thinks, that I should admit it, as in his estimation it subverts the doctrine of my proposition! But how does that fact affect my proposition. Spirits cannot be intelligent, he thinks, because the term applied to them is neuter gender. That is because there is no distinction of sex among spirits, they cannot, therefore, be conscious or intelligent!! But I have before shown that God is said to be a spirit: and angels are spirits, and hence, according to the doctor, they are neither conscious or intelligent. But he says, he admits that they are spirits, but denies they are in the neuter gender! With him then *pneuma* is sometimes in the neuter gender, and sometimes in the masculine, for he says in John iv, 24, the sign is of the

masculine, where God is said to be a spirit! He that would make such a statement *should* blush to claim to be a scholar. For such an assertion from a scholar is ridiculous beyond description.

Will Dr. Field tell us what the sign of the neuter gender in Greek is, when there is no article before the noun? The truth is, my friends, that the word *pneuma* is always in the neuter gender, whether applied to God, his spirit, angels, or the spirits of men, so that, there is no escape from the absurdity into which the doctor's objection unavoidably leads him.

He has given a long dissertation on the promise of the Saviour to the thief, and an imposing array of facts; some of which we will notice. He says, there is only two places where Paradise is located. The third heaven and the new earth. But he gives us no evidence that this is a fact. It is true, he gives two instances where the word occurs, as he thinks, in two different meanings. But let this be true or not, it certainly cannot prove that this word has no other meaning. This word originally means a park or garden, and is applied in the Bible to various places of delight. By the LXX it is applied to the garden of Eden. In the New Testament it occurs but three times, I believe, and in each occurrence in a different sense. In the passage before us it is used with reference to the state of the righteous in *hades*, and consequently his second fact has no force in it. His third fact assumes that the Saviour proposed to the thief the precise form of his request, of which there is no evidence. Fourth, the punctuation of the Bible is the work of uninspired men, this is true, and consequently it is not infallible. But there are certain principles founded in the structure and the meaning of the language which should

guide us in this respect. That the doctor in his rendering has disregarded this, will be evident by noting this fact, the word to-day (*semera*) is an adverb and must either qualify the verb say, or shall be; now the question is, which of these words is qualified by it, and to determine this we must determine which have need to be qualified — which would be obscure without it. The doctor's rendering makes it qualify I say; now I would ask, could there be any doubt as to the time he spoke, that made it necessary to use a qualifying word to explain it, certainly not. But if he had said, "Thou shalt be with me in Paradise," the time would have been obscure, hence, it is necessary to punctuate the text as it is in the Bible, that the qualifying word may qualify that which would be otherwise obscure. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

BRETHERN AND FRIENDS :

We are told that God has recognized the existence of the spirits of the dead, their consciousness and intelligence by enacting laws against necromancy or consulting the dead. My friend says, that the familiar spirits of the Old Testament, were the spirits of the dead. If penal laws against necromancy prove that the dead have knowledge and can communicate information to the living, the laws enacted against the worship of Moloch, Baal, and other gods of the heathen world, equally prove that there were such beings in existence, capable of rendering assistance to their worshippers. Whereas it is declared that they are imaginary beings, who can neither see nor hear. The address of Elijah to the prophets of Baal, demonstrably

proves that there was no such a being in existence. Necromancy was a deception, a fraud, upon the living, whose credulity might be imposed on by a class of people who made their living by trickery. Is it at all strange, my friends, that God should enact laws to suppress frauds? Have not all civilized nations recognized the justice and necessity of such laws? Has not God forbidden image and idol worship, and yet these dumb idols are nothing?

That there is an order of beings in existence, called devils or demons, no one will deny, but it will be time enough to speak of them when it is proven that they are disembodied human spirits.

We have, in the argument built on the laws against necromancy, an indorsement of the doctrine of Emanuel Swedenborg on that subject; if I am not greatly mistaken, before the discussion ends, my friend will, for consistency sake, have to admit the necromancy of our day, known as the "spirit rappings."

I repeat the statement, that I said nothing in my remarks on the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians to authorize the conclusion that the dead are conscious. I know what I said, and have not the most distant idea of retracting it. I said that from the first death there is to be awaking up or a resurrection, and here it was tropically represented by sleep, which is a state of unconsciousness, and in this point of view it more aptly illustrates death than any other figure that could be selected. But my friend insists upon it, that we are conscious in sleep, because we are alive and have the power to resume our thoughts! But my friends, this is all fallacious. What signifies the *power* of knowing our thoughts, when we *have* no thoughts, and cannot exercise

the power? Have you not often slept so soundly that a thief might enter your room, and rifle your drawers and pockets without your knowing it? In that case, of what avail is the *power* when it is dormant and inactive? Let me ask you, my friends, if you have never seen *live* men totally unconscious for many days? In some diseases I have witnessed a total suspension of all intellection, and the patient could no more be roused or made to understand, than if he were dead.

How often have men been rescued from water in a drowning condition — in a state of suspended animation, and when restored to their senses, they have attested the truth of my position. If, then, a *live* man can be insensible and unconscious, how in the name of reason and common sense can a *dead* man be as knowing and intelligent as though he were alive and in perfect health? If the dead know no more than a man in a profound and complete sleep, it is quite certain my friend will make nothing out of his cavils about the use of the trope in question.

But I am asked, if sleep is applied to the dead because they will wake, how can it be for something else? Why not? May there not be other points of resemblance? Such as unconsciousness, resting, ceasing to think, &c. ? Again he inquires, how I know, that in sleep I know nothing? This is truly an abstruse question, more so, than some of the problems of Euclid. It may be answered by asking another. How does my friend know when he is asleep? By what rule does he decide this question? Perhaps his answer will be mine. After his fashion of reasoning, he deduces the conclusion, from what I said about the prophetic declaration of the Saviour, that the dead have no God, as yet, they have one only in

prospect! Have I not stated repeatedly that they HAVE a God? *That Jesus Christ is Lord, both of the dead and living.* See Rom. xiv, 7-9. And that he will judge the living and dead at his appearing and kingdom. 2 Tim. iv, 1. Furthermore, I stated explicitly in my comments on Luke xx, that the *dead are raised*, was prophetic. How much plainer does he wish me to make it.

He claims that I have made an important admission in his favor, namely, that a proposition may be proved from the Bible by words and phrases equivalent to those in which it is couched. How can this admission help him? What would be words equivalent to those of his proposition? He set out to prove that after death the human spirit continues conscious until the resurrection. Now, equivalent words would be such as these: when a man dies, his never-dying spirit leaves his body, and still lives, in the full possession of knowledge and intelligence, until the body is restored to life. Has he produced such words as these? No, verily — but passages of a symbolic and parabolic import, isolated expressions, and narrations irrelevant to the question, or of doubtful import, which, if construed as he supposes, would flatly contradict many of the plainest statements of the Bible. His proposition *itself* contradicts the Bible.

What has he made, my friends, by his criticism of my remarks on the pronoun *that* and its antecedent. Nothing, on his own showing. The antecedent in this case is the *subject*, the *sense*, and not necessarily the words. Now, let us try it. "Madness is in their hearts while they live, and after they have lived with this madness in their hearts, they go to the dead. Is there any thing nonsensical in this? But I presume that, on this point, as on some others, he is resolved to have the last word.

My friend, Mr. Connelly, professes, I suppose, to be a critic in the Greek language, and he thinks I ought to blush for my remarks on the signs of the genders. For the life of me, I cannot apprehend the precise point he makes on the question of gender. He has evidently got into deep water by dabbling in the Greek, and he seems to be quite impatient because he cannot get out with the ease he expected. Now, my friends, I do not profess to be very erudite, but I think, however, that I will be able to confound him with his own learning — remembering the caution of the great American philosopher —

“Large boats may venture more,
But little boats must keep near shore.”

What does he mean by saying that I ought to blush for making the assertion, that in John iv, 24, where God is said to be a spirit, the sign of the masculine is used? Will he say that God, in this passage, is in the neuter gender? Will he? *Pneuma ho Theos*. Is God in the neuter gender in this expression? But he asks me to say what the sign of the neuter gender in Greek is, when there is no article before the noun. Well, as it is important that he should know, I reply first, by the adjective which qualifies it, and second, by its termination, or the rules of its declension.

I never affirmed, my friends, that *all* spirits are in the neuter gender. No such thing. My assertion was limited to *human* spirits. The dispute here is not about the gender of angels, the Holy Spirit, and God, but *the spirit of man*. This point has been overlooked, and some how or another, obscured. I showed that the spirit of man, which he has all along contended was the man proper, is a noun in the neuter gender, and that it is not an intelligent

rational, living entity, independent of the body. This he has not denied. Here he was fairly caught in the meshes of his own Greek net and vanquished. But in order to extricate himself, he tries to divert your attention from the true issue by contending *that God and angels are spirits!* And he would make you believe that my logic would place them in the neuter gender also!

There is much in my friend's last speech, the force of which I cannot perceive. I cannot answer declamation. He must make definite and distinct points, if he wishes me to respond to what he says.

He says that I have given no evidence that paradise is located in but two places — the third heaven and the new earth. Have I not? Did I not prove it demonstrably by two quotations, and the only two in the New Testament which speak of its locality? But he says that the word originally meant a garden, or park, and is applied in the Bible to various places of delight. Will he be so good as to inform us to which of these places of delight the thief went — for, according to the Old Testament they were all on this earth. But he assumes, without the least shadow of evidence, whatever, that in the twenty-third of Luke it is used with reference to the state of the righteous in *hades*. This he must prove by better testimony than his naked assertion.

There is another point in this connection which I will notice. He assumes that the adverb to-day (*scieron*) refers to the time when the thief would go to paradise, and not to the time when the Lord made the promise to him. This is the question. I have given several incontrovertible reasons why he did not and could not go to paradise the day on which he died. Has he answered them? He has not. Now, we all know that this form of

speech is not unusual even in our day. "I say to you now" — I say to you at this time, or to-day. At the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, this idiom was peculiarly appropriate. It was the day of his humiliation, when about to die in the hands of his enemies, under the odium of public opinion. No one looking at the circumstances in which he was placed, could reasonably hope to be heard and comforted by him then. But even in this trying hour he heard the prayer and made a promise to the penitent thief. In view of these facts, I regard this form of speech as fully warranted by the occasion.

Having noticed every thing in my friend's last speech worthy of attention, I will now introduce other texts of scripture subversive of his doctrine. Isaiah, speaking of the resurrection of the righteous, says, "Awake and sing ye that *dwell in dust*, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the *earth shall cast out her dead*," ch. xxvi, 19. Here the dead are said to be in the dust of the earth, from whence they are to be called up in the resurrection. Not a word about their being in heaven, or in a spirit land. Again, Dan. xii, 2, "And many that *sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The same fact is here distinctly asserted. They are not only represented as being asleep, but we are told *where* they sleep. Our Lord speaks of the dead, as being in their graves, where they will hear his voice, and come forth. He never once intimates that they are any where else. Not a syllable about their being in a place somewhere in the centre of the earth, or midway between earth and heaven.

There is another fact corroborative of my position in regard to the dead, which I will here mention. God sent a message to Hezekiah, that he must set his house in

order, for he should die, and not live. He was a righteous man, and as well prepared to die as any man at that age of the world, but he wept sore, and prayed to God to spare his life. God granted his prayer, and added to his life fifteen years. On the reception of this news, he gave utterance to the following expressions of gratitude and joy: "Behold, for peace I had great bitterness; but thou hast, in love to my *soul, delivered it from the pit of corruption*. For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day." Isaiah xxxviii, 17-19. It will require more ingenuity than my friend can bring to his aid to evade the force of this language. There is no avoiding the conclusion, that this king expected at death to go to the grave, and no where else. The idea of his soul still living and praising God, was out of the question. Had he entertained the modern views of the immortality of the soul, and that death would translate him to paradise, instead of weeping, he would have rejoiced. He would not have been so much distressed at the idea of getting rid of this troublesome world. We have a great many Hezekiahs at the present day, who, notwithstanding they profess to believe in going to paradise at death, when the messenger comes they are terribly affrighted, and employ all the medical science and skill around them to prevent him from performing his kind office! They will strenuously contend that the saints go personally to Christ at death, and join in the songs of the redeemed, and wear the victor's crown, but when it comes to giving up the ghost, and this ungodly world, they prefer to stay here and suffer. Let any one read the obituaries, daily announcing the departure of some pious and happy spirit to glory.

and then look at the habiliments of mourning worn by the relatives of the deceased, and you have a standing contradiction between profession and practice. Why mourn and lament that our relatives have gone to paradise? What an inconsistency! [*Time out.*]

MR. CONNELLY'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS:

Before we review the doctor's last speech, we will note his position on the case of the rich man and Lazarus. This would seem to be almost a work of supererogation, as he has given us the old Universalian position of this text, which has been refuted a thousand and one times. Conscious of the vulnerability of this position, he reads an extract from the Bible Examiner, published by his brother Stone, in which two views are expressed, seeming to say, if *one* will not do, surely the *other* will. Of course, both cannot be correct, though it is evident that both are wrong. But he still insists that it represents the reversed condition of the Jews and Gentiles, and not the state of the dead, as I have shown. And he asks us to believe this for the following extraordinary reasons: First, my view flatly contradicts many passages of scripture which he has quoted. These have all been harmonized, I think, to the satisfaction of all who have not determined to be blind. This is quite unsatisfactory to the doctor, however, for he says the rich man had a knowledge of salvation. And is it possible that he is about to fall in with Mr. Ferguson, of whom he spoke, on Friday, as having advanced some singular things with regard to the dead? This will

do pretty fair for modern progressive Universalism. It must seem to you, my friends, singular enough, that the rich man should have knowledge of salvation, and yet the dead know not any thing! But *Dr. Field* says this man *was not dead*. The declaration of the Bible, then, that the rich man also *died*, and *was buried*, is, in his estimation, *untrue*. Second — *Dr. Gill*, *Rev. James Bate*, of the Church of England, *Theophylact*, a Greek visionary, of the Origen school, who believed that every word in the Bible had a mountain of meaning, think that this is its meaning. And, third, these divines say there was a fabulous history existing at that time, in which this story was found. This is an overwhelming array of evidence, which would be hard to meet. The Saviour never founds his parables on fables or fiction, but on facts. If, however, this story really existed, of which there is much doubt, it was designed to present the condition of the dead; the Saviour's using it for the same purpose must be regarded as indorsing its correctness; for we repeat, what we said before, that the Saviour founds his parables on facts, and not on fictions. We stated, when we first introduced this text, that no other reasonable view could be taken of it than the one we have given; and the doctor, with all his ingenuity, aided by the wonderful discovery that man is all flesh, blood, and breath, has not been able to shed any new light on the subject, but has been compelled to give the old and absurd position, that it represents the condition of the Jews and Gentiles. Absurd, as will appear from the following facts. First: if these characters are taken nationally, the five brethren must be five nations, and as the rich man is made the representative of the Jewish nation, the five nations represented by the five brethren must be children of Abraham. Second: the

Jews and Gentiles include the entire race. Who, then, are the five brethren? Where are they found? The doctor's position evidently includes the *whole world*, and *the rest of mankind*.

The third position assumes, that it is an impossibility for a Gentile to become a Jew, contrary to the law of Moses on that subject; and also, that it is impossible for a Jew to be converted, except by the law of Moses; thus excluding them from the proclamation of the gospel, contrary to the practice of the apostles — or rather that the Jews cannot be converted at all, for there is an impassable gulf between them, so that no one can pass from the one to the other. There is no changing of conditions there. Will the doctor harmonize these facts with his view as readily as I have his difficulties with mine? Will he harmonize them at all? We will see.

By presenting in this striking manner, the awful and unchangeable condition of the unrighteous, the Saviour evidently designed to warn the covetous. This the connection clearly shows; for, whether it be regarded as parable or fact, the scene is laid beyond death. And as all the facts and customs from which the Saviour draws his parables, are fairly represented, this must be regarded as presenting the true state of the dead before the resurrection.

My friend thinks that the fact that God enacted penal laws against necromancy, no more proves the intelligence of the dead, than his laws against idolatry does the intelligence of the idols. This objection is founded upon a misconception of the whole system of the idolatry of the ancients. Their religion was evidently founded in the belief of the existence of some supreme power above their own, which they usually ascribed to the spirits of their departed heroes.

The idols, then, were not their gods, but simply their images. This the apostle Paul substantially shows, when he says they worshiped the creature rather than the Creator, Rom. i; so that their idolatry itself seems to be a species of necromancy. The fact that their gods could not aid them, cannot prove that they were not consulted. That this was carried to a great extreme among them, that they sometimes deified inferior animals, and even inanimate objects, is not to be denied. But its foundation was evidently as we have stated. We have some specific cases where communications have been received from the dead, which we will present in due time. We have been repeatedly told that the belief of separate spiritual existence is a figment of heathen mythology. This case shows that it is as old as the law of Moses. Indeed, its belief extends as far back as the history of our race. God has never contradicted it by his revelations, but has, as we have seen, at various times recognized its existence. We have shown that the Saviour indorsed it, by giving a partial description of spirit. The apostle Paul also confesses his faith in the doctrine, and that, too, under the influence of the Holy Spirit. For, upon a certain occasion, when it was necessary to make choice between the Sadducees and Pharisees, he said he was a Pharisee, the *son of a Pharisee*. And that there might be no doubt as to what point of doctrine the apostle held with the Pharisees, the writer adds: "For the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel or spirit: but the Pharisees *confess both*." Acts xxiii, 8.

The doctor seems to be making some advances on the twentieth chapter of Luke, for he seems to be getting that nearly right, if he will only let it remain so. As you remember, he first took the position that the present tense

was used for the future. I admitted that such was sometimes the case in prophetic language, and called on him to say if the words of the Lord to Moses were prophetic. He was constrained to confess they were not; but fearing that this concession would be carried beyond that declaration, he repeats the passage, adding, that Christ's words to the Sadducees were the same, both in character and meaning. But seeing himself that this would necessarily contradict what the Lord here states, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, as well as what he himself had so repeatedly declared, he thought to frighten us from exposing it, by stigmatizing it with *quibble*. But not succeeding in this, he now restricts the prophetic sense to the phrase, *that the dead are raised*, and asks what plainer I wish him to make it? No plainer, doctor, that will do; that I said at the first, and that the Lord proves that the dead *will be raised*, by first proving that there *is something to be raised*. My argument, then, upon this text is admitted. Very well.

Whether we have succeeded in proving our position in equivalent words, I am willing to commit to the judgment of those who hear, and those who may read.

He says the word *that*, in Eccl. ix, refers to the sense, and not to the words. Will he tell us how we can get the sense without the words. But what is the sense, according to his rendering. It makes Solomon, the wise man, unfold to us the *singular* fact, that after men live they die. To use his own words, if this logic will suit you, my friends, you are very easily pleased.

The doctor thinks that I have evidently got into deep water. This, no doubt, is his honest conviction, founded on sad experience; for, in his attempts to follow me, it seems that he has come so near sinking, that he cannot

see above the waves—he cannot see the points I make. There might, perhaps, have been some hope of him, if he had learned the maxim of the great American philosopher sooner; but, as is too frequently the case with the rash and adventurous, the lesson of experience comes only in time to develop his calamity. But as deep as the water is, he has yet to show that I have gone beyond my depth.

He asks, what I mean by saying, he ought to blush for his remarks on gender. Well, as he seems a little dull of apprehension, and complains that I do not make my points plain, he must pardon me for being somewhat plain. This, then, is what I mean. That any one, who would affirm, that *pneuma* is ever used in any other than the neuter gender, *should* not only *blush*, but be heartily *ashamed*. For if he does not know enough about Greek, to know that this word has no other form or *sign* but neuter, he should be ashamed to stand up before an intelligent assembly, and claim a knowledge of that language. And to prove to us, that a long series of assumptions of scholarship has not entirely hardened him to shame, he tells us, *he* does not profess to be very *erudite*. His efforts on this subject would have fully demonstrated that fact without the confession. But if he is not ignorant himself, but supposes that the majority of those present, and of those, who will afterwards read the debate, are not Greek scholars, and will not therefore be able to see the absurdity and stupidity of such a position; for the greater reason he should be ashamed. First for his want of respect to his own scholarship. But second, and particularly, for his effort at *duplicity*. Let either of these, or both, be his condition, I repeat that he *should* be ashamed. But that charity which covers a multitude of sins would lean to the hope, that the former reason is the true one,

especially, as he quotes the phrase from John iv, "*Pneuma ho Theos*," without perceiving that the article *ho* belongs to *Theos*, and not to *Pneuma*, which is in its regular neuter form. But he says the dispute here is about human spirits, and not about the gender of God and angels, &c. Let us see. He affirms that human spirits are not conscious or intelligent, because the word *pneuma*, by which they are designated, is in the neuter gender. I met this by showing, that the same word in the same gender is applied to God, angels, and the Holy Spirit, and consequently, if the fact that *pneuma* is neuter gender proves that human spirits are not conscious or intelligent, the same fact should prove, that those beings are neither conscious or intelligent. For I affirm, once for all, that an example in the whole Greek language cannot be found where *pneuma* has either the sign or form of either masculine or feminine gender, *Dr. Field* to the contrary notwithstanding. [Time out.]

DR. FIELD'S TWELFTH REPLY.

BRETHERN AND FRIENDS :

When I agreed to engage in this discussion, I resolved to use *soft words* and *hard arguments*. And under no circumstances to indulge in unkind or uncourteous expressions, so common in the excitement of controversy. I submit to you, whether the temper and language of the closing part of the speech you have just heard, savors of Christian courtesy, and the dignity of theological debate. But I do not complain, as it is almost impossible for a debater, under a consciousness of

defeat, to maintain his equanimity of temper. My friend, Mr. Connelly, is fresh from College—a graduated Bachelor of Arts—and now a teacher of the dead languages, and having come here under an impression, that he would be at liberty to play the critic with impunity, and finding himself disappointed, he becomes impatient and irritable. He is manifestly in a bad humor, and expects to relieve his perplexity by fretting and fault-finding.

The truth is, my friends, he has made nothing by the Greek, to which he appealed with so much confidence of success. Like all other tyros and smatterers in that language, when hard pressed with the *English*, they take refuge in the *Greek*, on which they ring as many changes as the multifarious creeds of their respective sects and parties. Every one has a translation to favor his peculiar views on some subject, and if full faith and credit were given to the criticisms of these sapient sophomores, the mass of people would never know what to believe.

I have made no pretensions to a critical acquaintance with the Greek language; and it was not at my instance, that the debate has taken a direction not suited to a popular assembly. But with all his learning, he has not been able, either in English or Greek, to prove his proposition. And, although not fresh from my *Alma Mater*, and *rusty* in much that I once studied, I venture to say, I can confute him in Greek, Latin, German, or English.

Now, what does all his tirade about the gender of spirit amount to? Have I denied that spirit is in the neuter gender? Have I not shown that it *is*, and by so doing, proved one of the fallacies of his system? He was careful to conceal that fact from the audience, and he had no idea that it would be discovered. He felt secure while

ensconced in the Greek, and now, that I have made it known, contrary to his expectation, and deduced a fair conclusion from it, he pretends that it is a matter of no importance! But he knows better. As a literary fact it has an important bearing on the question in debate, and it is useless to deny it.

I see plainly, that we do not understand each other. The point is this: He contends that spirit is always in the neuter gender, and as God and angels are sometimes called *spirits*, therefore, God and angels are also in the neuter gender, and hence, not rational intelligences according to my reasoning. I admit, that the *word* spirit is always in the neuter gender; which is *prima facie* evidence that, abstractly considered, spirit is no living or rational intelligence. The fact that God and angels are sometimes called spirits, no more proves that they are in the neuter gender, than does the fact that a *living man in the world* is called a spirit, prove him to be in that gender. Here, then, is his sophism exposed in a few words. The quotation from John iv, was designed to prove that God, and not the word spirit, is in the masculine gender. And I here affirm, that no matter by what name God and angels may be called, they are in the masculine gender. God, angels, and men may be described by various words and names expressive of some attribute or property of their nature, and these descriptive terms may, by grammatical rules, be placed in the neuter gender; and this is all that he can make of the fact, that they are sometimes called spirits. He cannot prove the consciousness of the human spirit after death, by proving that God and angels are spirits. I am contending about the gender of *things*, and not about their *names*. All this talk, then, about scholarship, blushing, being ashamed,

stupidity, &c., is out of place and must recoil on his own head.

He says I give the Universalist views of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Upon his principles, this signifies nothing, inasmuch as the greatest errorists and visionaries may believe some truth. But no matter whether they are Universalist views or not, it is certain that I did not give them from Universalist *writers*, but from distinguished writers *on his side of the question*. He and they for it, then.

But Theophylact was one of them, and he was a great visionary! So is every man who differs from him. How does he prove it? Simply by saying so. But we are told that he belonged to the school of Origen. And so do hosts of others, of modern times, and on the subject in debate, my friend, Mr. Connelly, is of the same school.

This celebrated Grecian was born at Constantinople, and was a metropolitan bishop. He wrote his commentaries on the four gospels in the eleventh century, in which we have his views of this parable.

But we are told that, by asserting that the rich man has some knowledge of salvation, I favor the views of a Mr. Ferguson, of Nashville, who believes that there is probation in *hades*, and that Christ preached the gospel to the antediluvians shut up in it at the time of his death. Not at all. I did not mean that the rich man had any knowledge of salvation for *himself*, but for his *brethren*. So much for this mistake.

He thinks that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus cannot represent Jews and Gentiles, because its structure would require five nations to correspond with the five brethren of the rich man. There is no force in this objection. It is evident that these five brethren were under

the law of Moses—they were Jews — and may represent the five religious sectaries of the Jewish nation, namely, —the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Herodians, and Samaritans.

The impassable gulf, he supposes, would, if the parable has a national signification, symbolize the hopeless condition of the Jews. To this I reply — as a *nation* they are cut off. While individuals among them may be converted, yet as a nation they will continue in their blindness and infidelity to the end of the gospel dispensation.

He says the belief in spirits is very ancient. So it is, but not in disembodied human spirits. From the days of Moses, and perhaps before, the Jews believed in the existence of a class of beings called devils or demons, who may have been the apostate angels. They were regarded by the heathen world as an intermediate class of beings between their gods and men. There is not a vestige of evidence in the Bible, that either the gods or demons of Persia, Greece, and Rome, were the spirits of dead men.

But we are told that Paul indorsed the doctrine of the Pharisees concerning the resurrection, when he identified himself with them. Very well, let us see what their doctrine was. It is said in Acts xxiii, 8, "That the Sadducees denied the resurrection of both angel and spirit, but the Pharisees confess both," that is, they confessed that there is a *resurrection* of both *angel* and *spirit*. Here, then, according to this text, we see something not very favorable to my friend's views. There was no question raised about the intermediate state between the Pharisees and Sadducees, or Paul. It was about the *resurrection*. Now, the question here is this: did Paul sanction the views of the Pharisees respecting the spirit after death? If he did, then we have him believing in their Pythagorian notions

of a transmigration of souls, and their pre-existence; for, according to Josephus, they held both. Before they became corrupted by association with the Roman philosophers, they held to the resurrection of the body, and just so far as this doctrine was concerned, Paul indorsed their sentiments. For he distinctly says, "*for the hope of the resurrection of the dead I am called in question.*" So far he was a Pharisee.

He says that the idols worshiped by the heathen nations were representatives of living beings, who were, in fact, the spirits of heroes, deified after death. He makes the devils of the Old and New Testament, to whom the heathen, and sometimes the Jews, sacrificed their children, the spirits of dead men. That this cannot be so, I prove by reference to many passages of the Old Testament, among which I will here mention the following: Judges vi, 31, Psalms xlvi, 5, Isaiah ii, 8. There is also one in the New Testament, that shows that the gods of the heathen were nothing more than imaginary beings. It is as follows: 1 Cor. viii, 46, "As concerning those things offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth; (as there be gods many and lords many;) but to us there is but one God, the Father," &c. Here we see that all those gods worshiped by the heathen, were really no gods at all. The idol was not merely the *image*, but the god himself, who was the object of their idolatrous worship.

There is another consideration connected with this branch of the subject, to which I invite the attention of my friend, and that is, if these gods were demons, and demons were the disembodied spirits of men, then we

have the fact verified, that the spirits of dead men, so far from being imprisoned, as he has endeavored to show, are at liberty to revisit the earth, enter into the living, and influence their conduct. Of this, the demoniacal possession, so often mentioned in the New Testament, is an illustration. How will he reconcile this idea with the fact that the rich man could not get back to warn his brethren? My friend will find, by assuming that the demons or devils are the spirits of men, that he refutes much that he has said in his former speeches. How can it be possible that the spirits of wicked men are tormented in hades, when they are in the living here on earth, tormenting *them*. We have an example of a legion of them being in one man, and when cast out, they entered a herd of swine. I would like to have these difficulties removed, and hope he will give us light on the subject.

He says it was contrary to the Saviour's custom to base a parable on fiction. But I ask if a parable is not a fictitious narration? "The trees went forth on a time to make a king," see Judges vii, 10. Was not this fiction? Buck, in his definition of parable, bears me out in this view of it.

I will now proceed in the presentation of evidence, that the dead are unconscious. In the eleventh chapter of John, we have an account of the death of Lazarus, and his restoration to life. In this instance, our Lord uses sleep as a figure of death. He said to his disciples, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth, and I go that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well." They knew not, however, that he meant he was dead, until plainly informed of it. On approaching the dwelling of his bereaved sisters, one of them met him and said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother

had not died." By way of comforting her, our Lord replied, "Thy brother shall rise again." He did not address this disconsolate sister as our modern clergymen do the relatives of a deceased person, by telling her that her brother was a pious man during his lifetime, and was now in heaven or in paradise, according to my friend's theology; that he was happy in the kingdom of glory, in the society of angels, and all the saints who had gone before him; that seeing he was so much better off than if alive in this world of sorrow, she ought to dry up her tears, and be contented. This, as you are aware, is the popular mode of ministering comfort to the living at the present day. But our Lord adopted a different method, and one that comports with the uniform teaching of the scriptures. His reply to Martha was, "Thy brother shall rise again." This, my friends, is as far as it was necessary to go *then*, and it is sufficient *now*. It is enough to be assured that our relatives will arise from the dead, and that we shall again meet them in the bloom and vigor of immortality. Martha readily declared her faith in the resurrection, as taught by our Lord. Whereupon, with a view to still further console her, and inspire stronger confidence, he said, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth shall *never die*." Here we have two classes of persons named in connexion with the resurrection;—one class who are *now* dead, but who shall hereafter be restored to life; and another, who will not die. The apostle Paul says we shall not all sleep or die, alluding to such Christians as shall be living when Christ shall make his second advent. According to my friend, those who had died in the faith were as much alive at the time our Lord spoke these

words, as they ever had been. But it is evident that they were then dead, in the true and natural sense of the word, and if not raised at a future time, they had perished. This still further illustrates the fact, that Christ is Lord both of the dead and living. Notice the fact, my friends, that our Lord does not say that those who were dead were *then* alive, but they *shall* live, — that is, from and after the resurrection. From this passage, it appears, beyond all doubt, that even those who have died in Christ are not *now* alive, in any sense of the word.

Again: 1 Thess. iv, 13. "But I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." He did not give them the slightest intimation, that they were alive and in paradise, and thereby alleviate their sorrow, but assures them, that those sleeping saints shall be raised from the dead when Christ returns. As God brought again Christ from the dead, so he will bring all the saints who sleep in him from the same dark dominion, and they with the living saints on the earth at the time will ascend to meet him in the air. Let any one read this passage of scripture in its connection, and he cannot fail to see, that without a resurrection of the dead all is lost. That, no matter what may be said about the body and the spirit and the whereabouts of either, it is certain the *saints are asleep*. As I have proved they sleep in the dust of the earth. Having died *in* Christ or in covenant relation to him, they *sleep* in the same relation to him, and will actually awake to everlasting life at his appearing and kingdom. Had Paul entertained the sentiments about the dead rife at the present day, he would have comforted the living by assuring them, that those who had died were then in paradise.

There is another fact which I will notice, that proves the falsity of the prevailing notions with regard to the state of the dead, and that is, that we never get the victory over death until the resurrection. Read carefully the conclusion of Paul's argument in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, beginning at the fifteenth verse, and you will see that death obtains the victory over us until the sounding of the last trumpet. Then it is, and not before, that we can sing the victor's song. But if my friend's doctrine be true, the saint ought not to regard death as an enemy, but as a friend; and if it is true that at death he goes to Abraham's bosom or paradise, he has unquestionable got the victory. This doctrine would make the apostle's reasoning of none effect, and like all other traditions it nullifies the word of God.

We are told in the same chapter that the first man Adam, though a living soul, was of the earth earthy. He was destined to return to the earth, and all his posterity partake of his nature and share his destiny. This is the much talked of penalty of original sin. His disobedience entailed on the human race indiscriminately natural death by which we return to dust, our earthy origin, from which we are brought up to everlasting life by the second Adam, who was for this purpose made a quickening spirit. Yes, my friends, had it not been for the mission of the second Adam or Lord from heaven, the whole human family would have, turned to dust and perished for ever. This fact gives point and force to the declaration, "that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him might not *p̄*erish but have *everlasting life*." Upon the hypothesis, that man is naturally immortal, and does not cease to exist consciously and intelligently at death,

whether he be saint or sinner, this declaration is meaningless not to say false.

Again: Our Lord himself teaches explicitly the doctrine that future life depends on the resurrection, and not on an immortal or spiritual nature. He says, "And this is the Father's will that he hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I shall lose nothing, *but should raise it up again at the last day.*" John vi, 39. Here it is affirmed, beyond all doubt, that his people will be lost without a resurrection. There is no erasing this conclusion. As I have shown repeatedly this could not be the case, if my friend's doctrine were true. The resurrection could be dispensed with, and the righteous could still live and enjoy happiness.

It has been said, that upon my principles the resurrection is a new creation — that in death our identity is lost. I do not hold myself bound to remove the philosophical difficulties in the way of those who maintain contrary views. The restoration of man to life after having returned to dust is a sublime mystery, so declared by inspiration itself. It is one of the truths of revelation that can be believed but not explained. God, who made the universe, with its innumerable multitudes of living beings, is able to reorganize the material body from the dust, and make it produce the same intellectual and moral phenomena with which it was endowed before death. No man who believes the Bible, can doubt this. To cavil about it, is to deny the power of God. Suppose, for example, I take this watch [takes it out and holds it up before the audience] and reduce it to powder, and scatter the particles, and there could be found a silversmith who could collect them together and re-adjust them exactly as they were and set the watch to running, and

make it keep precisely the same time that it did before I pulverized it, you would call this a wonderful achievement of wisdom and power. This is the best illustration I can give you of what I understand the resurrection to be.

Mr. Connelly.—Would it be the same watch?

Dr. Field.—Unquestionably it would. The reduction of man to his atoms, and his reorganization is a work of omnipotence, nevertheless God can do it. In the resurrection there is no change in the atoms, or identity of the person, but in the physical nature. From a natural it becomes a spiritual body. Every chemist knows that bodies may be changed without being destroyed. If there is an apparent impossibility in the process of the resurrection, it can only exist in the mind of a philosophic speculatist, who distrusts the power and wisdom of the Almighty. [*Time out.*]

FOURTH DAY,
Tuesday morning, 10 o'clock. }

MR. CONNELLY'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

The kind providence of our Father in heaven, has once more thrown around us the dark curtain of night, while we have slept, and having permitted us to see the light of this blessed morning with our faculties refreshed, we will proceed in the development of our proposition by presenting to your consideration a few more proof texts, after which we will examine the doctor's objections and texts.

We will call your attention, then, to 1 Samuel xxviii, 3-20. Now, Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa. And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her and inquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit, at Endor. And Saul disguised

himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night: and he said, I pray thee, divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me up him whom I shall name unto thee. And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die. And Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, as the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing. Then said the woman, whom shall I bring up unto thee. And he said, bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice: and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me, for thou art Saul. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid, for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What form is he of? And she said, An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed, for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore, I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore, then, doth thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him as he spake by me. For the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, even to David. Because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor

executed his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee, this day. 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. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel: and there was no strength in him, for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night."

This is a very important extract from the inspired volume; one that speaks for itself, and, as you must perceive, it speaks directly to the point in my proposition. Note, then, the following facts: First, this extract is a historical narration of facts — a statement of things that have occurred — of realities. Second, this being true, it is as certain that Saul sought for a woman that had a familiar spirit, as that he was the king of Israel. Third, that through her instrumentality, Samuel was brought up, not his body, surely, for that had evidently crumbled to dust, as it was before the formation of man at first, consequently it was his *spirit*. Fourth, the whole narrative shows that it was customary, in those days, to find those who had familiar spirits, who were consulters of the dead; and, fifth, their consultations, as this case shows, were *real*, and not mere delusions or frauds, as we have been told by Dr. Field. These facts illustrate my argument founded on the law against necromancy, and place my proposition beyond reasonable cavil. The doctor can, no doubt, dispose of this text as he has all the others I have adduced, by telling us that it is inferential or symbolical.

We will next call your attention to the mount of transfiguration, Mat. xvii: "And after six days, Jesus taketh

Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And behold, there appeared unto them *Moses* and *Elias*, talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here; if thou wilt, let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias." Here is, my friends, another case, which is neither symbolical nor inferential, but a plain statement of facts, where consciousness and intelligence is found between death and the resurrection. Moses had ascended to the heights of Pisgah, and beheld the beauties of the land of Canaan, Israel's promised inheritance, and died. But he is now here with our blessed Saviour, conversing concerning the Lord's death.

To the same effect we will read Rev. xxii, 8, 9: "And I, John, saw those things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then said he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren, the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." It cannot be denied, that one of the prophets who had gone from this world, is here conscious and intelligent. And should the doctor assume that this is an exception, or special case, will he please give us some proof?

It is hardly necessary that I should occupy your attention in further noticing his criticism on the twenty-third chapter of Luke. I have already shown that his punctuation of the text would not only violate the rules governing in such cases, but make the adverb qualify that which was plain, instead of that which was obscure. But he says such expressions are common. No good writer, so

far as I have observed, uses such language, unless they wish to contrast what is said at the present with something to be said afterwards. And will he give a single expression in all the holy oracles, similar to what he would make this to be? If he cannot, he will surely make a large draft on our credulity to require us to believe it to be an idiomatic expression. That the word paradise was applied to the condition of the righteous in hades, is abundantly evident from Josephus, whose Greek learning will hardly be questioned, and also from the Greek lexicons, which so define it. So that the fact that they went to paradise, harmonizes with my position precisely.

My friend is still greatly overcome with *sleep*, and yet he will not affirm that he *knows* it is a state of unconsciousness, but answers my question on that subject by asking me how I know when I am asleep? and thinks it likely that my answer will be his. Well, we will see. To his question there can be but two consistent answers. First, that we are conscious of sleep; or second, that we do not know. Will the doctor take the *first* of these answers for *his*? Then he concedes that sleep is *not* an *unconscious state*. Or does he take the last? Then he acknowledges what I before stated, that he does not know whether it is or not, a state of unconsciousness. That we sometimes have thoughts in sleep, we know. But he says our sleep is then imperfect. Imperfect sleep! we have none. Now the most any man can reasonably affirm on this point is, that he does not remember any thoughts that passed his mind during those periods. Will the doctor himself affirm more than this? And are we to conclude that we have no thoughts, simply because we do not afterwards remember them? If so, we have passed the greater portion of our lives without thought and with-

out consciousness. For I appeal to every gentleman and lady in the audience, if you can remember your thoughts — the thoughts that have passed through your mind for one fourth of your lives? Nay, I appeal to the doctor himself to tell us if he can remember all his thoughts for a single day of his existence? We all know that we have been infants, and that we have had thoughts in childhood. This we know by observation. But who can remember the thoughts of his early childhood. Again, I presume all have had thoughts in sleep, that were not remembered for days, and even weeks. And may we not very reasonably conclude that we have had thoughts which are never remembered at all? Hence the fact that our thoughts in sleep are not remembered, no more proves that we have no thoughts, than does the same fact prove that we have had none during any other period of life?

But an examination of his own proof texts will give much light on this point. Take his quotation from the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah, as an example: "Thy dead men shall live, together with thy dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dust is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead."

We will, at present, make no remarks with regard to the figurative character of this text, but shall examine it as it has been introduced, as though it were literal. We have in this text the term *awake*, which is used as the opposite of sleep. The same is true of quite a number of passages which he has introduced as the language of David, "then will I be satisfied when I *awake* in thy likeness," which shows that the doctor's first position with regard to this term, was correct; that sleep is applied to the dead to indicate a resurrection, with which he would

like to connect the idea of unconsciousness. And should he succeed in showing that this is true, (which he cannot do,) it would avail him nothing; for, according to this text, the term sleep is applied to the *body*. And there is no dispute as to the fact that the *body* dwells in the dust, or about the unconsciousness of the body. In my introductory speech, I introduced several texts, which show a clear distinction between the body and the spirit; and that the *body* returns to the *dust*, and the spirit to God who gave it. Hence, unless the doctor can prove what he has asserted, that man is *all body—just what you can see, dead or alive, nothing more and nothing less*; and that the *spirit* is only an ELIMINATION of the *body*, these texts can afford him no aid.

While these facts are before us, we will notice his quotation from Rev. xx. "The sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them," &c. Now connect this with Isa. xxvi, and it is clear that there are three localities for the dead, the *sea*, the *earth*, and *hades*. What of the dead, I would ask, are in the *earth* and *sea*? The dead bodies only, this my friend will not deny. But what of the dead are in *hades*? Will the doctor affirm that dead bodies are here too? no, my friends. This is the invisible, the state of the spirits of men.

We will next notice Isa. xxxviii. The case of Hezekiah. And we need only repeat that there is no dispute as to what goes to the grave or pit of corruption. But it is about that which goes to God. And is it possible that the eliminations of the body go to God at death?

But this text very happily illustrates my position as to the kind of knowledge the dead do not possess. "The *grave* cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee:

They that go down to the pit *cannot hope for thy truth.*" To the dead the truth of God is not declared. But to the living—the living only have the means and knowledge of salvation. And this was the reason assigned by Hezekiah for his unwillingness to die, and not as the doctor supposes, that he would have no consciousness.

Our attention is again called to the idolatrous worship of the heathen. And that you may not lose the point on this subject amidst the multiplicity of words, I will state it again. I prove by the fact that God has enacted laws against consulting the dead, that he thereby recognizes their existence and intelligence after death. To this the doctor replies by proving that laws were enacted against the worship of idols, and thus concludes that the same logic would prove that idols were intelligent too.

I have shown that this conclusion is not just by the fact that the images were only the representatives of their gods, which were frequently the spirits of departed heroes. To prove that the images were their deities without reference to other beings, he has named several texts in the Old Testament, but as he has neither read them nor given his points in them, we will not at present notice them. But he says, 1 Cor. viii, 46, proves that the heathen gods were only *imaginary* beings. Can it be possible that Dr. Field believes that their images were *only imaginary* images, it would seem so, for he says, the idol was not only the image, but the god himself. Had he not better concede my position that they only represent their deities to the senses! But that they are *only imaginary*, remains for him to prove. For there is certainly no evidence of this in the text in 1 Cor. For when the apostle says the idol is nothing we cannot understand him to mean that it is a nonentity, but that

it is no god, as the context shows; this all Christians concede; but the fact that it is not a god, surely does not prove that it does not exist.

We will notice his difficulties on demons in its proper place.

My friend says that he does not affirm that the spirit of God is in the masculine gender. Did it not look a good deal like it, my friends, when he called on me with such emphasis, and seeming triumph, to say that either God or spirit in the fourth chapter of John is neuter gender. But as he has conceded all I contend for on this point, I need not notice it further, except to note his most singular remark, that while the Spirit's being in the neuter gender does not prove that it is not a living intelligence, the fact that it is *never* in the masculine, is *PRIMA FACIE* evidence that it is not the man proper!! And I would ask, is the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit *ever* in the masculine? Then it must be *prima facie* evidence that *it* is not intelligent. So you perceive, my friends that the meshes of that Greek net, have rather entangled the doctor, and although he has flounced at random very considerably he is about to *yield*.

He admits, that according to *his* interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, it represents the Jews and the Gentiles, the structure of the parable requires five nations to correspond to the five brethren. But he thinks these may be found in the five sects of Jews. Could anything be more absurd? for that would only make the rich man's five brethren represent the different parts of himself! a singular brotherhood truly.

To prove that parables are founded on fiction, he cites the parable of the trees going forth to make a king: Would the doctor make us believe that the existence of

trees, kings, subjects, &c., is all fiction? so it seems. We repeat that parables are founded on realities.

[*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS:

From the case of Saul, Samuël, and the witch of Endor, my friend, Mr. Connelly, has come to several grave conclusions — among the rest, *that it proves his proposition!* Well, let us see how it does it. In the first place I wish to remind you of the fact that, from the commencement of this discussion up to the present time, he has located the spirits of all the dead in a place called *hades* — in which he says some are happy, others miserable. From his interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, it would seem, that the former could not return to this world, although he, doubtless, desired to do it, and the latter, being happy in paradise, had no wish to return; and, as it seems from the narrative, could not have done so without a resurrection from the dead. Now, he says that it was not Samuel's *body* that was raised, but his *spirit*. From whence, then, did it come? Let the narrative answer — *from the earth*. The witch said she saw gods *ascending out of the earth*; and when asked by Saul what form he was of, she answered that she saw an *old man* come up, covered with a mantle. What! a spirit come out of the ground covered with a mantle! Will he admit this? Besides, we know that spirits are invisible to natural eyes; how is this to be reconciled with his supposition that it was Samuel's spirit

that the witch saw? But notice, my friends, that neither Saul nor the witch expected Samuel to come *down*, but *up*. Up from whence, I ask? I wish him to answer this question plainly. If he cannot prove that paradise is down in the earth, he is bound to admit a resurrection of the spirit of Samuel, which will be fatal to his cause. Mark it, my friends, Samuel says himself that he was disquieted and brought *up*, and the witch says it was from the *earth*. My friend, Mr. C., has also contended that the spirits of dead men are in the heavenly regions, but here he has found the spirit of this good old prophet in the *earth*, brought up at the bidding of a witch! After making known to Saul the result of the approaching battle with the Philistines, Samuel said to him that the next day he and his sons would be with him. If Samuel was in paradise, of course Saul and his sons went to the same place! Here is another difficulty in the way of his interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, who, it seems, were neither in the same place or state.

It is manifestly impossible that his inferences from this case can be correct. There is not an example on record, nor any reliable evidence under the heavens, that the spirit of a dead man ever returned without the body, and conversed with the living. And this case of Samuel, allowing it to be a narration of real occurrences, proves nothing favorable to his proposition. If Samuel was brought up at all, it was *bodily*, without which he could not have been seen and conversed with by the king of Israel. The most ultra Swedenborgian does not believe that spirits can be seen with the natural eyes.

Our attention is next called to the mount of transfiguration, where Moses and Elias appeared, and conversed with our Lord. Luke tells us that *two men* appeared and

talked with him, who were Moses and Elias. You perceive, then, my friends, that it is all assumption to say that it was the *spirits* of two men who appeared on this occasion. The narration allows of no such a conclusion. I know it will be alleged that Moses was dead at the time; aye, but does not my friend teach that Samuel was raised for a less important purpose? If there is nothing absurd in the idea, that a witch could bring up from the dead the prophet of Israel, to make a communication to a wicked and abandoned king, how can it be considered unreasonable or improbable that the great law-giver of the Jewish nation should be raised up for the time being, at least, to appear on the mount, and there attest the superior claims of Jesus Christ, and lay down his authority at his feet? With regard to Elias or Elijah, there is no difficulty. He was the great prophet of Israel, who, as a reward for his constancy and courage was translated, and did not see death. I care not whether he denies that Samuel's body was raised or not; he teaches that his *spirit* was, and that too from the earth. It is said of Moses, that when he died God buried him, and his sepulchre was never known to any one. Jude speaks of a contest between Michael and the Devil about the *body* of Moses. This means something, and I can conceive of nothing else than that the body of Moses was needed for some special purpose, and Satan disputed the ability of God to restore it to life. At all events, I hold him to a strict construction of his proof text. It says, or at least Luke says, that *two men* appeared and talked with the Lord. They must have been there *bodily*, otherwise they could not have been seen and heard by Peter and his companions.

His argument from Revelation xxii, 8, 9, weighs nothing

when we consider the fact, that two of the most important prophets the world ever produced were translated, viz., Enoch and Elijah. Either of these men might have been chosen to communicate with John on the isle of Patmos, and thus all the difficulties in that case can be easily explained. For the person whom John was about to worship, stated that he was one of his brethren, the prophets. He appeared to John *bodily*, for he saw him with his natural eyes, and fell down at his *feet*, to do him homage.

My friend, Mr. Connelly, has great confidence in the Greek learning of Josephus, and says he and the Greek lexicons define paradise to be a place of happiness in *hades*. Well, we will see how they define it. Greenfield, the Greek lexicographer, whose work he has before him, says that "*paradeisos* is a word of Persian origin, and means a park, a forest, where wild beasts were kept for hunting; a pleasure park, a garden of trees, of various kinds; a delightful grove; used by the LXX for the garden of Eden, or of delight; in the New Testament, the celestial paradise is that part of *hades* in which the souls of believers enjoy happiness, *and where God dwells*." After very correctly defining the term, he gives you his opinion about its locality, as mentioned in the New Testament, which, you discover, is *above us*, in the *third heaven*, for he refers to 2 Cor. xii, 4, as proof of it. According to this definition, then, he is compelled to admit that the thief went to the third heaven, the very thing that he hitherto denied! He would not even claim that Paul went there at death. Again—How will he reconcile this definition with the case of Samuel, whose spirit was in paradise, according to Greenfield, and my friend, Mr. Connelly? Instead of his spirit coming *down* from the

the celestial paradise of these Greek critics and lexicographers, *it came up from the earth!* If he pins his faith to the sleeve of Josephus and Greenfield, he will be involved in interminable difficulty. But he says their definitions harmonize with his position precisely. So be it.

While on this subject, I will treat you to some of Mr. Campbell's views of *hades*, *paradise*, and the separate state of human spirits. In his appendix to his new translation he says, "Hades is very improperly translated hell in the common version. He says it literally means *hidden*, *invisible* or *obscure*, and that there is no word in our language that corresponds with it." This is doubtful, to say the least of it. The word *grave* corresponds with the term *sheol* in Hebrew, and *hades* in Greek. When the dead were deposited in the grave, they were said to be in *hades*, because *hidden*, *invisible*, or *obscured* from the sight of the living. If Mr. Campbell had not been biased by Platonism and Grecian mythology, he would have found a word in the English language by which to translate it. I will unhesitatingly affirm here, that the Jews never had any other ideas about this word, so far as the dead were concerned, than the *grave*, until they mingled with the Greeks and Romans, and imbibed their mythological views about an Elysium and a Tartarus. This Mr. Campbell himself virtually admits—see appendix to new translation, page fifty-five. He says, moreover, "that before the captivity, the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the deceased, as to their happiness or misery. They spoke of it simply as a state of *darkness*, *silence*, and *inactivity*." And well they might, when neither patriarch nor prophet ever taught the heathen doctrine of immortal-soulism and conscious existence after death. But we will hear Mr. Campbell again. He says

"it destroys the sense of many passages to render the word *hades* by the term *grave*," and assigns the following reasons for this opinion, which will plainly show that his doctrinal views were more in danger of being destroyed by such a rendering of the word, than the sense of any passage of scripture. He says: "The term *grave* with *us* denotes the mere receptacle of the body; whereas the *mansion of spirits* separated from the body, is by *us* supposed to be quite different from the *grave*. According to our views, we should call the receptacle of the body the *grave*, and the place of departed spirits, *hades*." Here you see the secret of Mr. Campbell's difficulties about this word fully disclosed. He has suppositions, views, and notions opposed to the rendering in question. He must have a receptacle for the body and one for the soul, and, therefore, he must have three states of human spirits. "The first in union with our animal body." This state, he says, terminates at death. The second is that state in which human spirits are separated from their animal bodies. This commences at death, and terminates with the resurrection. This, he says, "is precisely what is called *hades*." By whom, pray? But he goes on to say, that the third state commences after the re-union of the body and spirit, and continues for ever. *Hades* is said to be destroyed when the third state commences. Therefore, Mr. Campbell understands John to mean, that the intermediate state, or the receptacle or mansion of spirits, will be burnt up! And he has all the saints singing victory over *hades*, or the place where he locates Abraham's bosom, or paradise, and where, according to his own showing, they have enjoyed great blessedness! What a victory! To triumph over a place of happiness! Lest it should be supposed that I misrepresent Mr. Campbell, I will read what

he says on this subject. He says, "In *hades*, then, the receptacle of all the dead, there are rewards and punishments. There is a *paradise*, or *Abraham's bosom*, and there is a *tartarus*, in which the evil angels are chained, and the spirits of wicked men engulfed. Hence, Dives in *tartarus*, and Lazarus in *Abraham's bosom*, were both in *hades*. Jesus and the converted thief were together in *hades*, while they were together in *paradise*. But Jesus continued in *hades* but three days and nights. But when he leaves *hades* and the earth, he is said to be taken up into heaven."

So far as it regards the locality of *hades*, any one who will read Mr. Campbell's views on the subject, must see that he holds that it is *down in the earth*. He comments on the words in construction with it, and also *paradise*, the drift of which is, to show that they are somewhere below the surface of the earth. These terms and ideas, he says, were borrowed by the Jews from the Greeks and Romans, to whose views on these subjects they gradually assimilated. Notwithstanding all this, without any authority under heaven, he believes that *paradise is down in the earth!* I repeat, that there is no authority whatever for locating the paradise of the New Testament any where else but in the third heaven, or on the new earth. The idea that Abraham, Lazarus, Paul, Peter, and all the saints, are alive and down in a subterranean cavern, or a sort of Symmes' hole, is perfectly ridiculous. It is just such an idea as we might expect to be concocted in the brain of a Grecian mythologist.

The truth is, my friends, *hades* means the *grave*. Like all other words, it may be used in a figurative sense, to indicate a state of great depression, &c. But when used in connection with the dead, it means the grave. Our

Lord, for purposes of illustration, may have recognized the then existing ideas about it, as in the case of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, but it is certain that he never taught them to be true. Here I will take occasion to remark, that in Revelation xx, 13, the word *hades* means the grave, and is as much the place of dead bodies as the sea. But it will be asked, perhaps, why use the term *death* in this verse as a different place or state from the sea and the grave, and as also giving up the dead? The reason, I suppose, is that multitudes of the human family have died, and have returned to dust, without the rights of sepulture. Many, especially the martyrs, have perished at the stake,—have been devoured by wild beasts, and otherwise destroyed from the earth. These are said to be in death. Hence there is a propriety in using the term as descriptive of the condition of a certain class who shall appear at the judgment.

I need say but little more in answer to what my friend, Mr. Connelly, says, in defence of the assumption, that there is consciousness in sleep. He insists on it that we have thoughts in sleep, but do not often remember them. I presume he means that we sometimes dream. This I grant; but, as already stated, in perfect sleep we do not dream. The mind is as much at rest as the body; and hence, there are no thoughts to remember. Now, to sum this matter up, himself being judge, it amounts to about this:—that in death a man has no more thoughts or consciousness than he has in his lifetime when sound asleep. If, then, this is the best he can do for the dead, I think it will be admitted, on all hands, that he has not done much in proving his proposition.

He misapprehends me on one point, which I will simply correct. I did not say that *spirit* is an elimination of the

brain, but the *mind* or *intellect*. I have said it, and here repeat it, that *thinking is a function of the brain, and without a brain there can be no mind or intelligence*.

In his notice of the case of Hezekiah, he says there is no dispute about what goes to the grave. Well, what does Hezekiah say would have gone to the grave or pit of corruption, had not God respited him? He says, "But thou hast, in love to my *soul*, delivered it from the *pit of corruption*." My friend has told you that, in some instances, the soul and spirit are synonymous. Here, I suppose, is one of the instances. But Hezekiah says of *himself* that he would go to the *gates of the grave*. "That they (the persons) that go down to the pit cannot hope for God's truth." He certainly does not mean the body only. If he does, then the body with him was every thing, for the man proper, according to Hezekiah, goes to the grave.

I will here correct another misapprehension. I did not say that the *images* of heathen worship were imaginary beings, but the gods or beings they were supposed to represent. In the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, it is three times declared that there is no other God beside the great Jehovah, the God of Israel. In contrast with the gods worshiped by the heathen, he is called the *living* and true God. Baal, Moloch, Ashtoreth, and others, were *dead* gods, merely imaginary beings. Whether the images of the heathen represented their deceased heroes or not, it is no evidence that they were alive.

He is still trying to get out of the difficulties into which he is involved by the fact that the spirit of man is in the neuter gender, *and never in the masculine*. Now, I admit that this, of itself, would not be conclusive evidence that the human spirit is not a rational, intelligent entity, but

in connection with other evidence, strong as holy writ itself, it is conclusive. The arrangement of nouns in the Greek language is an arbitrary affair. The usage of classic writers and the rules of the language in this respect, are matters of taste rather than necessity. In many instances, however, it is presumable that there are good reasons why a noun should uniformly be used in the same gender. Hence, I infer that the *spirit* of man is not *man himself*. If it were, it would *sometimes*, at least, be in the same gender with man. But he thinks I have entangled myself here, and am compelled, for the same reason, to admit that the Holy Spirit is not a rational intelligence, and exultingly asks me to prove that it is ever put in the masculine gender. Well, let us see whether it is or not. John xiv, 26, "*Ho de Parakletos*" — But the Comforter. Again; xv, 26, "But when the Comforter is come" — *Hoton de elthe ho Parakletos*. Again, xvi, 7, "For if I go not away the Comforter (*ho Parakletos*) will not come unto you." Here, then, I have produced three examples of the Holy Spirit being used in the masculine gender — which proves my position, that rational intelligences properly belong to either the masculine or feminine gender, whether grammarians will have it so or not. Now, when it is said that *God is a spirit*, it is absurd to put God in one gender and spirit in another. If I say *man is a spirit*, most assuredly *man* and *spirit* are really in the same gender. But if I say *man has a spirit*, I affirm quite a different thing. Man and his spirit may, therefore, be in different genders. If I say Thomas P. Connelly is a scholar, according to the rules of the English language, Thomas P. Connelly and scholar belong to the same gender. It ought to be so in all languages, living or dead. When, therefore, it is said *God is a spirit*, God and spirit

are *de facto* in the same gender. And I have now proved that they are both in the masculine — one always and the other occasionally.

He thinks it impossible that the five brethren mentioned by Dives could represent five sects of Jews, because, as he says, it would make him represent five parts of himself. I must confess that I cannot comprehend this logic. Why it should be an absurdity, in a parabolic illustration, to make one man represent a nation, and five others divisions of that nation, I cannot understand.

If he understood me to say that parables are founded on *fiction*, he is mistaken. I stated that *they themselves* are *fictional* narrations. So say the theological dictionaries, (see Buck on the word parable.) They may be based on what does now, or has existed. Trees, kings, and subjects exist, and may be used in a parable. *History* also exists, and whether true or false, may be used for illustration. The same may be said of an existing popular sentiment. It may be made the material of a parable.

[Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

There are a few items in the doctor's last speech, on yesterday morning, which we must notice before we proceed.

To prove that the dead are unconscious, the conversation of the Saviour with Martha, John xi, has been cited. But if you have been able to perceive any evidence of his proposition, either in the text, or my friend's remarks

upon it, your powers of perception are much better than mine. So far from its proving the dead to be unconscious, from his own showing it proves the very reverse. And I will, therefore, adopt it as a proof-text of my proposition.

He says there are two classes presented in this text, viz., those who are now dead, and those who will be alive at the second advent of the Lord Jesus. That the phrase, "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live," represents those that are now dead. Now, if this is true, the text refutes the doctor's position most completely, unless he can show that they who have no thoughts, no knowledge, and no consciousness, as *he* says is the case with the dead, can *believe*. For the text represents this class as *believing*. He that BELIEVETH in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." We hope the doctor will try himself on this passage, and show us the evidence that the dead are unconscious, and how the unconscious can *believe*.

We would suggest, my friends, that there is no dispute either as to the fact that there will be a resurrection, or that the victory over death will not be gained until the dead are raised, as his remarks on Thessalonians and Corinthians would seem to indicate. Will the doctor show us how the fact that the dead will be raised, proves that there is no consciousness after death?

But the thought that his position denies a resurrection, still greatly troubles my friend. And he makes quite an effort to relieve it from such an imputation. But he confesses that this cannot be done on philosophical principles, and hence resolves it all into a sublime mystery. A very convenient way of disposing of difficulties. But he says it is declared to be so in the holy scriptures. Where, I would ask? It is true the apostle says, "behold,

I show you a mystery," but what is the mystery of which he speaks? The resurrection? No. But that some will be changed without dying.

I would be glad if he would take such a position as would harmonize with this blessed hope — the hope of a resurrection. But he will never be able to extricate his present position from such consequences as I have shown. For if he is right, man has no identity after death; but is as the dust before man was at all. It must, then, take a re-creation to make man again from the dust, as it took a creation to make him from the dust at first. Hence he must, of necessity, be a new being; hence there cannot be either rewards or punishments to the present order of beings. For they will have ceased to be, and new creatures made of the elements of the present order of beings. And, therefore, if blessings be granted in future, it must be to new creatures, and that, too, for the actions of others! But the doctor thinks that if it is the same material, it must be the same being; but according to this logic, my friends, the bed of coals on your hearth is a bed of the richest diamonds; for the material is the same. But let us try his position with some other facts. It is well understood that particles of the human body are constantly changing. Hence the same particles of matter have evidently composed, in part or in whole, the bodies of different persons since the creation.

I would like for the doctor to try his watch illustration, in view of these facts. Suppose his watch be reduced to its elements, and those particles enter into the composition of other watches, and after all have been dissolved to its elements, a watch made of the material, will he tell us which of the watches into whose composition its particles have been, this new one is? But he is not bound to

answer philosophical difficulties. He made quite an eloquent speech, the other day, with regard to the harmony of truth, and does he now recede from those just remarks on that subject, and tell us that philosophical truth will not harmonize with revealed truth?

But, he says, to question the resurrection on his principles, is to question the power of God. But let us see if his philosophy does not do even more than this. He told us, I believe, in his first speech, when objecting to my definition of spirit, that immateriality is nothing. I have asked him if God is material. But he will not answer, only that it is immaterial with him, whether he is or not. Well, let us see the result of his philosophy on the subject. God is either *material* or *immaterial*. If material, then ubiquity is not an attribute of the Deity, for no two particles of matter can occupy the same space at once. Consequently, when the scriptures assure us that God is every where, it is all a mistake. But if he is *immaterial*, then, according to Dr. Field, he is nothing. Hence his position not only denies the power of God, but the *existence of God himself*.

The case of Saul and Samuel gives my friend great perplexity. He is up and down, now in hades, then in the heart of the earth, and again in the heavenly regions. Now, what does all this blustering mean, but to obscure the point, or call off your minds, that you may lose sight of the force of this text. I wish you to note, my friends, that he admits that it is a historical account of *facts*. It is a fact, then, that this witch brought Samuel to converse with Saul. But this, he thinks, was the body of Samuel, for nothing else, he said, could be seen. He teaches, then, that witches had the power to reorganize the bodies of the dead, and set them in active operation, to eliminate

thought, and thus communicate to the living their fates and destinies! This is clearly in advance of the spirit manifestations of modern times. It cannot be true, then, that Christ alone has power to raise the dead. But how does this comport with what he has told us before. In reply to my argument from the laws against necromancy, he affirmed, and would have made us believe, that it was all delusion and fraud, and that God only enacted laws against the fraud. But, since I have given facts showing that the dead were consulted, he admits it. But, if possible to keep it from bearing on my proposition, he tries to make us believe that those witches and consulters of familiar spirits, had power to re-organize the bodies of men, and hence, according to his position, they had power to create man from dust, and endow him with all the faculties possessed by those that God had created. For, if man is all body, as the doctor teaches, and as this goes to its elements—to dust, at death—then Samuel had no identity, being dead, as he was before the creation, his being and intellection must have been given him by the witch!!! For it is evident that God had nothing to do with his appearance to Saul, for he had refused to make any communication to him. And that this is not an isolated case—that they were numerous—I think no one, who will carefully read this narrative, can doubt. And I doubt not that the doctor will find that this case proves altogether too much for his philosophy, notwithstanding his declaration that it proves nothing.

The doctor assumes that Moses was raised from the dead for the special occasion of the transfiguration. But does he give any proof that such is the case? None, whatever. Only that his case demanded—very urgently demanded—this assumption; demonstrable evidence,

however, with the doctor. And for the same reason — that is, his cause demands it — he assumes that the prophet who appeared to John in Patmos, was either Enoch or Elijah. But I am greatly mistaken in the character of this people, if you would not like to have some better evidence than this, however satisfactory it may be to the doctor.

The fact that Samuel, Moses, and Elias were seen, does not at all militate against my position, for it is evident that spirits frequently manifested themselves to the living; at least it was so believed by the disciples, as is clearly to be seen from their frequent reference to the fact.

My friend seems to be greatly excited about hades. I have proved to him that in hades there are conscious intelligences found, and it has so excited him, that his imagination has ransacked the universe for its locality. He sometimes imagines that I understand it to be in the heart of the earth, and that it is in the heavenly regions. And, unable to be kept in suspense any longer on this subject, he has spent a considerable portion of his last speech in discussing this question with Alexander Campbell. Had I known that his curiosity had become so ungovernable, I would have given a little more time to this term in my former speeches.

I would simply remark, however, with regard to his assault on brother Campbell's views, that A. Campbell is fully able to speak for himself. And he is known not to be very backward in defending his positions against the attacks of any reputable individual, on any suitable occasion. And if the doctor will attend strictly to all the facts and documents we present, *we* will try to keep him busy, without his disturbing those who have not now an opportunity to speak for themselves.

But what and where is hades? The etymology of the term shows that it originally meant the invisible — the unseen state. And the history of its use, as reported by the lexicons, shows that this original meaning has not been departed from, and is used generally with reference to the state of separate spirits. The term seems to be used with reference to no particular locality, but to the state of the dead. Hence all the doctor's thunder about up and down, the heart of the earth, or subterranean cavern, Symmes' hole, the air, the heavenly regions, &c., is all lost. He says, when used in connection with the dead, it means the *grave*. But by what authority? Does he cite any? None. But his position demands it.

He thinks the reason why the term death is used in Rev. xx, as distinct from the sea and hades, as giving up its dead, is, that multitudes have been sacrificed and died without the rite of sepulture! And does he think that their *bodies* have found no resting place, either in *earth* or *sea*?

But the idea that there is a degree of happiness and misery in hades is, with him, entirely inexplicable, unless the victory is gained and the judgment passed! And why not for the same reason conclude, as there is a degree of happiness and misery here, that the judgment is now passed and the victory won.

The truth upon this subject is this: all the joy and consolation of the saints, either here or in hades, are based upon the mediation of Christ, and a hope of the resurrection, to enjoy — *fully* enjoy — all the blessings of heaven, the crown of victory, and of life and righteousness, and the heavenly inheritance; the society of the Saviour and of the angels. This fact will explain why the Saviour and administering consolation to his disciples, directed their

attention to the final victory rather than to the intermediate joys.

Having failed to show that there is no consciousness in sleep, and as nearly all his evidence depends upon this figure of speech—for the sum of evidence from quite a majority of the texts he has quoted, is that the dead sleep—he finally concludes that there is no more thought after death than in sleep any how!

We will, probably, not have occasion to notice this subject again, and would repeat, what we have before shown, that his own texts show that this trope is used with reference to the dead to indicate a resurrection, and not the condition of the dead. Hence his evidence depends upon a perversion of the texts, where the term sleep is found.

He charges me with misrepresenting him, in saying that man's spirit is an elimination of his body. Let us see. He told us it was an attribute of man's nature. That I might understand him I asked what he meant by attribute, and he gave us a number of examples, which, he said, were the eliminations of the body. To what other conclusion, then, could I come, with respect to his view of spirit? Did you not understand him as I did? I am glad he is disposed to reject that absurd position. But will he now tell us distinctly what he understands the spirit to be? [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

Before I notice my friend's last speech, I will present some additional facts with regard to the soul, subversive of his doctrine. I would again remind you, that he has coupled the word soul with his proposition, alleging as a reason for it, that the soul and spirit sometimes mean the same thing. Keeping this before your minds, I will now prove that it is mortal—that it has died, may die, and will die. I am fully prepared to hear in reply to this evidence, that the word soul is used in various senses. This is not denied. But it will be for him to show that, in the examples which I shall produce, that it is not used in *every* sense.

Joshua xi, 11, "And they smote all the *souls* that were therein (Hazor) with the *edge of the sword*, utterly *destroying* them; there was not left any to breathe; and they burnt Hazor with fire." Here is a strong case, showing that souls can be utterly destroyed with the sword. Again—Psalms vii, "Lest they tear my *soul* like a lion *rending it in pieces*, while there is none to deliver." Again—lii, 9, "But those that seek my soul to *destroy* it, shall go down into the lower parts of the earth." Again—lxxxix, 46, "What man is he that liveth that shall not see death? Shall he deliver his *soul* from the *hand of the grave*?"

Again: Ez. xviii, 4. "Behold all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall *die*." Again: Ps. lvi, 6. "They gather themselves together, they hide themselves,

they mark my steps when they lie in wait for my *soul*." Again : "My *soul* is among *lions*. Deliver me from bloody men, for they lie in wait for my *soul*." Again : cvii, 4, 5. "They wandered in the wilderness in a solitary way ; they found no city to dwell in. Hungry and thirsty their *soul* fainted in them." Again : Num. xi, 6. "But now our *soul* is *dried away*; there is nothing at all but this manna before our eyes." Again : Rev. xvi, 3. "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea : and it became as the blood of a dead man ; and every *living soul* died in the sea."

Here we have ample evidence that the soul is mortal—as much so as the body. It is represented as *fainting, drying away, being or liable to be, rent in pieces, slain by the sword, going down to the grave, dying in the sea, &c.* In all the places in which it is mentioned in the Bible, an immortal or undying nature is never once predicated of it. How, then, can any man in view of these facts gravely assert that it never dies ? Many of the advocates of the immortal soul philosophy are becoming so well convinced that it cannot be sustained so far as the soul is concerned, that they have, like my friend, Mr. C., shifted the ground and contend that the *spirit* is the immortal part. But as you have learned in the course of this discussion, the evidence of the one is no better than that of the other. Both alike rest on nothing better than the vain philosophy of this world. The set and popular phrases of immortal soul and never-dying spirit have been so long hackneyed that the mass of mankind have taken it for granted that they are Bible phrases. That the word of God is replete with evidence that the soul is as immortal as God himself.

The word *soul*, like that of *spirit*, has several meanings. *First*. The principle of animal life. *Second*. The seat of

desires and passions. *Third*. The whole person. *Fourth*. A dead body. *Fifth*. A figure of personification. *Sixth*. Being or existence. It occurs about one hundred and twelve times in the English Bible, and in no instance whatever is it said to be immortal.

My friend, Mr. C., thinks that John xi, refutes me, because it says that the dead are now living. If that were the case it would have been unnecessary to distinguish them from the living when speaking of faith. Our Lord would have likely expressed himself thus. *He that believeth on me never dies*. But he speaks of a class who were *dead* and says they *shall* live—not that they *now* live. They died in the faith and have the promise of a resurrection. There is no man on this green earth that can give a more consistent and rational exposition of this passage than the one I have given. Any other view of it is attended with insuperable difficulties.

The passage in Ecc. xii, has often been pressed into my friend's service during this debate as proof of the consciousness of the spirit after death. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was ; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Now, I want him, when he rises again, to tell us what the spirit knew before it came from God ? I hope he will not forget this ; and when he gives us the desired information, perhaps it will throw some light on the question in debate. If he is right ingenious, he will in all probability make it appear, that it knows quite as much after it returns to God as it did before it came from him.

The doctrine advocated by him is essentially the same as that preached in the garden of Eden. "Thou shalt not surely die." It was productive of the most disastrous consequences then, and ever since it has conflicted with

the word of God, and operated injuriously on the best interests of mankind. The following are some of its evil consequences :—

1. It involves in mystery and confusion the word of God, contradicts the Mosaic account of creation and of the fall of man, and necessitates a mode of interpretation, which if universally adopted would unsettle every doctrine of the Bible.

2. It makes sceptics and infidels of many intelligent men, who are unable to reconcile the laws of nature, and the deductions of reason, with what are declared to be the doctrines of revelation, and, therefore, reject the Bible altogether.

3. It destroys that fundamental doctrine of the Bible—the resurrection of the dead — and substitutes for it, the comparatively inglorious doctrine of a re-construction of an almost superfluous body, thus depriving the resurrection of all its importance and glory.

4. It causes some to believe that at death, their souls or spirits are clothed in a sort of ethereal or spiritual body, and thus practically to believe that the resurrection is past already.

5. It gives rise to the conclusion, that if the essential and living part of man — the soul never dies — then the resurrection of dead men to life is a contradiction.

6. It is the strong-hold of Restorationism, Universalism, and Swedenborgism.

7. It affords the entire support of the invocation of saints, purgatory, prayers for the dead, and of many of the superstitions of popery.

8. The popular delusions about apparitions, nursery tales about ghosts, and the spirit rapping delusion rest on this doctrine.

9. It causes the atonement and mission of Christ to be misunderstood, undervalues his death, and the penalty of sin.

10. It deprives Christ of the honor of dispensing immortality in his mediatorial character.

11. It makes death a saviour and the sole instrumental cause of our first personal introduction to God and to heaven, thereby depriving our blessed Lord, who is the resurrection and the life, of this honor.

12. It supercedes the necessity for the coming of Christ, and a general judgment, and deprives these events of all their importance and solemnity.

13. It is one of the main causes of the inefficiency of the gospel. The wicked are taught to believe that they are naturally and necessarily immortal; from which they consequently infer that they will somehow or other escape the penalty of the divine law, as it is popularly understood, and live forever in a condition no worse than the present.

I have thus summed up some of the effects of the doctrine of the proposition, one of which is fraught with more mischief to the world than all other errors of Protestantism combined. I allude to the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead, which are fruits of the doctrine of immortal-soulism. Think, my friends, of the impositions practiced on the ignorant by a crafty priesthood through this error. How many millions of dollars have been extracted from the credulous, under the pretence of praying their friends and relatives out of purgatory? Tetzal had the presumption to say, that he had saved more souls out of purgatory by the sale of indulgences than Peter saved by his preaching!! A gentleman in Bardstown, Ky., and a member of the legal

profession, told me some years ago, that there were a number of wills on record in that county containing large bequests to the priesthood for praying the souls of the testators out of purgatory!! A few years ago the whole Catholic Church in the United States prayed for the repose of the soul of Bishop England of South Carolina! Upon the supposition that the souls of the saints are alive, they have been invoked as mediators, and the most abominable follies and superstitions have been practiced. If the doctrine I teach were universally believed, all this would cease, and Popery with all its corruptions and crimes would be banished from the earth.

Now, I defy any man to show that the doctrine I hold in reference to the state of the dead, can produce any injury whatever to the living. It is liable to no abuses, leads to no superstitions or delusions. No harm, whatever, can result to any man from believing that at death he ceases to be conscious—falls asleep in Christ, until it is his pleasure to restore him to life and incorruptibility. What danger is there, my friends, to the church from believing, and zealously inculcating the doctrine, that future life and happiness are dependent on a good Christian character; that a resurrection from the dead is indispensable to an introduction to the joys and felicity of paradise? None whatever. The belief is eminently calculated to humble the pride of man and make him feel his dependence on the grace of God for life and salvation. The answer we give to those time-servers, who acknowledge the doctrine to be true, but ask what good will result from teaching it is, that it has a practical influence in the formation of Christian character—in making men faithful, honest, and circumspect. As all hope of living forever depends on conditions, this fact increases the

probability of a strict and unwavering compliance. It is a powerful stimulus to obedience.

The sleep of the dead has been denounced by Alexander Campbell and his satellites as a blighting and withering doctrine—destitute of comfort—soul chilling in its influence, &c. Hence, they call it the soul-sleeping doctrine—and caricature it with other hard names, somewhat like those which the sects used to employ in exhibiting the danger and wickedness of some of their reformation principles.

But what is there either dangerous or demoralizing in the doctrine? Let them show that any good man has ever been made worse by it. How many thousands are there in the churches of the reformation, yea, all churches who hold the doctrine advocated by Mr. Campbell and my friend, Mr. Connelly, who are a disgrace to the Christian name and profession. I am aware that many people have an idea that an unconscious sleep is something dreadful and uncomfortable. But when it is considered that unconsciousness virtually annihilates time, what would a sleep of a thousand years be to one who is destined to awake from it and live through everlasting ages. Eternal life is not shortened by it. In comparison with it, the sleep of Adam will be no more than a drop to the ocean. And with all its seeming terrors, what is there in it more unpleasant than being locked up in the bowels of the earth?—in a great subterranean mansion where there is no light, unless Symmes' philosophy be true.

[Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

We have met again to prosecute, and this evening conclude, our investigations. My last speech was devoted chiefly to an examination of my friend's difficulties. And there are still a few things in his first speech this morning, that I will, perhaps, be expected to pay my respects to before I proceed.

He charges me with misrepresenting him, by saying that the idols were the gods of the heathen. I am sorry that the doctor's memory is so short. As you all know, he quoted several texts to prove that the idols were heathen gods, and added, that the idols were not the images merely, but the *gods themselves*. Being compelled to abandon this position, he now tells us that the beings—the images—*represented*, were only *imaginary*. He has a right, of course, to change any position he has taken. But it would at least have been as *honorable* to have confessed his mistake, as to charge me with misrepresentation. But does he give any evidence that his last position is true. For his failure in this, perhaps, he should be excused, as he evidently has no proof to give.

The doctor can see no incongruity in making one individual represent a nation, and then represent the different parts by other individuals. This may all do well enough; but it is only a flimsy effort to evade the point. He has already admitted that the structure of the parable would require that the five brethren should represent five nations, if the rich man represents the Jewish nation. And in immediate connection with this concession, he would so

far presume upon our ignorance as to try to make us believe that the different sects among the Jews would answer for nations! But, in his estimation, there can be nothing out of the way in making a man's members his own brethren! Truly a singular relationship!

He has made another effort to prove that *pneuma* is sometimes in the masculine gender, and has thereby furnished us another fine specimen of his Greek criticism. He cites a few texts where the word *parakletos* is used as indicating the office or work of the Spirit, and concludes that *pneuma* must sometimes be masculine, because *parakletos* is!! But what is most remarkable is, that all this effort is made while the doctor himself admits that it is not so. But he thinks that "*it should be so de facto.*" Of course it *would* be so, if he had the privilege to re-model and re-arrange the language to suit himself. What a pity he had not lived before the apostles, that he might have perfected the Greek tongue before the holy oracles were committed to it. He further admits, that if his criticism was true, it could prove nothing by itself. But connected with other things, as strong as holy writ, it proves his position most conclusively. Yes, *if it had* those other things it might do. So would the fact that Bonaparte died on St. Helena, if it had other facts—strong as holy writ, do as well. But, doctor, what are those other things! It would be edifying to us all to learn them. But let us see. He has presented two classes of texts to prove that death is a state of unconsciousness. The one, which includes nearly all he has offered, is where reference is made to sleep. But how can this prove his position; for he has failed to show that literal sleep is a state of unconsciousness, much less the tropical. Again, his own proof texts show, as we have seen, not

only that sleep is applied to the body, but that it is so applied not to indicate a state of unconsciousness, but a state from which there is a resurrection. The other class includes such texts as declare that the dead know not any thing, which, as we have clearly demonstrated, refer to a specific kind of knowledge—a knowledge of salvation. Hence, to bring his evidence to a conclusion, as the dead have no means of salvation, and will be raised from the dead, therefore, the dead are not conscious!

We are now up to the doctor's last speech, I believe. Why should he pass by my last speech entirely unnoticed, and spend his time in irrelevant matters? Perhaps he thinks that he can make better headway in an open field than he can in argument relative to the question. A large portion of his speech is a "*petitio principii*"—a begging of the question. For what reason has he given, or can he give, that his long catalogue of evils are consequent upon my proposition, besides his *own dictum*. Let him give reasons, if he has them, that the evils he has enumerated are necessary consequences of a belief of my proposition. For if they are necessary consequences, they must follow with every person who believes it. Will the doctor, then, be kind enough to furnish us with his method of deducing such evils from the fact that the spirits of men are conscious after death. It is quite evident, my friends, that the doctor has concluded that it is much easier to declaim against my proposition with hard epithets, than it is to meet the facts and documents which I have produced. He has a right, however, to pursue his own course in this matter.

My friend has favored us with quite a lengthy disquisition on the soul, showing that it has died, and that it does and may die. Now, this is wholly gratuitous. That the

soul dies, has not been disputed. I have even admitted that the spirit dies, not that it ceases to be conscious; but *dies, departs out of this world*, is separated from the body. Is it possible that he has nothing else to fill up his time with, that he must spend it in descanting on matters about which there is no dispute? Why not show that the fact that the soul or spirit *dies*—or is separated from the body—proves that it is not conscious after death. For what does it signify if the soul dies, unless it can be shown that death is a cessation of conscious being.

The doctor, and those with him, since their revival of this materialism, which is rather of French origin, have dwelt upon the words death and die, and emphasized them in their speeches and essays, as though they thought the words contain, in themselves—in their very structure—all the evidence of their assumption; and as though they thought no one could see that the laws and usages of the language were not violated by their use of these terms. For we repeat again, that there is no authority under the broad canopy, human or divine, for the meaning they attach to these words.

The soul, however, does not belong to my proposition. It is true, as we have shown, both by the authorities, and by a few examples, that it is sometimes used in the sense of spirit; not that it is always so, nor even that it is generally so. I would remark, however, that I have preferred the term spirit in my proposition, not because the word soul could not be successfully defended in the sense I have given it in the texts which I have introduced, but from a respect to the general use of those words in the sacred writings. So that I am under no obligation to notice his remarks on the use of the word soul. I must, however, give them a brief notice—a literary curiosity.

He says he is prepared to hear in reply, that the word has different meanings. This he admits; but calls on me to show that it is not used in all its senses in the texts which he has introduced; thus virtually affirming that it is! That one word is used in five or six different senses in the same connection or context, is perfectly ridiculous. The doctor must have learned this from his Greek author, Theophylact, who thinks every word has a mountain of meaning. But let us read a few of his texts, with all his senses of the word soul substituted, to see how his position will do. A single example will do for an illustration. Isaiah xii, 11, "And they smote all the principles of animal life. The seats of desires and passions. The whole persons. The dead bodies, figures of personification, beings or existences that were therein, with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them." This is, surely, ridiculous enough.

His fourth, fifth, and sixth definitions must have been taken from some literary gem, which has never been brought to light, and which will, doubtless, immortalize its author. As his fifth definition was evidently invented to meet his position on Rev. vi, we will substitute it in that text, and see if it will do. "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the figures of personification of them that were slain," &c. This, I suppose, suits the doctor's taste very well.

My friend's effort to save himself from his own proof text, John xi, 25, 26, shows that he feels his inability to save himself *from himself*, as will be seen by contrasting his first position with what he now says. He told us, in the first place, that the Saviour spoke of two classes; that by the phrase, "he that believeth, though he were dead, yet shall he live," the Saviour meant those that are

now dead. The very structure of the phrase shows that it means no such thing. But granting it, for the sake of the case, I showed that it proved that those who are now dead still believe. That such is the fact, on the doctor's own interpretation, no one, who will look at the text, can fail to see. Hence, by his own showing, his whole scheme of philosophy is forever refuted. But now he says, if that were the case, it would not have been necessary to distinguish them from the living, when speaking of faith; but that our Lord would likely have said, he that believes on me never dies. This is substantially what the Saviour does say, as any one may see who will look at his language. But fearful that all would see he had, in his remarks, abandoned his position on this text, the doctor affirms, with an air of *seeming triumph*, that no man on the green earth can give a more consistent and rational exposition of this passage than the one he has given!

We must not disappoint the doctor's hopes by forgetting his most profound question. And what would it prove if I could give no answer at all? It has been said that fools may ask questions that philosophers cannot answer. But without stopping to inquire whether this is one of that class or not, I must, for the doctor's sake, look a little at its logic. What did the spirit know before it came from God? He thinks, then, that unless I can prove that the spirit was conscious and intelligent before it was *created*, that it cannot be so *after* its creation!! That would prove that there is no consciousness now!

His remark that the doctrine of my proposition is essentially the same as that preached in the garden of Eden, merits no reply, and I will give it none, only to state that it is founded, as is his whole philosophy, on the *baseless* assumption that death is a cessation of conscious being.

And, as was before shown, he is sustained by no authority, human or divine.

We have been favored, in the concluding part of my friend's last speech, with quite a treat of the *pathos*. The doctor seems to think, that if he cannot succeed with argument in removing our old *superstitions*, he can at least arouse our sympathies.

He would make us believe that Alexander Campbell, and his satellites, have wonderfully persecuted him. They have denounced and characterized his views, till one would almost conclude, from his display here, that his very life had been in jeopardy. But he defies any one to show that his doctrine is productive of any evil whatever. It would be too cruel, after all he has suffered, to add aught to his difficulties, by recounting the evil tendencies of his views. For, if we may rely upon the doctor's remarks, we would be forced to conclude that there is no one who believes with him, that is not an honor to both church and state. I would ask, however, what good can his doctrine do, if it were true? For, he admits that many who believe it, can see no good result from its proclamation. This is, doubtless, just. And what are we to think of a doctrine whose good results are matters of doubtful disputation, even among its adherents. This is surely no part of Christianity, for it was never so regarded. The doctor's reply to all such is, that it makes men faithful, honest and circumspect! Surely he does not intend to say that he was unfaithful and dishonest before he adopted his present views! If so, we would not, for any thing, weaken his confidence in them. For he surely cannot suppose that any one could be made to believe that his are the only views that teach a conditional salvation.

He is aware that many look upon an unconscious sleep

as something dreadful. And why should they not, with such a display made before them as he made yesterday, with regard to old Hezekiah. But now he would make us believe that his doctrine is as consoling as mine—that unconsciousness annihilates time—and, consequently, the dead, I suppose, could not tell that they had been unconscious at all? For what, then, is he disputing?

We will now introduce an argument founded on the demonology of the Bible. We have been told repeatedly that demons are spirits. To this I agree. I propose now to inquire what kind of spirits. We also indorse a statement that has been made repeatedly—that words are to be taken in their plain, common sense meaning, unless the context decides differently. Having premised these facts, we ask, what was the commonly received meaning of this word in the time of the Lord and his apostles? We would ask you to remember our argument on the law against necromancy, as giving a clear intimation that they were the spirits of men. But let us examine some authorities. And, to save my friend from unnecessary trouble, we would state in advance, that we cite the proposed authorities simply to show what the word meant in the days of the Saviour and his apostles.

We will call your attention, in the first place, to the definition of Dr. Webster: "Demon, a spirit, or immaterial being, holding a middle place between men and the celestial deities of the pagan." Again, he says, "It was supposed also that *human spirits*, after their departure from the *body*, became *demons*." But what say the ancients themselves? Hesiod, one of the oldest writers known to history, who once wrote a treatise, called the genealogy of the gods, says the spirits of mortals became demons when separated from the body. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

There is much in my friend, Mr. Connelly's last speech, which does not merit an extended notice. The most of his points are obscure, and of but little importance. The only one very perspicuous, is the fact that he is in a *bad humor*. He needs to be exhorted, in the language of scripture, to let patience have her perfect work. As the debate will close this evening, I shall study brevity in my remaining speeches, condensing as much as possible my arguments and replies.

He complains that I did not fully reply to his last speech this morning. True I did not, but intended to do it this evening, and will now perform the task.

He assumes that man cannot return to dust, without losing his identity, and necessitating a new creation, in order to restore him to life. Yet he will not deny that *man does return to dust*. But calls on me to explain the resurrection in harmony with *his* views, and show how it is possible for God to re-organize a man from the dust of the earth! Will he say that God cannot do it? Suppose man's identity should be lost, cannot God restore it?

The whole of the argument, from the philosophical difficulties of the resurrection, is this: He holds that the body, from birth to death, passes through many changes of waste and reproduction. At death it returns to dust, or becomes the nutriment of animal and vegetable life. Its particles are thus scattered beyond the possibility of recovery. At death, the spirit, or man proper, goes to *hades*. When, therefore, the resurrection takes place, the

spirit returns to the earth, and gets a new body. The old body being lost by diffusion in the mass of vegetable or animal matter, is not raised at all, but there is a new creation of a body for the spirit! Now, as the spirit never dies, and the body that it inhabits while here cannot be found and re-organized, how, I ask, can there be a resurrection? What is there to be raised? Not the spirit, for that does not go to the grave, or cease to be conscious and intelligent; and not the body, for that is lost. Upon his principles, then, there is no such a thing as a resurrection.

I am under no obligation, whatever, to harmonize the Bible with any man's difficulties, or with science, falsely so called, but to harmonize *scripture with scripture*. While I hold that all truth is harmonious, and that there is nothing in the laws of the material universe that clashes with those of the moral, still, there is much that is *called* philosophy and science, that may be arrayed against the Bible.

He thinks that my position not only denies the power, but the very existence of God. And why? Because I did not say that God was immaterial! He argues that if I take the ground that he is material, I deny his ubiquity, because no two particles of matter can occupy the same space at one and the same time. Therefore, if I admit that God is omnipresent, I must admit that he is immaterial. But let us see how this would obviate the difficulty. My friend, Mr. Connelly, contends that immateriality is *substance*. Will he tell us how two *substances* can occupy the same space at one and the same time? Come, my friend, try your hand at solving this difficulty.

He says I teach that witches had the power to re-organize the bodies of men, make them think, speak, &c. Not

at all. It is not in evidence that Samuel's body needed any re-organizing. He was dead and buried, it is true, but this affair between Saul and the witch occurred immediately after his death. It is said Saul saw him, knew him, and bowed his face to the ground. If, as I have said, it was Samuel's spirit, it *came up from the earth*; and it is just as likely that the witch could bring up his body from the earth as his spirit.

His argument from this case is, that the spirit of Samuel returned from paradise, in obedience to the behest of a witch, and conversed with Saul, and that against his will; for the prophet asked why he was *disquieted* and brought up. This contradicts a fact in the parable of Dives and Lazarus — that the dead can make no communication to the living without a resurrection. If it was Samuel's spirit, God must have wrought a miracle to make it visible, and enable it to converse with Saul; and if so, it would contradict another fact, that he had abandoned Saul, and refused to answer him by urim, by dreams, or by *prophets*. If he believes that Samuel *really was* brought up by the witch, he must admit that it was done bodily, otherwise he is involved in the difficulties just mentioned.

He charges me with making an *assault* on the views of Alexander Campbell, and thinks I ought not to disturb those who have not now an opportunity to speak for themselves. For the same reason, he should have forbore to make an assault on the views of Dr. Thomas. I did not deem his notice of Dr. Thomas offensive or reprehensible, because I hold that the published opinions of men are public property, and that every man has a right to review them, and test them in the crucible of truth. No man ought to claim for his writings exemption from criticism and refutation. This complaint comes with a bad grace

from a party who, of all others, have been the most unsparing in their animadversions on the written and unwritten opinions of the sects. Mr. Campbell, himself, has made war on all churches, creeds, and sects.

He calls on me to say what the spirit is. In the beginning of this discussion, I gave him the desired information, but lest he has forgotten it, I will repeat it. The word means — *First* — The breath. *Second* — Vital principle, or animal life. *Third* — Thoughts, affections, temper, or disposition of mind. *Fourth* — The mind of man. *Fifth* — One's self, periphrastically. *Sixth* — In a few instances it means a person? Will this satisfy his curiosity?

I come now to notice some things in his last speech. With regard to the gods of heathen worship, he still misunderstands me. I repeat, that the idol was all there was of the god. The beings they were intended to represent had no existence, except in the conceit of the idolaters. It is for this reason they are said to be nothing. God charges the Jews with the sin of sacrificing their children to the *idols* of Canaan. And Moses, in prophesying their dispersion, said: — "And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell." "And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, *even* wood and stone." Now, I call upon him to say, explicitly, whether there really were such beings as Moloch, Baal, and Dagon? Will he say that the thousands of gods and demi-gods of Greece and Rome, had any *real* existence?

In reference to the gender of *parakletos*, (the Holy Spirit,) he says, that it is only an office of the Holy Spirit

that is put in the masculine gender. You recollect, my friends, he challenged me to produce an instance in which the Holy Spirit is in the masculine gender. I have done it, and now he tries to evade the force of this fact, by saying that it is only when *filling an office that it is thus used!!*

Office or no office, I ask him whether *parakletos* and Holy Spirit, in the passage quoted, are not one and the same thing? Does it not say that the Comforter is the Holy Spirit? Again: let him show that the human spirit in any of its operations or offices is put in the masculine gender.

He says, if the evils I have enumerated are necessary consequences of his doctrine, they must follow in the case of every person who believes it. Not so. Many men who are avowed atheists, are moral men, good neighbors, and inoffensive in their habits; but does this clear atheism of the imputation of being mischievous and demoralizing in its tendency? Certainly not. Because some people are better than their doctrines, it does not follow that their doctrines are harmless.

He admits that both soul and spirit die! This is very candid. Then the body, soul and spirit all die, and of course are in the same condition after death. Heretofore he only admitted that the *man* died — that death was a separation of the spirit from the body. This *separation* was the death of the *man*. The spirit and body were only *parts* of the man. When the *separation* occurred the body ceased to be conscious, but the spirit did not. Now, he admits that not only the *man*, but the *parts* of the man die, and it is reasonable to presume that all the parts are alike after death. If death is a *separation* of the spirit from the body, and by this separation the *man*

dies, will he tell us whether the spirit is separated again and from what?

I cannot believe that he understood me to mean that the word soul is used in five or six different senses in the same verse or connection. I quoted a number of passages in which it occurs, and in some it is used in one sense and in some in another. This is all I meant, and he must have so understood it. But as he is hard pressed for capital, I will allow him the benefit of this puerility.

He labors to make some of my definitions of *soul* ludicrous by substituting the definition for the word in certain texts. Suppose we try his definition by the same rule. With him the word soul in Rev. vi, means the immortal or never-dying part of man. Now try it. "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the never-dying part of man which was *slain*," &c. "And they (the souls) cried, how long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood," &c. So you see according to him the never-dying soul or spirit is distressed about its blood!!

I asked him to tell us what the spirit knew before it came from God? He cannot tell; but infers that because the spirit is conscious *now* it must be so after *death*. By the same parity of reasoning he may infer because the body has *sensibility* now, it will have after it returns to dust!

He could not have understood me either to say or mean that Mr. Campbell ever denounced me *personally* for my views of the dead, or any other doctrine. But he has denounced the doctrine, and many who hold it as unworthy of Christian fellowship, in direct and palpable violation of all his professions, pledges, and promises. When he commenced his reformation, he invited all sects and parties to unite with him on the Bible, with a guarantee of liberty to think for themselves. — But it has turned out

to be the liberty of thinking as he does or go out of *his reformation*. This fact is now well understood by the whole religious community in this country. And hence it is that the *reformers* have become ashamed to cry out against the sects for intolerance. No well informed person can longer doubt, that in this respect, they are as much of a sect as any in Christendom.

He is now fairly out of the Bible — in heathen mythology, in search of evidence to prove that demons were regarded by the ancients as the spirits of dead men and that the Saviour and his apostles subscribed to this tenet of paganism. We will suppose, then, for the sake of the argument that he has proved it. What, I ask, will be the legitimate conclusions from it? In the first place it will follow that all he has said about the spirits being imprisoned is false. So far from their being in prison or *hades* they are in *men*. A legion inhabited one man, and when expelled from him, they entered a herd of swine!!

Secondly — It necessitates the conclusion that the rich man could have returned to the earth, and, if necessary, could have entered his five brethren!!!

Thirdly — It also follows that there is no place of torment, nor is there any punishment between death and the general judgment; for the demons asked the Saviour if he had come to torment them before the time. His interpretation of the parable of Dives and Lazarus is all wrong if his demonology be true; for Dives was tormented and confined to a certain place from which he could not return to this world.

About the best witness he will ever get for the assumption that demons were men, will be Hesiod, who wrote a fabulous history of the heathen gods, in which he ascribes to them the most abominable crimes, such as theft,

murder, &c. Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and others condemned his genealogy as disgraceful and absurd, and taught that demons were an order of beings between the gods and men.

But he quotes Webster to prove his point. And what does he say about demons. Why, simply that they were a class of beings between men and the gods, and that it was *supposed* that the spirits of men, after their departure from the body, became demons, and from demons sometimes were promoted to be gods! All *supposition* and nothing else. They were considered by the heathen nations as distinct a class from men as angels are by the Christian world. But they thought that men might be made demons after death, as Christians now suppose they may be made angels.

Alexander Campbell indorses George Campbell's dissertation on the devil and demons, the amount of which is, as they both admit, that they cannot decide "whether demons were conceived to be the ghosts of wicked men deceased, lapsed angels, or (as was the opinion of some early Christian writers) the mongrel breed of certain angels, (whom they understood by the "*sons of God*" mentioned in Genesis) and "*the daughters of men*," it is plain they were conceived to be malignant spirits. The descriptive titles given them always denote some ill quality or other. They are represented as the causes of the most direful calamities to the unhappy persons whom they possess, such as deafness, dumbness, madness," &c.

Here, then, is a frank acknowledgment that they know nothing certain about them. It is evident the Bible nowhere says that they are human spirits. Of this much we can be certain.

Herodotus says "the Egyptians are the first of mankind

who taught the immortality of the soul. They believed that on the dissolution of the body, the soul immediately entered some other animal, and after using as a vehicle every species of terrestrial, aquatic, and winged creatures, it finally entered a second time into a human body."

On this, Gibbon remarks — "The Egyptian mummies were embalmed, and their pyramids constructed, with a view to preserve the ancient mansion of the soul during a period of three thousand years, when they supposed it would be re-occupied by the soul. The intermediate state of the soul it is hard to decide — and those who most believed in her immateriality were at a loss to understand — how she could *think or act, without the agency of the organs of sense.*"

The translator of Herodotus says "the Platonic doctrine esteemed the body a kind of prison with respect to the soul. Somewhat similar to this was the opinion of the Marcionites, who called the death of the body the resurrection of the soul."

"I know," says Pausanius, "that the Chaldean and Indian Magi have been the first who asserted the immortality of the soul." Larcher says "Moses, who was anterior to Sesostrius, heard no mention of it. It is, indeed, known that the immortality of the soul was not known to the Jews but by the commerce they had with the Assyrians, during the time of their captivity." (See Larcher's translation of Herodotus.)

Dr. Good says: — "If we turn from Egypt, Persia, and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, we shall find the entire doctrine (of the immortality of the soul) left in as blank and barren a silence as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or if touched upon, only to betray doubt,

and sometimes disbelief. The tradition, indeed, of a future state of retributive justice seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, and seems to have been generally, though not universally, accredited. *But the future existence it alludes to is that of a resurrection of the body, and not of a survival of the soul after a dissolution of the body.*" Dr. Good continues — "In the sublime and magnificent poem, (the book of Job) replete with all the learning and wisdom of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before us is merely as I have stated it — a patriarchal or traditional belief in a future state, *not by the natural immortality of the soul, but by a resurrection of the body.*" He further says — "The Hindoo philosophers totally and universally denying a resurrection of the body, and supporting the doctrine of future existence alone upon the *natural immortality of the soul*, and the Arabian philosophers (among whom was Job) passing over the *immortality of the soul*, and resting alone on the *resurrection of the body.*"

In these extracts we have the paternity of my friend's doctrine pointed out. Authorities can be multiplied to almost any extent in attestation of the fact, that it is of heathen origin. Plato greatly improved and modified the philosophy of his predecessors on this subject. Ammonius Saccas, one of his disciples, introduced it into the Alexandrian school — Origen became enamored with it, and by him it was intermixed with the Christian religion, and thus the theology and literature of all Christendom become corrupted by it. It is in our churches, schools, and colleges, pulpits, and forums, and so operates on the pride and folly of the human heart, as to set the omnipotence of God at defiance. Let me give you a sample of the pride and self-sufficiency which it inspires. Marcus

Cato, a Roman statesman, who espoused the cause of Pompey, in the civil war between him and Cæsar, on hearing of the death of Pompey, determined on self-destruction. Before he struck the fatal blow, he read Plato on the immortality of the soul, and thus soliloquized — “The soul shall live forever. It must be so. Plato, thou reasonest well. Else why this pleasing hope, this fond desire, this longing after immortality? Or whence this secret dread and inward horror of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul back on herself, and startles at destruction? *'Tis the divinity that stirs within us!* ’Tis heaven itself points out a hereafter, and intimates eternity to man. Thou pleasing dreadful thought. Through what variety of untried being, through what new scenes and changes must we pass? The wide unbounded prospect lies before me, but shadows, clouds and darkness rest upon it. Here I will hold. If there is a power above us, he must delight in virtue, and what he delights in must be happy, while heaven informs me I shall never die. *The soul secure in her own existence, smiles at dissolution, and defies its power. The stars shall fade, the sun himself grow dim with age, and nature sink in years. But thou (the soul) shall flourish in immortal youth, unhurt amid the war of elements, the wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds!!*”

Here we have a grandiloquent display of the wisdom of this world which is foolishness with God. Here is a sample of the evil tendency of the doctrine. To this day our modern Christian philosophers speak of death as a *shuffling off this mortal coil.*” Like the Platonists they regard the body as a prison, and death an escape from it! Mr. Campbell and his party committed a great blunder when they incorporated this heathen philosophy with the theology and literature of their reformation. [Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS :

When I last took my seat I was presenting an argument founded on the demonology of the Bible, which I will complete before I review the doctor's last reply. Our first object is to ascertain the meaning of the word demon. And for this purpose we have already given you the result of Dr. Webster's investigation on that subject, and also the testimony of Hesiod, one of the oldest writers known to the world. This testimony is indorsed by Plutarch, who adds: *The demons were the ghosts or spirits of departed men.* Josephus, the distinguished Jewish historian, who wrote his history in the Greek language, and who of course was perfectly conversant with the meaning of this term, says, *demons are the spirits of wicked men.* *De bella jud.*, b. 7, chap. 6, 5, 3. Justin Martyr says, those who are seized and tormented by the *souls of the dead*, whom *all call demons.* *Apology*, b. 1, p. 55. To these we will add the testimony of the learned Dr. Lardner, who, after examining these and all the fathers of the first two centuries, says: “The notion of *demons* or the *souls of dead men* having power over living men was *universally* prevalent among the heathens, and believed by many Christians.” Now in view of these authorities can there be a doubt as to the meaning of this word in the days of the Saviour and his apostles, as well as before and after their days? But this the doctor says, is fairly out of the Bible. What does he mean by such a declaration. That the Bible is a dictionary? and that we have no right to appeal elsewhere for the

meaning of words? surely he would not assume a position so absurd, or is it only an appeal *ad captandum*? Well, let us bring it into the Bible and see how the case stands. My argument then is this: The inspired writers always used terms in their accredited meanings in the times when they wrote, unless they had a stated or appropriated meaning. This I believe is a universally admitted canon. Indeed to deny it would be to deny a revelation from God. For there could be no certainty in arriving at the meaning of any thing they have said. This word is found in the New Testament, as used by the Saviour and his apostles some seventy five times and in no instance have we the slightest intimation that it is used in an appropriated meaning, hence they used it in its common popular acceptation. This, as we have shown by unquestionable authority, is the *spirit of the departed dead*. Therefore the Saviour and his apostles have indisputably indorsed and taught the doctrine of *separate conscious spirits after death*. There is no way of escaping this argument unless it can be shown that we have not given the common import of this word, or that the writers of the New Testament have not so used it. Neither of which can be done. Hence, my argument here stands as firm as the pillars of heaven, and teaches the truth of my proposition as plain as the sun at noon when no cloud intervenes.

It affects the doctor as we had anticipated; for he had sought to escape from some other points by referring them to demons, whom he admits to be spirits. Hence, he attempts to create a fog of uncertainty in which he may be able to escape.

He says it cannot be determined whether demons are fallen angels, or the spirits of men, or a mongrel breed, part angel and part man! And does Dr. Field believe

that such a mongrel breed does really exist? It would seem so, or he could at least tell that demons are not mongrels! Again, if he is right in saying, that it cannot be determined whether demons are the spirits of men, or lapsed angels, &c., he thereby admits that he *cannot determine*, but what my position is true, and thus concedes that his whole effort, for the four days we have been debating, is a failure. This is evidently both candid and just.

He places great stress on the word *supposed* in Webster's definition of demon, and adds that it is all supposition and nothing else. Now, whether the ancients believed that demons were the spirits of the dead by mere supposition or by some other means, is a matter of no consequence, neither to my argument or to the fact, for it cannot be denied that such was their faith, and its being indorsed by the Saviour and his apostles removes all supposition and doubt as to its truth.

But if my argument on demonology is true, the doctor imagines that all I have said about the spirits being in prison is false!! Miserabile dictu! Wonderful to relate! And what, I would ask, have I said on that subject incompatible with the doctrine of demonology? To prove the personality of the spirit, I quoted the language of Peter with reference to the spirits in prison, but concerning the nature of the prison, there has been no necessity for making any remarks, nor is it now necessary. But will my friend deny that prisoners may have such privileges as were possessed by the demons and still remain prisoners? This difficulty exists alone in the doctor's *imagination*.

If my demonology is correct, he thinks my exposition of the case of the rich man and Lazarus is not correct!

But why? because he says it necessitates the conclusion, that the rich man might have returned and entered his brethren. Well, what of all that, what is inconsistent in the two conclusions? Why, Dr. Field says, he was confined in a place of torment from which he could not return to earth. Will he please tell us where he gets his information! He was tormented; but who told Dr. Field that he could not return? The demons asked the Saviour if he had come to torment them before the time; therefore, he thinks there can be no punishment between death and resurrection of the dead!! For the same reason he ought to conclude that there is no punishment here. The doctor has surely been taking lessons in the school of Universalism. But notwithstanding these imaginary difficulties the doctor has not dared to deny the correctness of my argument and I doubt very much if he will be able to muster the moral courage to deny it.

We have been told again and again that the doctrine of my proposition is a figment of heathen mythology. This he makes quite an effort to prove, in his last speech. And what if it had been believed by the heathens first. Would not its indorsement by the Saviour give it sufficient authority? But we need only look at the nature of his evidence to see that this often repeated statement is wholly gratuitous. The whole amount of evidence is, that somebody has said that somebody else says so. None of them give one single fact to prove it so. But one fact ever has been given, so far as I have seen, and that is alluded to in the extract quoted from Dr. Good. And who, I would ask, is this Dr. Good? Will my friend inform us what school he is of? But to the point I was about to state; it is this—that in the writings of Moses and the prophets no allusion is made to the immortality of the soul. To

this we reply, first, that it is not the immortality of the soul we are contending for, but the continued conscious existence of the spirit after death, which the doctor, however, confounds with immortality. But of this in its proper place. But, secondly, we reply that the logic by which this doctrine is shown to be of heathen paternity, is exceedingly erroneous; for it assumes that all that is from God was made known in the first development of his revelation; and that whatever is not found in these, is of heathen origin. The doctrine of separate conscious spirits, they think, is not found in these early writings, and therefore conclude this doctrine is from the heathen. By this same logic, our Universalist neighbors prove that the doctrine of future judgment and future punishment is of the heathens. And by the same logic, they might prove that the doctrine of a resurrection, and, indeed, all the most cherished doctrines of the Bible, are mere figments of heathen philosophy. For the full development of all these have been made since the dispersion.

Thirdly—It is not true that no trace of this doctrine can be found in the first books of the Bible. Job, one of the oldest writers, if not the oldest writer known, in the first text quoted in this discussion not only sustains my definition of death, but clearly distinguishes between the body and spirit, and points out their different destinies. "If he set his heart upon man; if he gather unto *himself* his *spirit* and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Again, the laws proclaimed against necromancy most clearly show that the people believed that the dead were conscious; for we cannot account for their consulting the dead on any other hypothesis.

Fourthly—If no traces could be found of it in the

earlier writings, its being indorsed by the Saviour is sufficient to insure its truth.

He says I will not plainly deny that man returns to dust. I deny plainly and emphatically that any thing returns to dust except the body. How and why the term man is sometimes applied to the body, has been explained in the early part of the debate. But he says, I call on him to explain the resurrection in harmony with my views, &c. If he will explain it in harmony with his own it would do.

He does not deny that man's identity will be lost at death on his own position, nor that it will require a re-organization. Then *cogito, ergo sum* is not true.

Now, we have not intimated that God, who made man from dust at first, can make man from dust again, but that there must be a re-creation, and not a resurrection, to do this, as every one must see. But he is under no obligation to harmonize the Bible with any man's difficulties. It is well he feels thus free, for otherwise he would be obliged to do, with reference to the difficulties arising from his philosophy, what cannot be done. But he thinks I am in the same condition, so far as the body is concerned. This I have explained in a former speech, by showing that death is a separation of body (or matter) and spirit, and that the resurrection is, therefore, a re-union of spirit and matter, and this being true, the same particles of matter in the same body are no more necessary in order to a re-union, than that the same particles should remain at all times the same here to perpetuate the union. Hence his difficulties about a resurrection on my view, is wholly imaginary.

His intimation that the principles I have thrown in his way from science are false, is wholly gratuitous. For if they are not true, there is nothing true in science. The

insinuation is evidently made because he cannot meet them. Then let him show that they are not true.

The doctor does not deny that his materialist principles denies the existence of God, and is, therefore, atheism. And this, my friends, is the substitute he would make for that pernicious figment of heathen mythology, from which he has come to free us! How kind! how benevolent! But he tries to console himself a little by asking me how two substances can occupy the same space at the same time! He is quite a philosopher, truly! His difficulty here proceeds from a very fruitful source of error with him — a confounding of terms which are in themselves distinct. The term matter is applicable to what is appreciable by the senses, and is opposed to spirit. The fact that spirit is substance, neither renders it *matter* nor *nothing*. Every living human being furnishes an example of two substances, body and spirit, occupying the same space at the same time. So there is no aid at this point. The better way, doctor, would be to give up your notions of materialism altogether.

Our attention is again called to the case of Samuel. The doctor does not deny that if Samuel's body had been dissolved, it must have been re-organized by the witch. But he says there is no evidence that it needed re-organizing — the death of Samuel was *immediately* before the affair between Saul and Samuel. How any one can read the connection, note the chronology, and come to such a conclusion, I am not able to see. According to the most approved chronology, Samuel died in the year 1060 before Christ, and the affair between Saul and Samuel occurred in the year 1056, after he had been dead and buried four years. And yet there is no evidence that the body needed re-organizing!! Will he tell us how long a body must

be after death before it dissolves. And will he also tell us where he learns from the parable of Dives and Lazarus that the dead can make no communication to the living without a resurrection?

He justifies his assault on Mr. Campbell, by charging me with having made a similar one on Dr. Thomas. This is altogether gratuitous. I have neither reviewed nor attempted to review Dr. Thomas's views at any time during the discussion. Campbell's views are public property, I grant; and I did not complain simply of the fact that he noticed Campbell's views, but that he should pass so far out of his way, and leave my speech unnoticed, to make war on brother Campbell.

In answer to my question, what is the spirit of man, he repeats his definitions, considerably revised, and asks if I am now satisfied. I answer no, for he has only avoided the question. This word, like all other words, has a leading meaning. There is something in man emphatically called the *spirit*, and it was for this I inquired, but in vain. He at first professed to quote his definitions from Webster, some of which are neither found in Webster, or any other standard author on the language. Where, for example, is the vital principle given as a definition of the English word *spirit*? Again, there are many texts where the word *spirit* occurs, in which none of his definitions will answer. Take, as an example, Acts xxiii, 8, "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor *spirit*." Now, can any one believe that the Sadducees denied either *breath, life, thoughts, mind, one's self, or person*? So that none of these definitions will do here, even were they all correct?

Our attention is again called to the gender of *pneuma*. That my position with regard to this word is right, no

scholar will question. When the doctor first blundered on this, it was a new argument, subversive of my whole theory. But after I exposed it, it would prove nothing by itself, and yet he cannot give it up. It is original. And I am called on again for an example where the human spirit, in any of its offices, is in any other than neuter gender. Lest we are wearied by his importunities, I must accommodate him. I have just demonstrated that the word *demon* is used with reference to the spirit of man. It is either masculine or feminine. Angels are spirits, and are masculine, as he admits; and I feel confident that had I time I could find an example of the human spirit being in the same gender. Again, I have shown that *psuche* (*soul*) is used in some texts for spirit. This word is feminine gender. In order to make my definition of *soul*, in the sixth chapter of Revelation, ridiculous, he makes a definition for me, and substitutes that. Why this, but from a consciousness that he could not expose mine. Give my own, doctor—the immaterial, intelligent part of man—and then submit the substitute to an intelligent public.

[Time out.]

DR. FIELD'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

We are notified in the scriptures that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to *seducing spirits and the doctrines of demons*. I am almost afraid we have this prediction verified on the present occasion. We have some very interesting teaching on the origin, nature, and influence of this mysterious class of

beings. My friend, Mr. Connelly, seems to know all about them—their privileges, powers of locomotion, and their whereabouts. Not being able, however, to determine these knotty questions from the Bible, he obtains abundant light from Josephus, Justin Martyr, and Dr. Lardner. It is a little surprising, however, if this information is so abundant and reliable in the records of profane history, that such men as George Campbell, and Alexander Campbell should have been so much at a loss to decide who the demons were! Whether they were the ghosts of dead men or lapsed angels, was not settled to their satisfaction by either Christian or heathen writers. But all doubt is now solved by Josephus, Dr. Lardner, and my friend, Mr. Connelly. As to Justin Martyr, there is no authentic evidence that he ever wrote a syllable upon the subject. He is one of the early Christian fathers to whom any thing and every thing is now and then ascribed. There is no doctrine however false and unscriptural which may not be defended on the authority of one or all of the Christian fathers. This fact goes to show that either their genuine writings have not come down to us, or, that if they have, they are so corrupted and interpolated as not to be depended on. As it happens I have the Apocryphal New Testament containing the writings of several of the contemporaries and successors of the apostles, which I have read carefully, and I find nothing in them favorable to his views, but every thing against him. Justin Martyr is not one of them; but admitting that he wrote what is attributed to him, it is no proof of the point assumed, for the best of all reasons, it receives no countenance from scripture.

I take it, my friends, that the heathen philosophers were better judges of what they believed than either

Josephus or Dr. Lardner. Josephus was very fond of the marvellous, as his story of the Dead Sea, and other matters equally fabulous, abundantly prove. He was very accommodating in his religious sentiments, especially to his captors.

In Stanley's lives of the philosophers, a synopsis of which was published in 1804, giving their views on this subject, the souls of men are placed next in rank to demons.

My friend, Mr. Connelly, assumes that the gods worshipped by the heathen nations were the souls of their heroes, and were called demons. Then the souls of dead men are, in some cases at least, gods. This is giving them greater dignity and promotion than that promised by Satan; for he only told Adam and Eve that they should "be *as* gods," not gods or demons as you have been told, but *like* them.

There is no dispute as to the fact that the heathen nations, or at least a majority of them, believed in the separate existence of human spirits. But it is by no means certain that the mass of them considered them identical with demons. That individuals among them did, is quite probable. There is no evidence, whatever, that either the prophets, the Saviour, or the apostles indorsed the dogma that the ghosts of men and demons were one and the same. On the contrary, a marked distinction is made in the New Testament between *men and devils*. The latter are said to believe and tremble, and are, doubtless, the fallen angels; for whom the fires of the second are prepared. It is something singular, that my friend, Mr. C., takes no notice of this class of beings. In his eagerness to prove that the spirits of dead men are doing all the mischief in the world, he overlooks the devil and his

angels. He says I assert that it cannot be determined whether demons are the ghosts of men, the fallen angels, or the mongrel progeny of angels and men. There is no difficulty in my mind on this subject; it is with Alexander Campbell, as I showed from his critical notes on the word. Notwithstanding he is the most profound demonologist in America, he does not know who they are, or what the ancients thought about them. The word *demon* is generic, and means a *knowing one*, and is as applicable to the fallen angels as to the spirits of men, even supposing them to exist consciously after death, as my friend's demonology teaches.

The idea that the Saviour and the apostles sanctioned the dogmas of heathen philosophy with regard to demons and the human soul, is monstrous. He might as well affirm that, because the heathen used the word *god* in their mythology, therefore the Saviour, by using the same word, sanctioned their superstitions and absurdities with regard to the Creator and Governor of the universe. The etymology of the word *demon* shows that it might, with all propriety, be used by the Saviour and his apostles as the name of beings different and distinct from those to whom it was applied by some of the pagan philosophers.

We are told that communications can be made from the dead to the living without a resurrection; and that Dives could have returned to this world; for those in hell have many privileges, such as traveling about from place to place, not at all incompatible with their imprisonment! This will be good news to the wicked, who will not need a Lazarus to give warning to their friends, or even give them a drop of water. Having the right and power to pass the impassable gulf, they can escape the torturing flame, and go where they please! This is *certainly* good

news, for which they are indebted to the science of demonology, as expounded on this occasion.

He says if there is no punishment between death and the resurrection, there is no punishment here! The gist of this argument is, that if men are not punished while dead, they cannot be while alive!

He asks, with an air of surprise, who is Dr. Good, and what school is he of? I supposed every scholar knew something about Dr. John Mason Good, the celebrated author of the Book of Nature. So far as the question in debate is concerned, he was of my friend Mr. Connelly's school. In his lecture on the nature and duration of the human soul, he traces the doctrine of its immortality to its source, and that, too, for the purpose of proving it. The fact that he finds nothing of it in Arabia, the country of Job, or in the records of the Bible, but in the Vedas, Zendavesta, and mythological creeds of the heathen world, is an irrefragable argument against his conclusions.

He says, by assuming that his doctrine is of heathen origin, I adopt the logic of the Universalists, when they undertake to prove that there is no future day of judgment and future punishment; because such ideas were entertained by the heathen; and by this process of induction, he thinks the most cherished truths of the Bible might be disproved. I reply, that the doctrine of a future judgment, future punishment, and a resurrection from the dead, are clearly and indubitably taught in the Bible, regardless of what heathen mythology may say on these subjects.

But he thinks he finds a trace of it in Job. But, unfortunately for him, Job does not say so. The assertion, as I have shown, rests on the most flimsy kind of inferential reasoning, contradicted by explicit declarations of this ancient writer.

But, after all, necromancy is the magic wand that removes the veil, and discloses to us the world of human spirits. Like the magnetic telegraph, it brings us intelligence which cannot be obtained by any other agency, and thus settles the question that the dead have knowledge! Necromancy can dig into the lower parts of the earth, unlock *hades*, and make revelations from the ghosts of dead men, that neither prophets nor apostles ever learned or dreamed of!!

This imposture must be accredited as inspiration itself, "because the Jews believed it." And what if they did believe it? Does that make it true? No, my friends. The very fact that it was an imposture, a delusion, is the reason why God forbid their having any thing to do with it.

He denies, positively, that man returns to dust. Nothing, he says, but the body does. This assertion contradicts the text he quoted from Job, which says positively that man *does* return to dust. It not only contradicts Job, but other inspired writers. He and they for it, then.

He admits that a new body is created for the spirit. All that is needed for this purpose is matter. This, then, settles the question that, according to his views, there is no resurrection of any thing whatever. The spirit is not raised from the dead, and the old body is lost or dispensed with, and a new one made!! Was there ever any thing in reformation theology more monstrous?

I will now notice one of his sophisms. It is this. He defines *substance* to be something different from *matter*, and then tells us that they can occupy the same place at the same time, therefore, I am an atheist for not believing certain deductions of his from these premises! This is not what I asked him. I called on him to say whether

two *substances* can occupy the same place at one and the same time; and not whether *matter* and *substance* can do it. He has evaded the answer, and expects to hide the point in this fallacy. I call upon him again to say whether two *substances* can occupy the same place at the same time?

He says Samuel's body was buried four years before Saul called on the witch to raise him; and for proof of this he depends on the marginal notes of the publishers of the Bible! Let any one read the history of the transaction, and he will see that he has no authority for his chronology. It is after the Philistines had assembled for war against Israel, that the death of Samuel is mentioned, and before the first battle was fought, his resurrection is mentioned. (See 1 Samuel xxiii.)

He says, none of my definitions of spirit will do in Acts xxiii, 8, where it is said the Sadducees deny the resurrection of both angel and spirit. Why not? One of my definitions of spirit is a person or man. Now try it. They denied the resurrection of both angel and man. And that is just what they did do, for they did not believe in the separate existence of spirits.

It is really amusing to see how my friend, Mr. C., proves that human spirits are sometimes in the masculine gender. The process is somewhat circuitous. He first proves, to his own satisfaction, that demons are human spirits, and they are of that gender. While in the body they are neuter, but when out of it they are masculine! He next assumes, that in certain cases the word soul and spirit mean the same thing, and in these instances the soul is feminine, and, therefore, the spirit is in that gender too! Yet he has told us that the word spirit is *always* in the neuter gender!

That the word soul is sometimes found in the feminine gender, is all true, but it is all assumption that in the instances in which he finds it in the feminine gender, it means the spirit.

I have called on him to say in what sense the spirits in *hades* are dead, but he will not answer. Evidently he feels that this is a hard question—one which cannot be answered without subverting his doctrine, or involving himself in the grossest absurdity.

Once more I ask him to tell this intelligent audience in what sense those who are in *hades* are dead? If he do not remove or explain this difficulty his cause is lost—irretrievably lost.

I will now treat you, my friends, to a few more specimens of modern Platonism. And, first, I will read an extract from a late number of a Cumberland Presbyterian paper, called the Theological Medium. It says: "The soul of the impenitent, after death, will be in a state of suffering. The body will be in the grave. When the judgment trumpet shall have sounded, the soul, like a guilty thing, started on a fearful summons, will come forth from the prison house of woe. *Convulsed with anguish, swelled with rage, and weeping tears of blood*, it will return to earth and seek the spot of earth where the body was interred. Hovering over the grave, I can, methinks, hear it say—'Come forth, thou cell of my former iniquity; come forth, thou hated, detested companion of my former guilt; we have sinned together, we have violated God's commands together. Come forth, and partake of my suffering and punishment!' The grave rends. Wide open it cleaves. Up rises the body. It responds to the soul, 'Hail, my old companion. I know thee well. I hate, I detest, I abhor thee. Thou horrid

guilty thing, why comest thou hither? But I know thy errand. It is but meet. We sinned together, and should be tormented together. Come, let us unite in perpetual and jarring discord. We lived on earth in sin and rebellion; it is but proper that we should together be punished in that dismal world, where punishment knows no end."

Here we have quite an interesting colloquy between the soul and the body. The confinement of the soul in prison until the judgment trumpet sounds, without the privilege of returning to earth, and the resurrection of the old body, cannot be harmonized with my friend's views; although the Medium is considered orthodox on the subject of the soul, with perhaps a single exception, that of its *weeping tears of blood*. Some of the *evangelicals* might dissent from such gross ideas of materiality.

But here is another precious morsel, which I extracted, a few days ago, from one of the Louisville papers:—
"DEATH OF JOHN TOMLIN.—The death of this gentleman is announced in the last number of the *West Tennessee Whig*. He died recently in the Charity Hospital, New Orleans. Domestic troubles and reverses of fortune had for many years rendered his life unhappy, and forced him to seek relief in the fatal cup. In his death, a noble and generous spirit has taken its exit from earth, and now mingles in a more congenial throng beyond the Stygian river." Platonism and Grecian mythology have placed this unfortunate inebriate in as good a condition as could be desired. Beyond the Stygian river! In the Elysian fields, no doubt. A much better place than a coffee house or the Charity Hospital.

Here is another. "Died, on the 11th inst., in Lagrange, Ky., —, youngest son of the late — and —, formerly of Louisville, aged fourteen months.

Of little — well may it be said,
That in the spring-time of life he fled
From earth to a home in the skies,
Where such as he never, never dies."

This is very consoling, and yet it is more than likely, there was bitter lamentation in consequence of this happy transition.

These Platonic speculations and utopian ideas, which anticipate and forestall a day of judgment, and a resurrection of the dead, when men shall be rewarded according to their works, pervade our Christian psalmody. Our hymn books are full of such *painted moonshine*. They abound with sentiments calculated to destroy the true hope of the gospel. Our cemeteries bear testimony to the prevalence of the wide-spread delusions of the vain philosophy of this world, against which we are cautioned. The following is a transcript of an epitaph on a tombstone in one of our cemeteries: —

"Now in her snow white shroud she lies,
Her lily lids half veil her eyes,
As if she looked with wild surprise,
Up to her soul in paradise.
Her hands lie folded on her breast,
Crossed like the cross that gave her rest;
She looks as if some heavenly guest
Had told her that her soul was blessed."

Compare this with a passage in Ovid, who wrote before the Christian era, and you will see that it is pure, unmixed Platonism:

"Nor dies the spirit, but new life repents
In other forms, and only changes seats;
Then death, so called, is but old matter dressed,
In some new figure and a varied rest.
Thus all things are altered. *Nothing dies.*
Death, so called, can but the form deface,
The immortal soul flies out to seek her fortune!"

[Time out.]

MR. CONNELLY'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

BRETHREN AND FELLOW CITIZENS:

With this speech, this discussion, on my part, will close, according to agreement. I must, therefore, notice a few things in the last speeches of my friend, before I recapitulate my arguments.

In his last speech this forenoon, he asked me the profound question, how much the spirit knew before it came from God, and supposed that, if I was right ingenious, I might make it know quite as much after it returns to God, as it did before it came from him. To this I replied, without making any pretensions to ingenuity, that the logic of this question was this — as the spirit knew nothing before it was created, therefore it knows nothing after it is created. In his first speech this afternoon, he furnishes quite a specimen of that *fairness* of which he boasted to us on yesterday, by saying that *I infer* that because the spirit is conscious *now*, it must be so *after death!* Now, I infer no such thing. But I do say that the fact that the spirit knows nothing before it came from God, or before it was created, militates no more against its consciousness after death, than it does against its consciousness now.

His remarks about Mr. Campbell's violation of his guarantee, in his offer of union with all, on the Bible alone, are, of course, irrelevant, and out of place. But as the subject is before us, I would simply remark, that if Dr. Field, or any one else, has understood Mr. Campbell's proposition for union as an offer to embrace every visionary or speculatist, and fellowship every thing that such men

may imagine is taught in the Bible, they wholly misunderstood both Mr. Campbell and this reformation. We guarantee the right of private judgment, it is true, and even propose a compromise in matters of difference, by ceasing to speculate about such matters, and to speak of them only as the Bible speaks of them; but surely this is not incompatible with the Christian obligation to *detect* and *reject* heretics. And as to reformers being ashamed to cry against religious intolerance, that is all fustian.

We will now notice a few things in the doctor's last speech. And I confess that if mere declamation and irrelevant cant were argument, I might have no hesitancy in admitting myself vanquished in this discussion. For I doubt not that you will agree with me in the conclusion, that my friend has few equals in this kind of argumentation.

I would here remark, that there are three methods of meeting an argument. First, and as I conceive the only correct one, is to show by logical analysis that its foundation is untrue, or that its conclusions are not legitimate. The second and more convenient one, is to declaim against it as obscure and impertinent. And third, when a show of replication is desired, when the argument cannot be refuted, to state something else as the argument of an opponent, and reply to that. And I am sorry that the last two or three speeches of my friend furnish us with an illustration of this last method. Take a few examples. First—he objected to my interpretation of the case of the rich man and Lazarus, as denying a future judgment, because Dives was in torment. Thus arguing that, if there was suffering after death, and before the resurrection, there could not be a judgment after the resurrection. To this I replied, by showing, by the same logic, the fact that their suffering here would also preclude and deny the

necessity of a judgment; which the doctor meets by saying, we are told that if there is no punishment after death there is no punishment here! As different, you perceive, from what I did say, as day is from night. Hence his thrust is made at a man of straw, of his own creation.

Second—With regard to the resurrection, I show that as death is a putting off this tabernacle—the body—and is, therefore, a separation of spirit and matter, the resurrection is a re-union of the spirit with matter; and that, as the same particles of matter are not necessary to the union in life, they are not necessary to a re-union or resurrection. This, the doctor says, settles the question that, according to my views, there is no resurrection; and he is horrified beyond description. But does he point out what there is in this so alarming? Not at all. But he does not deny, what every well informed gentleman and lady knows to be true, that there is a constant change of matter in every living body, and, consequently, the same particles of matter are at different times in different bodies. Now, to relieve his friends from the horrors of my position, and console them with that sublime and cheering doctrine, which has been kept secret for ages and generations, except to the favored sons of France, and a few of their American sons and converts, that man is all body—will he explain to us how the same particles of matter can be a part of two or more bodies at the same time? For in view of this philosophical fact on his views of resurrection, this *impossibility* must be accomplished. For his views of man and the resurrection, require that the same matter—nothing more, and nothing less, and nothing different—should be re-organized, and act as before. And he asks me to say if this cannot be done; to which I answer,

that it would be just as impossible for the same particle of matter, at one and the same time, to compose a part of two or more different bodies, as for hills to exist without hollows; as impossible as for God to lie, or as for God to deny himself. A new creation there may be, but there can be no resurrection on these principles. And I need not, my intelligent friends, point out to you the absurdity of rewarding or punishing new creatures for the actions of others, that have been before; which would necessarily be the case, if my friend is right. He evidently finds it easier to affect to be horrified at my position, than to disprove it.

But what, I would ask again, is there so monstrous in the thought that death is a separation of body or matter, and spirit? And if this is true, and I defy any man to show to the contrary, either from the Bible or philosophy, what is there so terrible in the position that the resurrection is a re-union of spirit and matter?

Third — He told us at the beginning of the discussion, that that which is immaterial is nothing. This position, I show, is atheism; that it denies the existence of God. Instead of *trying* to prove that my conclusions are not just, he asks me to show that two substances can occupy the same space at once. This I have done. But he now says "I define *substance* to be something different from *matter*, and *then* show that they can occupy the same space at the same time, therefore he is an atheist." Now, Dr. Field's mind is certainly not so obtuse that he cannot see that his statement is but a feeble effort to obscure the premises from which my conclusions are drawn; and thus, if possible, destroy the force of what he could not otherwise meet. But this effort is too flimsy, although connected with the epithet "*sophism*."

But he did not, he says, ask me to show that matter and substance can occupy the same space at one time, but that two substances can! I have no hope, my friends, of getting the doctor to see the difference in the meaning of the terms, for there is none so blind as he who *will* not see; but with the intelligent, who are not pre-determined to maintain a cause at all hazards, there is no difficulty in seeing the force of what I have said; to which I will add, that all *matter* is *substance*, but all *substance* is not *matter*. The term *substance* includes all that is meant by *matter*, and more too; it comprehends *spirit* as well as *matter*. Hence, when I show that matter and spirit occupy the same space at once, I show that two *substances* occupy the same space at the same time.

Again, every Christian is an example of two immaterial substances occupying the same space at once — their own spirit and the Holy Spirit. The demoniacs are also examples sometimes of *more* than two. In one there was a legion. We are sorry thus to deprive the doctor from his *only* solace in his atheism, viz., that I am in the same condition. But it must be so. We would exhort him, however, to give up his *materialism*, whose legitimate result is, as we have shown, atheism. No ingenuity can save materialism from atheism. For if God is *matter*, as materialism affirms, then he is not *spirit*, as the Bible declares; consequently, the Bible, the only book that reveals him, is false. If he is not matter, then, according to Dr. Field, who is here as the champion of materialism, he is *nothing*. I defy the doctor to give any other legitimate conclusion from his own exposition. The cry of sophism will not answer.

Fourth — To show that the word person or man — one of his definitions of spirit — will do in Acts xxiii, 8, he

tells us that the text says the Sadducees deny the resurrection of angel or spirit, and says this is just what the Sadducees did do. I need not tell you, my friends, that Dr. Field *knows better* than this. Does he not know that the word *of* is not there. Is he so hard pressed for evidence that he must manufacture scripture that will answer his purpose; so it seems. In reply to his frequent insinuation, that the doctrine of my proposition is substantially the same as that preached in the garden of Eden; I would remark, that his addition here is just such as was made to the word of God on that unfortunate occasion. So that the example of his satanic majesty may, perhaps, be found quite as near his own door.

But he blunders upon the truth in spite of this effort to pervert the text. For he says they (the Sadducees) did not believe in the separate existence of spirits; thus conceding, at last, that the term spirit here means separate spirit. This is true, and the doctrine is indorsed by the apostle Paul; for he here claims to be a Pharisee, and these points of the Pharisees' faith are named by the writer evidently to show in what respect the apostle held with them. Hence this illustrious man may be added to the doctor's list of Platonists. He might, perhaps, find as good examples of what he is pleased to call Platonism, in the letters written by this holy man to the churches at Corinth and Phillippi, and some others, as some of those he has given us. Some of his examples, it is true, show that their authors should be seeking a place in some asylum. And were it not for the apology found in the fact that *something must* be said, we should conclude that he who would introduce them on an occasion like this, should seek a place there too. But what does he design to prove by them, for I confess I can see no point in them;

unless it is this, that those men believe in the existence of the spirit after death, therefore there is no such existence! If the doctor is so near out of argument as this, it is surely fortunate for him that the debate is about to close.

Our attention is again called to the gender of *pneuma*; and I confess that an apology for so often adverting to a matter confessedly of no consequence, would seem necessary. We should, however, excuse the doctor, I think, for so often pressing this matter upon us, from the fact, that it is perfectly natural for a father to be thus attached to his own offspring, though sometimes, as in the present case, they are confessedly worthless.

He says I affirm that the spirit is sometimes masculine and sometimes feminine, and yet *always* in the neuter gender. This may be set down as a fifth example of stating something else to reply to, rather than reply to what I did say.

I said that *pneuma* is always in the neuter gender, in all its applications, whether applied to God, angel, the Holy Spirit, or the spirits of men. And hence, if the fact that the spirits of men are not conscious because the word applied to them is neuter gender, the same fact would prove that God, the Holy Spirit, and angels, are not conscious either, as the same word is applied to them. The doctor then shows that words in the masculine gender is sometimes applied to these, and calls on me to show that any words are applied to the spirit of man — which I have done — showing that both masculine and feminine nouns are applied to it. But these no more change the gender of *pneuma* than does *pneuma* change the gender of these words.

My success in showing that *pseuchee* and demon are used in the sense of spirit in the texts I have cited on that

point, must be left to an enlightened public. There are a few things, however, in his remarks on demonology, which I must not omit to notice, as this will be my last opportunity.

It seems that my friend is determined not to see the point for which I quote profane authors on this subject, though I feel satisfied that you have no difficulty on this subject. I proved by these, that that word, at the time, was used for the spirits of men. Has the doctor shown that this is not true? Not at all. He says he has read some things which rather go against that position, but has he told us what they are? Not a word, and evidently will not, as by the rules of discussion he has no right to. But why did he not, if he could, when he had an opportunity? He has insinuated, it is true, that the quotation from Justin Martyr is not genuine, but does he give us any evidence? None. He also says the word *might* have been applied to fallen angels, but has he given us any evidence that it *was* so used? Not a word. Then, I ask, as the Saviour and the apostles have used this word without giving any appropriate meaning, how could he deny my position? Not by becoming horrified and emphasizing the word monstrous. Will he be able to set aside my argument, however horrified he may feel about it?

But it is marvelous that Alexander Campbell should not have discovered this point, if it is so plain in the profane writings of these times. There is no man in the nineteenth century, who has more clearly and pointedly expressed himself on this subject than Alexander Campbell, in an address on that subject, delivered in Nashville, some years ago, to which I acknowledge my indebtedness for some very important suggestions. The idea that these spirits are in prison, and have, or had some liberty,

troubles my friend exceedingly. He cannot comprehend it at all. And how would it help his difficulty if the term meant the fallen angels? Are they not imprisoned—reserved in everlasting *chains* of darkness unto the judgment of the great day. There is no evidence that any profane author ever applied the term, in any case, to fallen angels. Hence, if the Saviour had applied it to them, he would have said so. He could not have been understood without such an explanation. His failure to give any explanation, shows that he used the term in its common import, consequently he has, beyond all cavil, indorsed my proposition by his own use of this term.

When the inspired writers use the word god, they explain it, so that no doubt is left as to whether the living God or the heathen gods were meant.

With regard to the time that Samuel had been dead when he appeared to Saul at Endor, we only ask that you will read attentively the connection, and you will perceive that, after the death of Samuel, occurred the affair between Nabal, Abigail, and David. After this, David is pursued by Saul for some time; and after Saul leaves off pursuing him, he resides in the land of the Philistines for sixteen months. All this required time, and all occurred after Samuel's death, and before the affair at Endor. So that my statement about the time, does not depend wholly on the marginal references, as the doctor would have us believe.

I will now give a brief recapitulation of my argument, and it must, of necessity, be very brief, as I perceive my time is nearly out.

We have shown, by a number of texts from Job, Solomon, Peter, &c., that there is a separation of body and spirit at death, and that death is, consequently, a separa-

tion—a putting off this tabernacle. And that though the term is sometimes applied to the body, which *alone* goes to the dust, while the spirit returns to God, it no more affects my position than the fact that the word Christ or Lord, is sometimes applied to his body, which is the seed of David, affects the divinity of the Son of God.

We next showed a number of texts, that personality is an attribute of the spirit; and that there is no personality without consciousness. On this point, he tried to show that dead bodies were personalities, and, therefore, spirits. But he could give no evidence, except the fact that the personal pronouns are applied to them. By the same evidence, we showed that all animals and inanimate things would be persons, and, according to the doctor, spirits; and thus showed the utter worthlessness of his objections to my position. We next showed that the apostle recognized the power of existing in or out of the body, and then proved by the Saviour that *all the dead live* to God. We then presented numerous examples where conscious intelligence is found with those that have died, showing, at the same time, that the texts quoted by the doctor, declaring that the dead have no knowledge, are restricted by their contexts to a knowledge of salvation, or the means of salvation, &c., and thus harmonizing them with every proposition, and with all the teachings of the Bible. We have also shown, that the dead are said to sleep because there will be a resurrection, and not because they are unconscious; and concluded our argument, by showing that the demons mentioned in the Bible, are the departed spirits of men. Whether these all do not most completely and triumphantly establish my proposition, we are willing to submit to an enlightened public.

Many of our friends are gone, and we are fast hastening

after them, and the great matter with us, after all, is so to live that we may be approved by our blessed Saviour, when he comes to destroy *hades*, to bring back the dead, and to be glorified in his saints, and to be adored in all them that love him.

We cannot conclude without expressing our gratitude to our heavenly Father, that he has enabled us to pass through this discussion with so much kindness and good feeling; and to the moderators, for the dignified manner in which they have presided over us; and to you, my friends, for the patient and attentive hearing you have given us. [*Time out.*]

DR. FIELD'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS :

Before I sum up the rebutting arguments adduced in this discussion, I must notice some points in my friend's last speech.

He complains that some of his arguments have not been fairly stated and answered. If I have failed to do so, it has not been because I did not desire it. Throughout this debate, I have endeavored to make every issue as plain as language would allow. Brevity and simplicity have been studied, with a view to a clear and intelligible presentation of every argument and deduction bearing upon the question. It can be no advantage, whatever, to my cause to manufacture and demolish "men of straw." It will be for you to decide, my friends, whether or not this complaint is well grounded.

He assumes the perpetual and unceasing consciousness

of the spirit from the fact of its creation. For the same reason, and upon the principle of analogy, he might infer the perpetual sensibility of the body, for that also is created. And why may he not extend this inference to the brutal creation. If *any* thing must necessarily continue conscious forever because it is *created*, then *all* things may. But there is another difficulty growing out of this postulate. Paul says that the whole creature is made subject to death. If, therefore, the spirit is a creature, as he asserts, then it is subject to death, as well as the body.

When God created man, he breathed into his nostrils the breath or spirit of life, and then, not before, man became a living soul, or person. Here was an organized man, to which God applied the motive power, and the result was, the machinery of this organic matter was put in operation, and produced the phenomena of intellectuality and the moral passions. But for sin, it was decreed that he should return to dust. When, therefore, he is disorganized, the breath of life returns to God who gave it, and the constituents of the man are in precisely the condition they were in before he was created. Until it pleases the Almighty Creator to re-construct the dust, and again infuse into it the principle of life, he remains in his primeval condition, as it respects sensibility, consciousness, and intelligence. Having once lived, and formed his character for good or evil, God, for wise and just purposes, will re-organize and restore him to life, that he may be judged and rewarded according to his deeds.

In reference to Mr. Campbell's platform of Christian union, and his guarantees of the right of private judgment, were this the proper time and place to speak fully of such matters, I could easily prove that he has changed his ground, not only on these subjects, but on all others,

except *immersion for the remission of sins*. The universal excuse made by his followers for his course, is *that we do not understand him*. As he has a perfect right to narrow his platform, and make his own terms of fellowship, as experience and reflection may suggest; it would be much more to his and their credit to frankly acknowledge their mistakes. If he were too latitudinous in the commencement of his reformation, and has since found it necessary to restrict himself to a more sectional bond of union, candor and justice alike demand an acknowledgment of the fact, and not to seek to hide his changes in the threadbare apology that he is misunderstood. Now, to show that I do not misunderstand him, I will make but two out of many extracts taken from his writings, definitive of his views of Christian union. He says: "It is not our object to make men think alike on a thousand themes. Let them think as they please on any matters of human opinion, and upon doctrines of religion, *provided they hold the head Christ, and keep his commandments.*"

But we are told that Mr. Campbell was willing that men might *think* about doctrines provided they did not *talk* about them. In reply to this, I will quote another extract. He says: "We long since learned the lesson, that to draw a well-defined boundary between faith and opinion, and while we earnestly contend for the faith, to allow perfect freedom of opinion, *and of the expression of opinion*, is the true philosophy of church union, and the sovereign antidote against all heresy." (See his Debate with Rice, page 797.)

Here you see, my friends, that the door was thrown wide open for free discussion. The utmost freedom to think and speak was proposed and guaranteed, and the only *sine qua non* to union and fellowship with this new

reformation, already in its dotage, was *faith in Christ as the head of the church, and obedience to his commandments.*

While on this subject I will remark, that it has been several years since I read his lecture on demonology and witchcraft, delivered before some literary institute in Nashville, and do not now recollect precisely what his views were with respect to the origin of demons, or the supernatural power of witches. But I take it for granted that more reliance is to be placed in his critical notes appended to his New Translation, as presenting the sum of his knowledge on the subject, than in a popular lecture, designed, perhaps, as much to elicit investigation as to instruct. The one goes to the world in a permanent form, and the other as a perishable and fugitive production.

With regard to death being a separation of body and spirit, a putting off this tabernacle, I would remark that all this has been sufficiently canvassed in former speeches, and need not now be repeated. I would simply add, that such expressions as putting off, and putting on, clothing and unclothing, import no more than a change of relation or character. It is a kind of imagery peculiar to the Hebrew writers. "Put on the Lord Jesus Christ," "Put off the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man," "Put on charity," "Be clothed with humility," are examples of this mode of speech. We have a striking illustration of it in Isaiah xlix, 17. It is as follows: "He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation on his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak."

You see from this, my friends, how unsafe it is to infer a doctrine from a metaphorical expression.

He defies any man to show that the resurrection is not a re-union of spirit and matter. If he will say a re-union

of the spirit or breath of life with the matter of the human body, I will not controvert this favorite idea of his.

But we are informed that the matter of the human body has passed through so many changes in the lapse of years, that this is impossible. That during a long life, the body has been wasted and reproduced so many times, that if all the matter which successively entered into its composition, were collected together, it would make a huge mass. Now, my friends, this is sheer nonsense, the result of taking things for granted without proof. The framework of the human body, from adult to old age, remains the same. The bones, brain, lungs, heart, and, indeed, all the vital organs, are permanent and unalterable, except by disease, which can do but little more than so impede their functions as to destroy life. It is the interstitial matter alone which is wasted and reproduced. In the greatest state of emaciation, the human frame has all of its vital organs, bones, muscles, arteries, nerves, cartilages, membranes, and ligaments, that it has in perfect health. And when it is considered, that the body is composed of solids and fluids, this fact is susceptible of a rational explanation. When, from any cause, nutrition ceases, the fluids and interstitial matter are drawn upon by the absorbents, in order to sustain life, and when exhausted, death ensues. Notwithstanding many of you have grown old, and have, perhaps, been often reduced by disease, you are still conscious that you have essentially the same body you had when young. The shape of the body, the contour of the face, and other peculiarities of your physical structure, assure you that the philosophy of my friend, Mr. Connelly, is utterly fallacious.

He adopts a maxim of the Cartesian philosophy, that when we cease to think we cease to exist. *Cogito, ergo*

sum — "I think, therefore, I am" — was the starting point in the researches of Des Cartes, who believed it to be necessary to doubt every thing, even his own existence, until demonstrated by some process of ratiocination. The first thing to be done by this philosopher, in the acquisition of knowledge, was, to prove his own existence. This he did by framing this novel syllogism. Like my friend, Mr. Connelly, he thought that it would be impossible to exist without thinking. Therefore, the moment he ceased to think, his identity would be lost. This is precisely the ground taken by my friend, in all that he has said against the unconsciousness of the sleeping state, and the resurrection of the body that dies. He believes that the man proper must perpetually think, whether asleep, or dead, or alive, in order to maintain his identity, and make him accountable for his acts. In the predicate of this logic, he commits a *petitio principii*, or begs the question. For, in order to make his conclusion run parallel with the predicate, he should first prove that he *thinks*. If, then, it can be proved that at any time he ceases to think, it follows, that *he is not*, or ceases to exist. My friend, Mr. Connelly, like Des Cartes, must maintain that the mind of man never suspends its operations. Now, I think I have shown that it does every time we sleep soundly. There is not a physiologist or philosopher under the sun, worthy of the name, who would deny this. One of the greatest writers of modern times, who is a strenuous advocate for the immortality of the soul, says "that in a state of general fatigue, or exhaustion of the physical powers, not only the will, but the whole of the internal senses concur in the common torpor or inertness that is produced, and when we advance to a state of lethargy, or dead, senseless sleep, *we are without thought, or an idea of*

any kind, but still the sleep is natural and healthy." He further says "that in a complete paroxysm of apoplexy, no man has ever been conscious of a single thought or idea. The same thing occurs in suspended animation from drowning, hanging, or catalepsy." Again he says "sleep is the death or torpitude of the voluntary organs, while the involuntary continue their accustomed actions. *Death* is the *sleep* or torpitude of the whole." Webster says in sleep there is a suspension of consciousness and of the intellectual powers. (See his definition of the word.) These facts attest the fitness of the word *sleep*, when used as a trope, to represent *death*.

If the reasoning of Des Cartes, and my friend, Mr. Connelly, on this subject were true, it would be necessary for *spirit* Connelly to watch *body* Connelly every time he sleeps, for the purpose of assuring him, when he awakes, that he is the same man! [*Laughter.*]

He reiterates several points which have been sufficiently discussed, such as the distinction between substance and matter, the gender of *pneuma*, the impossibility of there being a God upon my principles, and the possibility of a plurality of substances occupying the same place at the same time; all of which I will dismiss with a single remark. He says that all matter is substance, and that substance includes all that is meant by matter, and more too. With this explanation of his, I ask, is it possible for a legion of substances, which is matter in some form, to occupy the same place at one and the same time? Common sense answers no.

I have had no desire, my friends, to enter into any speculations with regard to the essence of the Deity. No man but a fool will say that there is no God; nevertheless, it is impossible for mortal man to find him out to perfection

— to comprehend the *modus* of his being. The ancients generally believed him to be corporeal. Many of the fathers of the church held the same view. By the word *spirit*, the Greeks and Romans equally understood a subtle matter, extremely dilated, but consisting of parts. These views were perpetuated in both the Greek and Latin churches for several centuries. The materiality of the human soul was not renounced by the Church of Rome till the time of St. Augustine. The American sage, Thomas Jefferson, deist as he was, well remarked, in a letter to John Adams, in 1820, that “when once we quit the basis of *sensation*, all is in the wind. To talk of immaterial existence, is to talk of *nothing*. To say that God, angels, and the human soul, are immaterial, is to say that they are nothing. At what age of the church the heresy of immaterialism crept in, I do not know; but a heresy it certainly is — Jesus taught nothing of it.”

As he has reduced the time about two thirds, between the death of Samuel and the trick practiced on Saul by the witch, I need not spend time in noticing this point, further than to say, that if the prophet was raised at all, it must have been from the place where he was. The narrative informs us that *he was buried in his tomb at Ramah*.

The slight inaccuracy in a quotation which I made from Acts xxiii, where it is said the Sadducees denied the resurrection of angel and spirit, amounts to nothing. The preposition *of*, it is true, is not there. But what of that? Nothing is gained or lost on either side by leaving it out. The sense of the passage is precisely the same. Syntactically, it is understood.

I will now proceed to sum up my arguments, with the preliminary remark, that it is a rule of criticism among

theologians, that scripture is a key to scripture; and that whenever one part of scripture appears to contradict another, the analogy of the whole Bible, and unbiased reason, must determine which of the contradictions ought to give way. Keeping this rule in view, I will submit the following summary: —

1. I have proved that the spirit of man is not a personal, intelligent entity, separate and distinct from the body. No such thing is taught in scripture, and can, at most, only be inferred from certain ambiguous texts. That the utmost that can be proved respecting it, is that it is but a part of man, and not the man himself. That all animals have spirits, and if a deathless nature is inherent in *spirit*, then brutes are as immortal as man.

2. That man, in his present living state, is called a *spirit*, and in that meaning and application of the term it is a personality. But after death no such attribute is ascribed to his spirit. So far from it, personality is still affirmed of that which remains, and is visible. And as the word *spirit* is often used in the sense of person, it may, without an abuse of the laws of language, be applied to him when dead. The same is true of the word *soul*, which I have shown is applied to dead bodies.

3. That the dead know not any thing, and that all their thoughts have perished.

4. That in *hades*, where my friend, Mr. Connelly, locates the spirits of the dead, there is no *knowledge*, nor device, nor work. That in that state or place, they neither praise nor thank the Lord, for the best of all reasons, *they cannot do it*.

5. That they are asleep, and that, too, in the dust of the earth. That natural sleep, when complete, is a state of entire unconsciousness. That in such a state, all the

voluntary organs, and likewise the intellectual operations, are suspended, and, in many respects, it is an appropriate figure of death.

6. That future life depends upon a resurrection from the dead, and not on any thing naturally and necessarily immortal in the constitution of man. That such a thing as a deathless spirit, nor never-dying soul, is not once mentioned in the Bible. And if there be no resurrection, then all the dead have perished for ever, which could not be upon the hypothesis that spirit, in its very nature, is intelligent and indestructible.

7. That in *hades*, the place of departed spirits, according to my friend, *they are dead*, from whence they will be summoned to judgment. That in the sense in which men are dead in the sea, they are dead in *hades*. If not so, there is an end of all rational rules of interpretation.

8. That we do not obtain the victory over death when we die, but when Jesus comes, who is the resurrection and the life. Until then, we must continue in the bondage of corruption, under the power and dominion of the last enemy.

9. That the texts quoted by my friend, Mr. Connelly, in proof of his proposition, can be explained in harmony with the foregoing texts. But if correctly construed by him, they make the Bible a contradictory book. That they are more or less metaphorical, parabolical, or prophetic; and that there is nothing beyond the establishment of a favorite dogma, that would justify an effort to make them conflict with positive and unfigurative declarations of scripture.

10. That the doctrine of an immortal soul, which survives the death of the body, is of heathen origin, and has descended to us through the Alexandrian school,

where it was introduced upon principles of compromise with the disciples of Plato.

11. That if my friend's doctrine be true, it undervalues and supercedes the necessity for the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and a day of judgment, and in its tendency, otherwise mischievous. That it in fact virtually, if not in effect, denies a resurrection altogether, and is susceptible of an easy and consistent affiliation with the doctrines of Emanuel Swedenborg.

12. That the gods of the heathen, in the days of Moses, were idols of wood and stone, the representatives of mere imaginary beings; and necromancy was a deception — a fraud — for which reasons penal laws were enacted against idolatry, and for the suppression of witchcraft in all its forms.

Last of all, my friend, Mr. Connelly, appealed to the polytheism and demonology of the heathen nations of antiquity, as furnishing conclusive evidence of the truth of his proposition. The predicate of the argument from this source is, that the gods of the heathen, in the days of Moses and Christ, were the ghosts of dead men; that Moses, by enacting laws against the worship of these gods, acknowledged their personal existence; and that the Saviour and the apostles, by using the word *demon*, endorsed the demonology of Greece and Rome. I called upon him to say, explicitly, whether Baal, Moloch, Ash-toreth and Dagon, were real or imaginary beings. But he has declined answering the question. If he did not, he should have known, that from the time of Abraham to that of Moses, and indeed, long after the Israelites had occupied the land of Canaan, the gods of Chaldea, Persia, and Egypt, were siderial and elementary. They worshiped the sun, moon, and stars — called in scripture

"the host of heaven" — and also air, water, fire, and the earth. To this practice they were probably led by their researches into the science of astronomy. Mars, Mercurius, Jupiter, Saturn, Venus, &c., were the names given to the planets. In process of time, they gave their ancient kings the names of their gods. This was done to raise them to honor and veneration with the people. They sometimes put the names of several of their planetary deities together, and applied them to their kings, intimating thereby, that they were persons under the extraordinary care and protection of their gods. Thus the kings and great men of Babylon were called Peleser, Belshazzar, Belteshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonassar, and other names of the same kind; to explain which I would remark, that Pil, Pal, or Pel, or Baal, Bal, or Bel, which was written *Belos* in Greek, and sometimes Phel, or Phul, or Pal, for they are all the same word, signifies lord or king, and was the name of the sun, whom they called the *Lord or King of heaven*. Belta, or Beltes, which signifies lady or queen, were the names of the moon, which they called the *Queen of heaven*. Azar was the name of Mars. Gad signified a troop or host, and Nabo was the name for the moon. This explains the compound names of their kings. Pel or Pel-Azar — a man in special favor with the sun and Mars. Nabonassar or Nabo-Azar — a favorite of the Moon and Mars. Nebuchadnezzar or Nabo-Gad-Azar, or one favored by the Moon, the host of heaven, and by Mars. Dr. Hyde thinks that Bel was the name of Jupiter, Belta of Venus, and Nabo of Mercury.

That the Chaldeans, Babylonians, Persians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, thus deified the sun, moon, and stars, and subsequently the elements, we have the concurrent testimony of Diodorus Siculus, He-

rodotus, Pausanius, Eusebius, and even Plutarch himself. On this point all ancient historians, sacred and profane, agree. Baal-Zebub of the Phœnicians, was the lord of Theis, by which they meant the sun. The Ammonites worshipped the same god under the name of Milcom or Moloch. The Arabians worshiped the sun, under the name of Baal-Peor or Baal-Phegor. It was into this idolatry that the Israelites fell, during their pilgrimage through the wilderness of Idumea. From this practice, the Asiatic nations did not depart for many ages after the exode of the Israelites from Egypt.

As an evidence that the ancient deities of these nations were not men, or their disembodied spirits, their images were representatives of beasts, of various kinds, and combinations of the most singular and phantastic forms. This was the idol worship interdicted by the law of Moses, not because their gods were real living beings, but because of its folly and absurdity.

For the same reasons laws were enacted against necromancy and other practices, prevalent in those times, as calculated to delude and disappoint the ignorant and credulous. With but few exceptions, this is the view taken of necromancy and the whole subject of witchcraft by hosts of the most learned and pious men of the so called orthodox churches of Christendom.

Whatever may have been the opinions of later times, with regard to the ghosts of dead men and demons, there is no satisfactory evidence that the writers of the New Testament used the term demon to denote the same class of beings, real or imaginary, to which, it was applied by some of the mythologists of Greece and Rome. As the word imports simply a *knowing one*, it was entirely appropriate to the lapsed or fallen angels, so often mentioned

and recognized in scripture, as having a real and positive existence.

It cannot be doubted, I think, by the impartial student of the Bible, that the Christianity of the present day, both Catholic and Protestant, is a compound of the gospel, Judaism, and Paganism. The doctrine I have combated on this occasion, belongs to the latter; and though long consecrated and believed, it is not invulnerable. For

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

The debate is now closed, and, in view of the facts and arguments submitted, you will make up your award: In conclusion, allow me to exhort you all, my friends, to study the holy scriptures. Be prepared, when death shall come, to fall asleep in Christ, in the hope of a glorious and triumphant resurrection to life and joys eternal. In this happy state, I hope, through the grace of God, to meet you, and my friend Mr. Connelly, where the storms and troubles of this life will be ended, death shall be swallowed up in victory, and paradise shall be vocal with the songs of the redeemed. Until then, I bid you all an affectionate farewell.

[After a short and appropriate speech from one of the Moderators, expressive of their high sense and appreciation of the good order and decorum observed during the discussion, the audience was dismissed with the usual benediction.]