

DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

REV. JOHN L. SHINN,

OF THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH,

AND

ELDER MARK H. FORSCUTT,

OF THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS,

HELD AT

ROCK CREEK, ILLS., AUGUST 10TH—13TH, 1875.

PLANO, KENDALL COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.

1875.

370 62

copy

P R E F A C E .

THE discussion reported in the following pages arose from the Rev. J. L. Shinn preaching against the doctrines in controversy as held by the Latter Day Saints and by eminent christians of many other churches, and by his throwing out a challenge to the christian world generally, and to Elder Forscutt in particular, to discuss these points with him. Brethren Walter Head and Wm. Lambert being present, accepted the challenge in behalf of Elder Forscutt.

These brethren wrote to Elder Forscutt to ascertain whether he would meet Mr. Shinn, and received the following reply :

LEWISTOWN, Fulton County, Illinois, April 16th, 1875.

BRO. A. W. HEAD, *Sonora, Illinois:*

I am engaged for the present at this place, Bryant, St. David's, Canton, and Peoria—when through here, I can come to Sonora, if necessary, and if Mr. Shinn wishes to debate with me the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, or any other doctrine we hold, he can readily be accommodated. You can hand him an Epitome of our Faith, and tell him I am ready to affirm any part or all of it, or to deny if any chooses to affirm an opposing faith. King James' Translation of the Bible to be the standard reference on doctrinal matters, standard authors on Antiquities of America, if the Book of Mormon be assailed; time to be equally divided, each to choose one Moderator, and the two Moderators and audience to choose a Chairman, who shall not belong to the Church of either disputant.

Your brother in Christ,

MARK H. FORSCUTT.

On receiving the foregoing letter, the brethren waited on Mr. Shinn, who wrote the two propositions hereinafter found, and discussed between him and Elder Forscutt.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Shinn did not accede to the request of Elder Forscutt to extend the debate still further, as there would have been, without doubt, very much of interest to the Bible student, which the limited time given prevented the introduction of.

It is, however, now sent forth, with a prayer that the truths, thoughts and views presented may be reviewed carefully by the reader in the light of the revelations of God's Holy Word, and that in its perusal each reader may obtain light and comfort from the promises of Him who is able to perform all that He hath promised.

RULES OF DISCUSSION BETWEEN M. H. FORSCUTT

AND J. L. SHINN.

1st.—The discussion shall be held at Rock Creek Township, Hancock County, Illinois, commencing Tuesday, August 10th, 1875, and shall continue four days. There shall be two

sessions each day. The forenoon session shall commence at ten o'clock, and the afternoon session at two o'clock, and each session be of two hours' duration. The debate shall close at four o'clock on Friday, August 13th.

2nd.—Each session shall be composed of two speeches by each disputant, which shall be alternate half-hour speeches. The affirmative shall open, and the negative shall close the debate on each proposition. In the final speeches no new matter shall be introduced without mutual consent.

3rd.—Each party shall choose a Moderator, and they two shall choose a third, if necessary. Their duties shall be the usual duties of Moderators of such assemblies.

4th.—Each party shall occupy four sessions in the affirmative of his respective proposition; but the time may be extended by mutual consent.

5th.—Each session shall be opened and closed by prayer, the disputants alternating in the opening service, either by themselves, or by some one of their appointment.

6th.—The parties mutually agree to be governed by "Hedge's Rules of Logic" in this discussion, as follows:

"Rule 1st.—The term in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined, that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them.

"Rule 2nd.—The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and desire for truth, with himself, and that it is possible therefore that he may be in the wrong, and his adversary in the right.

"Rule 3rd.—All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect, in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided. All expressions may be considered as unmeaning which contribute nothing to the proof of the question, such as *desultory remarks*, and *declamatory expressions*, all *technical ambiguities* and *equivocal expressions*.

"Rule 4th.—Personal reflection on an adversary should in no instance be indulged in. Whatever his private character, his foibles are not to be named, nor alluded to in a controversy. Personal reflections are not only destitute of effect in respect to the question in discussion, but they are productive of real evil.

"Rule 5th.—No one has a right to accuse his adversary of indirect motives.

"Rule 6th.—The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

"Rule 7th.—As *truth* and *not victory* is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be on either side should be examined with *fairness* and *candor*, and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by arts, or sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy."

The following are the propositions agreed upon by disputants, and their order:—

Prop. 1st. The Bible teaches that the coming of Christ to judge the world is now past.

J. L. Shinn affirms.

Prop. 2nd. The Bible teaches the literal resurrection of the body from the grave.

M. H. Forscutt affirms.

Signed,

M. H. FORSCUTT.

J. L. SHINN.

DISCUSSION BETWEEN

M. H. FORSCUTT AND J. L. SHINN.

PROPOSITION FIRST.

“The Bible teaches that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past.” J. L. Shinn, affirms; M. H. Forscutt, denies.

Elder J. L. Shinn, in his opening speech, said:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I never enter into theological discussion without feeling my weakness and my inability; but I am nevertheless proud on this occasion, that I have to meet my worthy brother, in whom there is reposed the utmost confidence, in view of his past efforts. From all that I had heard along the road from my home to this place, of the giant powers of my brother, I began to feel that I should be but a mere David in this contest; but I believe, being armed with the implements of truth, that God will empower the sling of David.

I have nothing to lose in this discussion; for I conceive the object to be to gain knowledge of the truth, rather than victory. Truth never lost anything by debate or criticism, and it never can. In order that the lines may be distinctly drawn, and our position clearly understood by this congregation, I take the privilege here, to state what I conceive to be the popular view upon the subject before us for discussion. I am willing to admit that my brother has an advantage in this discussion; viz; the popular view taken by the people is in his favor.

I now state the popular view upon the subject of judgment. The popular view of the coming of Christ is, that his coming in his kingdom, in power; in glory; in clouds; with his angels, to render judgment upon mankind according to their works, will be a literal, personal coming at the end of the mediatorial reign; or at the end of the world, in connection with the resurrection of the dead, when all the dead will be congregated together and judged; yea, and re-judged in a day; and this is represented as the final judgment. Upon this I read from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, of the Church of Latter Day Saints, section 76, par. 4.

“These are they who shall go away into the lake of fire and brimstone, with the devil and his angels, and the only ones on whom the second death shall have any power; * * *. And this is the gospel, the glad tidings which the voice out of the heavens bore record unto us, that he came into the world; even Jesus, to be crucified for the world, and to bear the sins of the world, and to sanctify the world, and to cleanse it from all unrighteousness; that through him all might be saved whom the Father had put into his power, and made by him; who

glorifies the Father, and saves all the works of his hands, except those sons of perdition who deny the Son after the Father hath revealed him; wherefore he saves all except them; they shall go away into everlasting punishment, which is *endless* punishment, which is *eternal* punishment."

Again, sec. 45, par. 7:

"But before the arm of the Lord shall fall, an angel shall sound his trump, and the saints that have slept, shall come forth to meet me in the clouds; wherefore, if ye have slept in peace blessed are you, for as ye now behold me and know that I am, even so shall ye come unto me and your souls shall live, and your redemption shall be perfected, and the saints shall come forth from the four quarters of the earth."

Par. 10: "And then shall the heathen nations be redeemed, and they that knew no law shall have part in the first resurrection; and it shall be tolerable for them; and Satan shall be bound that he shall have no place in the hearts of the children of men. And at that day when I shall come in my glory, shall the parable be fulfilled which I spake concerning the ten virgins; for they that are wise and have received the truth, and have taken the Holy Spirit for their guide, and have not been deceived; verily, I say unto you, they shall not be hewn down and cast into the fire."

Again, sec. 18, par. 2:

"Again it is written eternal damnation; wherefore it is more express than other scriptures, that it might work upon the hearts of the children of men, altogether for my name's glory; wherefore, I will explain unto you this mystery, for it is meet unto you to know even as mine apostles. I speak unto you who are chosen in this thing, even as one, that you may enter into my rest; for behold, the mystery of Godliness, how great is it? For, behold, I am endless, and the punishment which is given from my hand is endless punishment, for endless is my name; wherefore—Eternal punishment is God's punishment. Endless punishment is God's punishment. Wherefore, I command you to repent, and keep the commandments which you have received by the hand of my servant Joseph Smith, Jr., in my name."

I am to affirm in this debate an opposite theory from the one already advanced. I am to affirm that the Bible teaches, that the coming of Christ to judge the world is now past. By his coming, I mean his revelation, his presence in power; his coming in his kingdom, in power, in glory, in clouds, with his angels; to judge the world, and reward mankind according to their works.

From Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, I give the following, on the Greek word *Crisis*, it being the same so often translated judge:

"*Crisis*, from the root of *krino*, to separate, to determine, to decide. First: In medical science, the change of a disease which indicates its event; that change which indicates recovery or death. It is sometimes used to designate the excretion of something noxious from the body, as of the noxious fluids in a fever. Second; (Greek) *Krino*, (Latin) *Creno*, to separate, to judge, to decree, to condemn. The decisive state of things, or the point of time when an affair is arrived at its height, and must soon terminate, or suffer a material change."—See Webster on *Crisis*, and also on *Crime*.

Once more, I remark, that the Day of Judgment began with and is the day of Christ's meditorial reign. It will have an end when that reign is finished, and the kingdom delivered up to God, even the Father; and will end with the destruction of every evil, and the purification of all souls.

By the word world, in the proposition, I mean mankind in general; but we here give, as the Bible definition of the word judgment, the scriptural laws, or commandments of God to the Jews, found in Deuteronomy 7: 11, 12.

"Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the *judgments*, which I command thee this day, to do them. Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these *judgments*, and keep and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers."

Second, as descriptive of punishment; Isaiah 34: 4, 5:

"And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig-tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse to *judgment*."

Isaiah 5:9: "In mine ears said the Lord of hosts, Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant."

Isaiah 32: 1: "Behold a King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment."

Third,—Descriptive of government, rule:

1 Samuel 8: 5: "And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways; now make us a king to judge us like all the nations."

Judges 16: 31: "Then his brethren and all the house of his father came down, and took him, and brought him up, and buried him between Zorak and Eshtaol in the burying-place of Manoah his father. And he [Samson] judged Israel twenty years."

Acts 24: 10: "Then Paul, after that the governor had beckoned unto him to speak, answered, Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself."

I presume that this explanation of the subject will be deemed sufficient. I now allege my first argument; namely, that God judges in the earth. Here I propose to establish a precedent in favor of the thought of Christ's judging the world; or of that judgment being past, my brother; *i. e.*, the coming of Christ to judge.

Proverbs 11: 31: "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner."

Genesis 15: 13, 14: "And he said unto Abram, know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward [now, mark it, *afterward*,—after they are *judged*], shall they come out with great substance."

Ezekiel 21: 28-30: "And thou, son of man, prophesy and say, Thus saith the Lord God concerning the Ammonites, and concerning their reproach; even say thou, The sword, the sword is drawn: for the slaughter it is furbished, to consume because of the glittering: while they see vanity unto thee, while they divine a lie unto thee, to bring thee upon the necks of them that are slain, of the wicked, whose day is come, when their iniquity shall have an end. Shall I cause it to return into his sheath? I will judge thee in the place where thou wast created, in the land of thy nativity."

Psalms 58: 11: "So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous: verily, he is a God that judgeth in the earth."

Ps. 105: 7: "He is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth."

Eccles. 3: 16, 17: "And moreover, I saw under the sun the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and the place of righteousness, that iniquity was there. I said in my heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time there for every purpose and for every work."

Prov. 7: 11: "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish: and the hope of unjust men perisheth."

Jeremiah 9: 24: "But let him that glorieth, glory in this that he understandeth and knoweth me; that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth."

My brother will please notice the tense here, "I am the Lord which exercise," in the present tense, "loving kindness and judgment in the earth." If you will turn to Deuteronomy, twenty-eighth chapter, you will there see the blessings promised by God to the obedient, and the punishments promised by him to the disobedient. I read Deuteronomy twenty-eighth, from the first to the sixty-eighth:

"And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high, above all nations of the earth; and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God. Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field. Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store. Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall cause thine enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face; they shall come out against thee one way, and flee before thee seven ways. The Lord shall command the blessing upon thee in thy store-houses, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto; and he shall bless thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

I now omit from the twenty-ninth to the fifty-eighth :

"If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance. Moreover, he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed."

This fixes the fact, my respected congregation, that God rewards mankind in this earth, in this life; and in this connection I call your attention to Isaiah twenty-sixth, ninth :

"With my soul have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit within me will I seek thee early: for when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the earth will learn righteousness."

Ps. 67:4: "O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth. Selah."

Ps. 62:12: "Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according as his works shall be."

Ps. 119:75: "I know, O Lord, that thy judgments are right, and that thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me."

Ezekiel 36:19: "And I scattered them among the heathen, and they were dispersed through the countries: according to their way and according to their doings *I judged them.*"

"I JUDGED THEM."—Heb. 2:2.

My brother will remember the point I make here. Paul says to the Hebrews, "For if the word spoken by angels," (the law was given by angels), "was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward;" this settles the matter forever, in regard to the judgment of the old world up to the time of the Messiah's reign. We read here from the "Christian System," the views of that noted and scholarly man, Alexander Campbell :

"God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.' Adam rebelled. The natural man became preternatural. The animal triumphed over the human elements of his nature. *Sin was born on earth.* The crown fell from his head. The glory of the Lord departed from him. He felt his guilt and trembled; he saw his nakedness and blushed. The bright candle of the Lord became a dimly smoking taper. He was led to judgment. He was tried and condemned."—Christian System, page 28.

Once more; Genesis 28:17:

"And he was afraid, and said; How dreadful is this place; this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

Now we notice, that the judgment came upon Adam, in the day of transgression, as we learn from Campbell in his criticism upon this subject. We remark, that these arguments are abundant, showing that God judges *in the earth*, and God would not remove his judgment seat from the earth, without giving his children due notice; and this he has nowhere done. I will select here some of the most remarkable instances of crime recorded in the Bible, showing that they have received punishment in this life; in this world. The case of Cain. The testimony clearly shows, that he was judged and punished in this life for the crime which he committed, in the murder of his brother.

Gen. 4:11: "And now *art* thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

We call your attention here to Genesis 3:14 to 19 inclusive:

"And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over

thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

We notice here the fact, that God did judge mankind, according to his purposes from that period or time; and there was in this instance, an immediate judgment and punishment. In regard to the punishment of the Antediluvians, we call your attention to Genesis 7 : 11 to 24 :

"In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights. In the self same day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark. They, and every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, every bird of every sort. And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life. And they that went in, went in male and female, of all flesh, as God had commanded him: and the Lord shut him in. And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bear up the ark, and it was lifted up above the earth. And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters. And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered. Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days."

Now we notice again, the punishment is in this life. There is not a word said about any other punishment; about a future day of judgment beyond this life; if there is a future day of judgment beyond this life, it is my brother's duty to show it; and in this connection I present again the point upon which I rely. The apostle Paul says, that every transgression and disobedience *received*, in the past tense, a just recompense of reward, and he was doubtless correct in this statement, as the evidence I have just adduced plainly shows.

Punishment of Sodom; Genesis 19 : 23 to 26 inclusive.

"The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt."

Is it not remarkable, that all these accounts of punishment, leave out a judgment beyond this life.

Second Peter, 2 : 4 to 6 inclusive :

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemning them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly."

Again we notice the correctness of the apostle's statement in Hebrews 2 : 2 : "Every transgression and disobedience, received a just recompense of reward." "If the word spoken by angels was steadfast," *how shall we escape now, a just recompense of reward*, "if we neglect so great salvation, which in the beginning began to be spoken by the Lord, and was conferred unto us by them that heard him."

Punishment of the Jews; Lamentations 4:1 to 12:

"How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed! the stones of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street. The precious sons of Zion, comparable to fine gold, how are they esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of the hands of the potter! Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones: the daughter of my people is become cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness. The tongue of the sucking child cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirst: the young children ask bread, and no man breaketh it unto them. They that did feed delicately are desolate in the streets: they that were brought up in scarlet embrace dunghills. For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her. Her Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing was of sapphire: their visage is blacker than a coal; they are not known in the streets: their skin cleaveth to their bones: it is withered, it is become like a stick. They that be slain with the sword are better than they that be slain with hunger: for these pine away, stricken through for want of the fruits of the field. The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children: they were their meat in the destruction of the daughter of my people. The Lord hath accomplished his fury; he hath poured out his fierce anger, and hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof."

Ezekiel 22:17-22: "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger and in mine fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you; yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof."

The moderator here called Time, and Elder Shinn took his seat.

Elder Forscutt's reply to Elder Shinn's first argument, was as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It becomes my duty too, as well as the duty of Elder Shinn, to explain clearly, or as clearly as I may be able to do, the position which I expect to take in this discussion.

At the outset, I would express to you the same thought that he did; namely, that our desire should be the obtaining of *truth*, rather than *victory*; and with this as the object of the disputants and of the audience, the discussion is sure to be productive of good to us all. If we let no desire other than the one expressed arise over this discussion, the debate will terminate in feelings that will meet my mind most heartily. To this end may good order be established, and remain with us.

In stating before you the position which I expect to take, I do so by reading from "The Epitome," a printed fly-sheet declarative of our faith and doctrines, article sixth, as follows:

"We believe in the doctrine of eternal judgment, which provides that men shall be judged; rewarded, or punished, according to the degree of good or evil they shall have done."

I also read for your information and mine, in brother Shinn's handwriting, the proposition we are now discussing: "The BIBLE TEACHES that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past." This, Elder Shinn affirms.

I have listened with some degree of pleasure, and with some little degree of astonishment, to the line of argument adopted by our friend in presenting the "evidence" which he has collated, to prove that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past. Nearly all the evidences that he has produced, (and they have been quite voluminous), from the scriptures, have been in support of a theory that none of us will dispute, that God's judgments are past and present, as well as future. That the judgments referred to as having taken place in the past ages, were judgments which came upon God's people, upon those whom

God had before time blessed with peace, as a punishment for transgression, is, I think, clearly manifest. They may be properly denominated temporal judgments, or national judgments. The apostle Paul reasons thus upon this subject:

"Some men's sins are open before hand, going before to judgment: and some they follow after."—1 Tim. 5: 24.

It seems that our friend has been collating, and presenting to us in evidence, cases wherein the sins that men had committed, to a very great degree, went beforehand to judgment.

I believe that, in many instances, the transgressions of God's people go beforehand to judgment; and that God imparts to them the blessing of pardon for their obedience, or they suffer the penalty for their transgression. That they may receive this pardon, or suffer this penalty, their transgressions go beforehand to judgment. Some would have us believe, that they may be judged twice by God for the same offense; but I can not believe that God is so unjust as this theory would make him out to be; first to punish for sin in this life, and still lay up their sin against those punished, in order that it may be punished by him again in the life to come.

I think, however, that the evidences presented to us teach some very good things; among the rest, the principle that when God pronounces a judgment upon a people, that judgment is sure to follow, if the conditions upon which the judgment is predicated remain attached to the people.

The doctrine therein contained is in harmony with the doctrine of "free agency," or moral agency, if you please. The doctrine of man's agency must be received and enforced, if need be, as a part of the statutory law on which judgment is to be administered; otherwise, there could not justly come to man any privileges for obedience, or any punishment for disobedience. God reserved woes which he pronounced against Israel, should they transgress against the law, and promised them blessings should they obey the law; and true to this principle, recognizing their moral agency, the things promised or threatened came upon them, whenever the conditions upon which they were promised or threatened attached unto them. This rule we should keep in view while noticing the argument of our brother.

Now, just so sure as the woes pronounced by God to be realized in this life were realized, just so sure the woes pronounced by him to be realized in the life to come, will also be realized. The promises are of the same nature, and come from the same source; therefore they will receive a like fulfillment. Many woes have been pronounced against individuals, that have not been realized in this life, and either must be fulfilled in the life to come, or will not be realized at all.

What the brother has read from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants is very instructive to me, and the testimonies therein make clear to the understanding the views held by the Latter Day Saints respecting this doctrine of eternal judgment. The accent placed by the brother upon the words, "eternal," "endless," etc., is very proper, and will serve as a good introduction to the thoughts I wish to present before you.

If these words form the pith of the sentence in which they are found, then we must find what original meaning the words have attached unto them in this book; (taking up the Book of Covenants); and I conclude that the extract read for us is sufficient to make this known: "Eternal punishment is God's punishment. Endless punishment is God's punishment;" and the reason for this is, we are told, that "*endless* is my name," therefore the punishment administered by him is punishment by the endless one, or endless punishment.

Now, while we believe, with almost all christians, in future judgment and future punishment, we do not agree with them in believing, that the punishment

sentenced by that judgment shall be one that shall last throughout what is called all the eternities of God.

We believe that that punishment is *eternal* punishment, because administered by the *Eternal One*.

We believe it is *endless* punishment, because it is administered by the *Endless One*.

This punishment may last an age, or it may be like the punishment of Jonah, spoken of in the Bible, where the word "*forever*" is used, that lasted only three days.—Jonah 2:6. Whatever it may be that it represents, whether a long or a short period, it is, in the sense in which we apply it, an eternal punishment, because administered by an Endless, Eternal One. This rule will be found of great service, in the examination and consideration of our views of the scriptures on this question.

I do not exactly agree with my brother, respecting the judgments of God being administered exclusively upon this earth, and that therefore, there is nothing attaching to, or explanatory of, a future punishment.

The argument drawn from the statement, "I am a God that judges in the earth," we believe to be a very good one. God does judge in the earth. We believe with Brother Shinn that God's judgments will be administered in this earth; but we differ from him in the thought, that these judgments are *all* administered while in the mortal state. We believe that mankind will be called forth again, and that then the judgments of God will be rendered and come upon them according to the deeds they shall have done. This judgment we, too, believe will be rendered on earth, not in heaven. There is a difference between us only as to the time when, and the conditions upon which this judgment shall be administered.

God's language is peculiar. "Every day, every year." He may be angry with the wicked every day or every week, and yet his judgment may be deferred until a stated time, instead of punishing them every day, or every week. Though the nations are under condemnation every day, and some of the individuals in them receive punishment of conscience every day; yet God's judgments, other than this by the conscience, may be deferred. This judgment we may call a reproof of conscience, which is administered every day. Hence, taking these thoughts into consideration, we can see how, without the use of any especial figure of speech, God is angry with the wicked every day. His anger is manifested in the threat of punishment, and yet this punishment may be turned away by seeking and gaining the righteousness which is by faith, showing conclusively, that the punishment is not administered every day.

In the fifty-ninth chapter of Isaiah, the Lord deprecates the sad degeneracy of Israel, in that justice, judgment and truth have all departed, and equity ceased to be ministered among them. He then declares with a beauty, a force, and a grandeur, the unchangeable decree of his heart, to accomplish that in which Israel has failed, both as to justice and judgment, as well as to salvation,—aye, and as to vengeance also. Let us read this grand array of purpose in Deity:

"And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him: and his righteousness, it sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak. According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay, fury to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies; to the islands he will repay recompense."—Vs. 16-18.

The reference to Isaiah 32:1, is a happy one for our view of the future judgment; but a damaging one for Elder Shinn's, taken with the context in thirty-first and remaining portion of thirty-second chapters, as it places the judg-

ment at the time of Israel's redemption, instead of now, as Elder Shinn argues. We quote from 31 : 3-5 inclusive :

"When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they shall all fail together. For thus hath the Lord spoken unto me, Like as the lion and the young lion roaring on his prey, when a multitude of shepherds is called forth against him, he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them: so shall the Lord of hosts come down to fight for mount Zion, and for the hill thereof. As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also he will deliver it; and passing over he will preserve it."

And from thirty-second chapter, thirteenth to seventeenth verses inclusive :

"Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers; yea, upon all the houses of joy in the joyous city: because the palaces shall be forsaken: the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens forever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks; until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted a forest. THEN judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, *quietness and assurance* FOR EVER." Isa. 32:13-17.

The quotation made by our brother from Psalm 58 : 11 is terribly explained by verse ten :

"The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked."

Those made from Acts 24 : 10 and Proverbs I pass by, the one as irrelevant, the other as answered by my answer to Isaiah. Isaiah 32 : 1.

The brother asserts that, "His judgments are fixed in the earth." This I think we shall understand more fully, when we realize *how* his judgments, so fixed, are to be administered upon the earth. Again, and in another and an important sense, His judgments are eternal; because the punishment that we shall receive, will probably affect our condition for ever. God will not add stripe to stripe, but the punishment we shall receive, because we have disobeyed the law of God, in its effects never can pass away, so as to require to us for time and opportunity lost.

The brother has told us, in connection with the quotation which he has made, that there is nothing said about future punishment; and argues from this, that there is no set day, in which God will judge the world. He says that in the case of Adam there is no intimation of any future punishment. Well; grant it, for argument's sake. The words spoken to Adam, were concerning what was then his existence, his dwelling then on this earth; consequently, to that place and the conditions upon which he might dwell there, they only related. The law, with its blessings and penalties, related to his dwelling on the earth; to his possession in the earth; to his inheritance on the earth. The whole promise, the whole command, the whole condition or conditions, in the case of Adam referred to the earth, and to the earth only. We think, therefore, that no particular argument can be logically drawn from this absence of reference to a distinct future state.

We are cited to the case of Cain. We will notice the testimony of the Scriptures in this case; which is, that after Cain had murdered his brother, God talked with him, and pronounced upon him his curse; to which Cain replied :

"My punishment is greater than I can bear. * * * And it shall come to pass that every one that seeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him SEVEN-FOLD."

Let me here ask the question, What could be a *seven-fold* punishment? If the death that came to Abel was a punishment due to sin, according to the generally received idea; if Cain had to be a vagabond in life, and afterwards die, whence comes the punishment that could be seven-fold greater, if there be no *future* punishment? Cain seems to have had prosperity principally in this life,

in so far as temporal things are concerned, 'tis true, yet his punishment was severe, and in so far as his conscience condemned him, and banishment from God's presence deprived him of spiritual blessings, almost insupportable to one born to such high honors. Yet he could die but one death, or suffer but one lifetime. If then there be no future punishment, how could there be punishment seven-fold greater than his? How could it be multiplied seven times in the life that now is?

Our attention is called to the testimony given by Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, 2:2, 3: "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience *received*,"—(our brother says the word is in the past tense that refers to rewards; but we have one here in the future tense immediately following),—"a just recompense of reward; *how shall* we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him."

Here we notice first that those who transgressed against the law which was given by angels, were visited with punishments according to their transgression. If that brought to the transgressor a just recompense of reward, how much more so shall it be with us, if we neglect the law of our Redeemer, that higher law, the law of life in Christ Jesus. "How shall we escape, if we *neglect so great salvation*."

If there be no punishment to be received, after or beyond this life, what great salvation is referred to? What is the use of this adjective "great," in this connection, if there is to be no salvation hereafter, which some will "neglect" to obtain.

We all feel and know that there must be a dividing line drawn, between this great salvation, or the condition of those who receive it, and the condition of those who do not. A class is represented as having been called to this great salvation, and in considering this we naturally ask, What is this great salvation? Was it the salvation given under the law? No, for the apostle tells us, that that could never make the comers thereunto perfect. The blessings promised under the law were chiefly earthly, pertaining to the earth—blessings of the heaven above, and of the deep beneath; blessings on their lands, their flocks, and their herds; everything which pertained to this life, was promised under the law of carnal commandments. This "great salvation" must, then, be above this present condition of things on the earth, and must be in the world to come. If the reward is to be in a life to come, then the judgment must belong to that life also, the result of which is to be condemnation or salvation.

If there is no greater salvation than the one given to us in this life, in the condition we are in upon the earth, there is, contradistinctively, no great salvation.

We pass along a little farther, and we find in the tenth chapter of Hebrews, what the apostle understood, thus; at least, I think so. Beginning with the twenty-third verse and ending with the twenty-fifth verse, we read:

"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised: and let us consider one another, to provoke unto love, and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching."

The definite article *the*, points out some especial day,—"*as ye see the day approaching*." The Book of Covenants is right, Brother Shinn, for the next verses describe exactly the class who shall go away into everlasting punishment:

"For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, *but a certain fearful looking for of JUDGMENT and FIERY INDIGNATION* which shall devour the adversaries."—*vs. 26, 27.*

Here, sir, are the conditions, and the kind of punishment attached; namely, the destruction of life; for we again read, twenty-eighth, also twenty-ninth to thirty-first verse;

"He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, VENGEANCE belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, *The Lord SHALL judge his people.* It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

That is, it is fearful because it is the Lord shall judge his people; it is a fearful thing to fall into his hands, because he shall have power to pronounce upon those who do so, condemnation; it is fearful because he shall not only be judge to condemn; but shall also inflict upon them the punishment which attaches to those condemned.

We now call your attention, for a moment, to Hebrews 9 : 27 :

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this* THE JUDGMENT."

We need not be told that the scriptures do not teach that there is a judgment and punishment after death; for here is the direct statement that, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this* the judgment." Why? Because, sir, at present the judgment is but a partial one, in a measure compensatory, 'tis true, yet imperfect; but in future there shall be a just and a perfect judgment rendered. We may argue as we please, but beyond question, the gospel of Christ contains provisions for a future judgment, necessitating both future rewards and punishments.

If there is no judgment beyond this life, there are a great many good people who go unrewarded, and a great many bad people who go unpunished; for, on the one hand, there are a great many good people who pass their lives in comparative wretchedness, and end their career in misery; while on the other hand, there are a great many wicked people who occupy the first position in society, even in our land. Some of these are sent to Congress; others are sent here and sent there, as ambassadors, plenipotentiaries, envoys ordinary and extraordinary; others are elevated to governorships, and to the highest offices in the gift of a too-confiding and deceived people. Some of these, too, like those of olden times, are doubly dyed in wickedness, of whom the people become, or were made willing or unwilling slaves. Were we to receive in this life a recompense for our deeds, I wonder that these men are so honored that they do not receive it. If this life brings the reward of the christian; if it were true that every man's sins are here judged, or every man here rewarded for his acts of righteousness, we should not find so great a disparity between the manner in which this is done. Here the wicked sometimes flourish like the green bay tree, while the righteous suffer ignominy, poverty and reproach; yet we learn that God will render to every man according to his deeds. The expression is in the future tense, "will render."

For the testimony of Jesus Christ, upon this subject, we refer you to the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, thirty-first to forty-sixth verses, to a sermon or statement made by him to his disciples, concerning the last days, wherein is expressed the same thought to which we have just referred. It is written of him in Isaiah 40 : 10, that when he shall come, "His reward is [shall be] with him, and his work before him." In Matthew it is written :

"When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then shall* he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him *shall be* gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left. *Then* shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you

from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. *Then* shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. *Then* shall he say also unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. *Then* shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? *Then* shall he answer them, saying, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: [to endure God's wrath or whatever it may be]; but the righteous into life eternal."

The tense is *future*; the time, *when the Son of man shall come in his glory*. We gather from this what we supposed to be perfectly plain, namely, that there will be a judgment in the future, in which the righteous shall receive a lawful reward, and the wicked a just punishment. One class, everlasting life; and the other, everlasting punishment. How, we ask, can this everlasting punishment, and everlasting life, be administered, if there be no future judgment? We might as well spend our lives in comparative ease and comfort, and care not for the life hereafter, if there be no future judgment, no future recompense for righteousness, or just punishment for wickedness. We might as well seek and take all the privileges of men on earth, if there be no future judgment. We might as well enjoy all the pleasures of this life, if there be no reward hereafter. If there is no judgment to come beyond this life, then justice will have been frustrated, and the purposes of God will have failed.

The Moderator's call of Time closed Elder Forscutt's argument.

Elder Shinn's second argument, was as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I confess I admire the frank, candid, manly manner of my opponent. I repeat that I feel myself proud to meet so able an opponent, as I believe my brother to be. I do, therefore, sincerely hope, that this discussion may be conducted throughout, in the most harmonious manner, and then it will be productive of much good, as I doubt not it will be, if we manifest that degree of christian courtesy, we will be happy to manifest.

Some of the points made by our brother in his opening speech, which we desire to notice. He admits that God's judgments are continuous; we are agreed upon that point. But the words "eternal" and "temporal," it was my object to introduce in my first speech, and to show that God's judgments are of a temporal character, and were in the earth. The judgments and punishments, administered under the Mosaic law, were of a temporal character. But again, my brother attempts to show that they are to be rejudged, by first admitting a judgment in this life, and then endeavoring to prove one in the life to come.

He also admits that the judgment is to be here in this earth, and that he does not believe they will be twice judged. How then can there be a judgment beyond this life? Brother, persons differ with each other in their views, who are not prejudiced; but let him show another judgment beyond this life if he can. Of this we might be convinced, if we could be convinced of the correctness of his explanation in regard to the words "endless" and "eternal" being synonymous. But he explains that it is endless punishment, because administered by the Endless One, and says it may be for a day, a month, or a year. Well, my brother, let "endless punishment" be of that character, and I could

believe in it myself; but otherwise, I must forever object to it. It is endless, says my brother, because administered by God, and God is endless. Everything would be endless which God does, upon the same principle.

I have shown you that my brother acknowledged my first argument; namely, that God's judgments are in this earth, and that there is punishment in this life. I have called your attention to the fact, that he does not believe they will be re-judged. Now let him come up with his re-judgment, if he can. And again; if there is no punishment now, his position would be something like this. You go around here to teach school; you have a written article of agreement along with you, which states the terms upon which you will teach, so much per scholar. The children come, and you proceed to teach school. But mark, you do not administer any punishment during the school, until the last day, when you call them all up, and whip them like blazes. If there is a judgment and punishment beyond this life, what is the judgment and punishment here for, which my brother has admitted. But he can not prove we are judged hereafter, without bringing that latter day into this discussion.

Genesis 2:17, my brother made a few remarks upon that. I maintain, that the punishment sent here upon Adam, was a spiritual death. In the day of transgression he died. "To be carnally minded is death;" therefore, Adam was punished in the day of his transgression. And it can not be shown that Adam was brought before God's judgment seat, and condemned again.

Seven-fold punishment. My brother, however, said, that I declared there was no future judgment. I affirmed all along through my first speech, that it was your duty to show there was a day of judgment beyond this life. That was what I said. I have not taken the position there is no future punishment. I took the position and made the remark, it was your duty to show there was a day of judgment beyond this life, after the resurrection of the dead. And if there is, as the brother has said, mankind are judged here, there will simply be a re-judgment.

Seven-fold punishment I speak of now. I remark, that the punishment of Cain was of a temporal character. It could not have been endless, according to the usual acceptation of that word, otherwise he who had to suffer a seven-fold punishment, would have had to suffer a seven-fold endless punishment. We agree in regard to the nature of Cain's punishment, that it was merely of a temporal character; he was to suffer physical pain and mental anguish for his transgression.

Hebrews 10:23-27, he read, and calls our attention to the 27th verse:

"But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

Speaks of this death without mercy under Moses' law, and reads thirtieth verse, and emphasizes the word vengeance; when he knows, if he knows anything, that the word vengeance means retribution. Let me call my brother's attention to the thirty-seventh verse in this connection:

"For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."

Here, my brother, we see that he that was to come and take vengeance, or retribution, was to come soon, and not to tarry; but we have abundance of time to canvas that ground before the close of this debate.

He calls my attention also, to Hebrews 9:27, 28. I read, my brother, from the "Emphatic Diaglott:"

"And as it awaits *the men*, [Greek, *tois anthropois*], once to die, but after *this* a judgment; SO ALSO the anointed one, having been once for all offered for the many, to bear away sin, will appear a second time without a sin offering," etc.

He speaks about the great salvation spoken of by the Apostle, in connection

with the just recompense of reward, visited upon all under the Mosaic law. I believe he maintains, that as every transgression under this law, received a just recompense of reward, we can not, after the gospel has come, escape a just recompense of reward. We have proved that men were judged and rewarded under the Mosaic dispensation; so likewise shall they be, under the gospel dispensation, for a great many considerations. He has added double force to my argument by showing that men shall be rewarded under the gospel dispensation. That is what I propose to prove in this debate.

"Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according to his work."—Ps. 62:12.

Mark the tense here, not *will* render, but *renderest* unto every man according to his work.

Men are not judged, he says, in this life, and speaks of some wicked fellows that have been sent to Congress, &c. My brother stands on one side, and the word of the Lord on the other. "Verily, thou art a God that judgeth in the earth." "Though the wicked be hand joined in hand, they shall not go unpunished."

He calls our attention to Matthew 25:31. My brother, we will reach that in due time. That is just the point at issue; whether this coming in power and in glory has been fulfilled; and I think I shall be able to show before the discussion closes, that it has been, and that is a description of the judgment when he came. This I shall use as a precedent to my second argument, which is, that Christ's reign was to be one of judgment upon the earth. I presume my brother will admit it was to be upon the earth. Daniel 2:31-45:

"Thou, O king, sawest, and beheld a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet, that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This is the dream, and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: for as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with the miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."—Dan. 2:31-45.

Now mark:

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter; and the dream is certain and the interpretation thereof sure."

We see from this that it must be upon the earth, and that it is to be so great and glorious, that it shall break in pieces and subdue all other governments on the earth.

Again; Daniel 7:9-14:

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then because of the noise of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. I saw in night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Again; Daniel 4: 34, 35:

"And at the end of the days, I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honored him that liveth forever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom is from generation to generation: and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say, What doest thou?"

Isaiah 9: 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it, with *judgment* and with *justice*, from henceforth, even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

That his work is to be on the earth, I refer you to Isaiah 11: 1-9:

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots; and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not *judge* after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the *earth* with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fating together, and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den."

This denotes reign upon the earth:

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the *earth* shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Isaiah 42: 1-7: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth *judgment* unto the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth *judgment* unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set *judgment* in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law. Thus saith the Lord God, he that created the heavens and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles. To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."

Jeremiah 23: 5: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute *judgment* and *justice* in the *earth*."

Remember, my brother, this is the one in which David is to be king; it is the branch, the character of David.

Matthew 4: 16, 17.—"The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them

which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up. From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Matthew 10: 7.—"And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Mark 1: 14, 15.—"Now after John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel."

Luke 17: 20, 21.—"And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here, or lo there; for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

I remark that *among* you is the marginal reading, and I believe that to be the most truthful rendering that can be given of it.

Ps. 2: 7-9.—"I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

Once more; 2 Tim. 4: 1-4:

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables."

When, my brother, is this judgment to take place under Messiah's reign, but at his appearing and kingdom? There is when it shall take place, and I have shown beyond controversy, that his kingdom is here in this earth, that the kingdom of heaven is upon the earth;

The thought of its being established in the earth, makes clear the testimony which I have read from Paul, "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and in his kingdom." Then the language is that Christ judged mankind at his appearing and his kingdom, which was eighteen hundred years ago.

I now reach my third argument. Christ becomes judge when he receives the kingdom. Micah 5: 2:

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting."

I should have noticed this, however, in my other argument, to which it properly belongs. I will now notice Acts 17: 30, 31, under argument third, that Christ is judge when he receives his kingdom.

"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; and hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

Thus you see that we have assurance that he is to be judge of the world, because he hath been raised from the dead. The day spoken of, I believe to be the gospel age. Again, Matthew 2: 6:

"And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of the shall come a governor, that shall rule my people Israel."

Luke 1: 31-33.—"And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son, and shall call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David."

Here is the branch spoken of by Jeremiah, in 23: 5. And this king is to reign forever, and his kingdom is to have no end. I will bring this properly into the discussion before it closes, and I call my brother's attention to it now.

Again; Acts 10: 40-42:

"Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he arose

from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the judge of quick and dead."

You will remember here, my brother, that the judgment was to take place, "at his *appearing and kingdom*."

Matthew 16: 27, 28.—"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and *then*, [mark it now; we emphasize the word *then*], he shall reward [judge] every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Then it is a fact, my brother, after all, that there were some living right there, who heard these words fall from the lips of Jesus, who should not die, until he came in his kingdom to judge mankind, according to their works. Unless you are able to prove that there are some living now who were living then, you will utterly fail in this discussion.

Rev. 19: 11-13.—"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God."

Another presentation of the Messiah coming to reign in his kingdom. I will call your attention, in this connection, to Matthew 25: 31-34:

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; [nations, my brother, not individuals]; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. *Then shall the King*."

Then there is to be a kingdom, and this is something, which is to be fulfilled simultaneously with his coming in the clouds, his appearing, his coming to reward mankind. We have already proven that this coming was to take place during the natural lifetime of some who were standing there when Jesus spoke those words recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, and this fastens the argument, that the kingdom of the Messiah was established upon the earth, over eighteen hundred years ago, in justice and judgment.

Jesus says, Matthew 28: 18, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." John 5: 27, "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." My brother has acknowledged the precedent which I laid down in the beginning of this discussion, that God judges in the earth. I, having presented this argument, call his attention to the fact, that the Father judgeth no man any longer, but hath given all judgment unto the Son.

John 9: 39.—"And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind."

John 12: 31.—"Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out."

My brother will notice that it says *now*. Does that mean a thousand or ten thousand years in the future?

Elder Shinn yielded at the call of Time by the Moderator.

Elder Forscutt's reply to Elder Shinn's second argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In listening to the arguments we have just heard, I do not believe any of you can tell how much gratified I was. If I could only have thought it right to do so, and could have had the inspiration necessary, I believe I would have ordained my brother a Mormon Elder, right away; for I believe his positive arguments were, some of them, at least, just about as good as though they were found in a sermon preached by our own people, and in regard to a great many of the positions which he took, I have but little to answer, unless I were to fall upon

my own theory. Perhaps he expects me to branch off, and lead him a little in the debate; but this it is not my province to do, for he tells us that he expected I should prove there would be a day in the future, in the which God will judge the world.

We will examine, then, some of his arguments, and notice, First; that he tells you, if endless punishment be endless punishment because administered by an endless being, everything done by God would be endless on the same principle. In a certain sense we might subscribe to this. Again he tells us he has not taken the position, that there is no future punishment, and whether he will or not we have not yet learned; but if there be no future judgment, then it will be a difficult matter to show that there will be future punishment; for, unless God shall be so unjust as to punish without judging, there certainly will be no future punishment without a future judgment. That is disposed of so far as his arguments are concerned.

Our friend tells you that I stand on one side, and the word of the Lord on the other. I was really under the impression that the very reverse of this was true, and shall endeavor to show, that the word of the Lord and I, both stand on the same side. I think too, that the gentleman has helped me to some extent in his arguments; and that I shall be able to do so. I shall use some of his arguments for that purpose. He quotes Psalm 62:12:

"Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou renderest to every man according to his work."

When we examine this psalm, we discover that there is something else spoken of beside the mercy of God. "God hath spoken once; twice have I heard this; that *power* belongeth unto God. *Also* unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *mercy*; for *thou renderest to every man according to his work.*"

Now this term *also*, certainly applies to something. The inspired Psalmist tells us, that God hath spoken, that God hath power, and he tells them in a preceding verse, to trust not in oppression, and set not their heart upon riches. Why? Because these things can not save them. They should not trust in them; but should trust in God. True, the theory presented to us is that God is a God of mercy. "Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy;" but there is added very significantly, "for thou renderest to every man according to his work."

When a criminal is charged with crime, and brought before the court for trial, is it a question then whether or not it is mercy to him to punish him for his crime? Or is it not a question of justice and judgment, as well as of mercy? Is it not true, in a general sense, that that judgment and that justice which are administered to him for his wrong doing, may be affected by mercy as well as by justice? May not justice, God's justice, be the foundation on which mercy may build? If there is such a thing as the justice of God, manifested by his judgments upon the ungodly, then we shall not be compelled to show that there must be some kind of punishment, some kind of vengeance, which he will bestow upon those who do not keep his law, but who are breaking it, for it follows as a necessity of justice.

The wicked in this life stand an equal chance with the righteous, so far as the things of this world are concerned. They live about the same period of life. Good men are often imposed upon and subjected to wicked rulers; but these rulers must, in justice, be punished, and the time will come when God will judge them, that they may be justly punished; "for thou renderest to every man according to his works," is the declaration of the inspired Psalmist. Now, on this point, I submit the question, If God is to render to every man according to his work, how can it be that there is no future punishment; while lying, cheat-

ing, robbery, and wickedness of every name and nature are being practiced, and receiving no punishment in this life. If these are not to be punished hereafter, then the Psalmist's words are false, and God does *not* render to every man according to his work. Everywhere wickedness is rampant, and crime triumphs. If there is no judgment beyond this life for the wicked, then they do not receive the reward due to them for their works.

We have introduced to us the prophet Daniel, where he is called upon to give the interpretation of a dream or vision of king Nebuchadnezzar, wherein the prophet speaks of the establishment of *the* kingdom upon the earth. Our friend thinks this had its fulfillment in the days of Jesus Christ, at least I conclude from the manner in which Mr. Shinn used it, that he meant to show that Jesus came and established that kingdom upon earth. In this, I think the gentleman has fallen into an error; and, I apprehend, he will have as much difficulty in proving this, as I will have in finding the man that was to live until Jesus comes. I pass the dream, and proceed to notice the interpretation. Dan. 2:38, 39, "Thou art this head of gold," Daniel says to the king. "And after thee shall arise another, inferior to thee," which was represented by the silver. A third was represented by the brass, and the fourth by the iron. From the legs of the image, which were of iron, grew ten toes, part of iron and part of clay. Now the prophet's declaration, forty-fourth verse, is, "In the days of *these* kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. Where were these kings, Sir, or these ten kingdoms, that should grow out of the feet of the image? Did they exist in the days when Jesus was upon earth?"

The fourth great power existed at that time, the Roman, iron power. This power was represented by the legs of the image, and had also feet attached to its legs; to these feet were also attached toes. These toes represented ten kingdoms, arising out of the Roman government. "In the days of **THESE** kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Let me say to you, Sir, that in the days when Jesus was upon earth, these ten kingdoms were not in existence. In that day the Roman government was one, not ten; it was one, and one only. It was not divided at all.

We read in the second chapter of Luke, that the proclamation went forth for all the world to be taxed. From the Roman emperor this proclamation went forth, from the iron ruler, Cesar Augustus. This Roman government was not then divided. It was one government, and only one, not ten. It was the one iron kingdom that was to break into pieces, and bruise; and after this iron kingdom should have ruled for a long time, for many hundreds of years, it was to be divided into ten divisions, represented by the ten toes, and to be ten kingdoms instead of one.

We discover further that this kingdom was one for hundreds of years after the death of Jesus. It then became gradually broken. One kingdom arose in or about the year 356, and after this^d down to about 450, or a little later, we can trace the ten toes very distinctly. But these, the gentleman will notice, had no existence when Jesus was here. The toes were not yet developed, and it was more than three hundred years before they were developed, and the Roman government divided. The language of the prophet is, "IN **THE DAYS OF THESE KINGS**, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Now, sir, if the kingdom of Christ was established in the days of these ten kings, it could not be before the year 350; and it may not be established yet; for these ten kingdoms yet exist in some form.

These kingdoms passed through many changes, it is true, but still in their varied conditions they can be traced down through the history of the past to the present age. This kingdom that Daniel says was to be set up "in the days of

these kings," is represented as having great power, and being a kingdom that shall never be thrown down any more. "The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, that shall never be destroyed; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." How vastly different from the spiritual kingdom which Jesus came to establish, when he came to earth the first time. For instead of that bringing a kingdom to break in pieces and consume all others in this world, he said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight." If the argument presented before us be a correct argument, Jesus did not state exactly the truth; nay, the very opposite of the truth. Instead of saying, "My kingdom is not of this world," he should have said, My kingdom shall subdue this world, and break into pieces all the kingdoms thereof.

The argument is adduced by some, that because Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world," that therefore his spiritual kingdom was then set up in the hearts of the people. My brother, I am very glad, understands this as I do. I have often been amused at our friends of other churches who hold this view and deny the future kingdom. A very strange thing indeed, for the kingdom of God to be within (in the hearts of) those wicked Pharisees. The kingdom organized by Jesus had apostles, prophets, and a number of classes of officers within it; surely these could not be within the heart.

But that was not the kingdom that was to break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms. This was to be set up in the days of the ten kings. And whether it is now set up, or will be set up in the future, it matters not; for so long as the ten kingdoms remain, God's kingdom may be established. The kingdom spoken of by Daniel is to be in the earth, and is to be a political kingdom. It will be established by the coming of Christ in glory; coming *in his kingdom*, is implied, in the manner in which even Elder Shinn presented the evidence concerning it, it must be by the personal coming of Christ in the glory of God; the glory of the Father manifested from heaven in and with Christ, when the kingdom set up by himself will break in pieces all other kingdoms.

I have no disposition to doubt the testimony or statement in the fourth and fifth of Daniel; for his kingdom must; aye, it shall be an everlasting kingdom, and shall endure from generation to generation. His government is to be a never ending one. "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David," was the promise of the angel to his mother before his birth.—Luke 1:32. He did not do this when he was here. He never entered the sacred precincts of Mount Zion; he never went into the sacred spot, where David and Solomon sat; therefore did not seat himself upon the throne of his father David. But the promise of God, sworn with an oath to David, that "He would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne."—Acts 2:30.

He is to establish justice and judgment, while he is seated upon this throne. Is not a special throne indicated by the expression, "The throne of his father David?" What kind of a throne was it? Was it a spiritual throne; a throne of justice and peace in heaven? Oh no! It was a literal throne upon the earth, "*the* throne of his father David;" the throne the description of which is given in the book of Chronicles. Upon this throne Jesus never was seated while he was here in the flesh.

Again; being seated upon the throne of David, implies the restoration of the government or rule of David, or the government of the people which David governed. But, Sir, he did not sit upon the throne of his father David in this sense while here. When his disciples propounded to him this question, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" he answered, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power."—Acts 1:6, 7. Sir, what a fine opportunity this was for him to declare

unto them that the kingdom was to be immediately restored; but his words rather imply the thought, I am not now a king to have temporal rule, or a temporal kingdom. He had already said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight." And here he adds to his disciples, "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." If the setting up of his kingdom in any sense was to take place during the life time of his apostles, why did he not inform them of this most important event? They viewed the promises as relating to a temporal kingdom; he did not correct their views, but confirmed them. If it be true that Christ's kingdom was then established, then must there have been so utter a failure to establish it in the way in which it was expected, that neither Christ nor his apostles recognized it.

We are referred again to the tenth chapter of Acts, and forty-second verse:

"And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he that was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead."

The Judge is then Jesus Christ, who after he had been put to death, arose from the dead; and when the Spirit was given to the apostles, they, by the influence of that promised Holy Ghost which they received, declared of him that this "is he who was ordained of God to be the judge of the quick and dead."

The time of this occupying the judge's seat as the gentleman quoted for us from 2 Timothy 4:1, is to be at his appearing and kingdom. Now, if he was to sit as judge at his appearing and in his kingdom, when was that? If it was in the past, *when* was it? It can not be that Elder Shinn is right that Christ took possession of the seat of judgment, at the time he ascended to the right hand of God to commence his "mediatorial reign," and Paul's testimony be true; for this testimony was given thirty-three years *after* Jesus Christ had ascended to heaven, and the apostle then writes, "I charge thee before God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall* judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." Why should Paul say *shall* judge, if he had then been judge for the last thirty-three years previously.

There has been considerable said about grammar, tense, etc., this morning, and as I see that we have two or three school teachers here this morning, I wish to submit to them the question, if in speaking of such an event thirty-three years past, they would use the future tense, and say *shall* judge? Or instead of saying, "I charge thee before God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall* judge the quick and the dead at his appearing," would they not say, "I charge thee before God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *has been* judging, or who is *now* judging." Nothing of this kind is found in the declaration, but the future tense only, Sir, was used in this declaration made thirty-three years after Jesus had gone to heaven. The language we repeat is, "who shall judge." If you are right, Sir, the kingdom of Jesus Christ had been upon the earth for thirty-three years, and he therefore had been judge for that length of time. Then instead of the terms here used by the apostle, he should have used language that would convey the idea that Christ's judgment was partly past and partly future.

The apostle's language immediately following that which we have just noticed, we will leave for the present, as it properly belongs to the apostasy, and will proceed to notice the testimony we are referred to, in the twenty-second Psalm. I admit that this language has reference to Jesus Christ; but in order to understand it correctly, we will read what precedes the language quoted by Mr. Shinn:

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing. The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed."

The prophets in speaking of many events which were to take place in the future, frequently spoke of them as though they were present with them. The Psalmist here is doubtless speaking of the time, when Jesus Christ will come to take the throne of his father David. Then the heathen will rage, and the kings of the earth take counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed. But notwithstanding this opposition, which is to be raised against Jesus, the promise is, eighth verse:

"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

This is, evidently, yet in the future; for Jesus is to break the nations when this is fulfilled; but when he came before they broke him, commemorated by us in breaking in pieces the bread at the sacramental altar. When this is fulfilled, he will "break" the nations "with a rod of iron, and dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel."

When he was here, he was the sufferer; when he comes again, he will be the conqueror.

He was the "Lamb of Calvary" the first time; he will be the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" the second time.

He came to die the first time; he comes to reign as "King of kings," blessed forever more, the second time.

Two distinct characters.

Two distinct callings.

We now turn to the testimony given to us from the nineteenth chapter of revelations. In this there are some evidences which, to my mind, are very clear; and to those which the gentleman has quoted for us, we may profitably call your attention again. We begin reading the fifth verse:

"And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. [6.] And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of many thunderings, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

Then occurs what is said about the marriage of the Lamb, and the garments in which the bride is to be arrayed, which are of fine linen, clean and white. *Only such will be there as are so arrayed.* In that we will have to be arrayed, Sir, if we enter into the marriage of the Lamb. We continue, eleventh verse:

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth *judge and make war.*"

Does this teach that he will establish a kingdom which shall gradually overcome the world? No, Sir. "In righteousness he doth *judge and make war.*" When he was here, he offered salvation and mercy; but now he comes to "judge and make war." "He shall break them [the nations] with a rod of iron, and dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel." John continues:

(12.) "His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; [symbolizing his conquests]; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called the Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a *sharp sword*, that *with it* he should *smite the nations*; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

Sixty-three years, if the chronology of King James' Bible be correct, and it is generally accepted as being so, sixty-three years after Jesus Christ had gone to heaven, this was written. Was this, Sir, the *history* of Jesus having established his kingdom, written sixty-three years after Jesus had gone to heaven, as

a history of what transpired when Jesus was upon earth? Or was it a prophecy? We read in the first chapter and first verse of this book, that it was "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants thing which *must shortly come to pass.*" Sixty-three years after Jesus had gone to heaven, these things were yet to come to pass, were yet in the future, were yet to be.

In the first three chapters of this book, John is commanded to write to the churches *then in Asia*; but in the opening of the fourth chapter we read:

"After this I looked, and, behold a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet, talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and I will shew thee *things which must be HEREAFTER.*"

Sixty-three years after the kingdom was established, if our friend be correct, the angel said to John, "it *must be hereafter.*" If the angel was right, "Brother Shinn" is wrong. I have no hesitancy in deciding. There was also shown to John, sixty-three years after Jesus had gone to heaven, a vision of his return to reign; his return "to make war" upon the nations, "to break them in pieces;" his return to rule, fulfilling the prophecies of God's holy prophets.

I again call your attention to the testimony given to us in the first chapter of Luke, 31-33 verses. It is the testimony given by inspiration, the word of the angel of the Lord, before the conception of Jesus took place:

"And, behold, thou shalt * * * bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David."

Notice carefully the reading of this verse; not the throne of his majesty on high, but "the throne of his father David."

"And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

When Jesus comes again, he is to reign over *the house of Jacob*. When he came the first time, instead of reigning over that house, he said to Jacob's children, "Behold, *your house is left unto you desolate.*" Our friend says he entered upon his reign. Strange way for a king to come and rule over a house, to make the house desolate!

"How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."—Matt. 23:37, 38.

When Jesus comes again, Sir, in fulfillment of the prophecy concerning him, he will reign over the house of Jacob; not a desolate house, but a house gathered together. God, through his prophets, declares in effect, Though I have scattered you, yet will I gather you from the four quarters of the earth, from the north, from the south, from the east, from the west, unto your own land, I will establish you there forever; even forever and ever. This must be done before Jesus can reign over them, and before he comes to reign; for the testimony of the word of God is, that he shall find them in their land when he comes; and praises be to his name, he is now gathering them there, in fulfillment of the prophecies of the holy prophets. They are to be gathered in their land, and the nations are to be gathered around them, to take a spoil and prey. Then will Jesus be the defender of his people; "for he shall go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle."

He shall gain the victory over their foes, and then he will reign over the house of Jacob.

Then, too, those who have faithfully kept his word, and have endured the trials of life for his sake, will he especially bless.

Then shall judgment be given, and the Saints shall see fulfilled unto them

the promise, that he would make them rulers and judges in his kingdom, when he should come.

Then to the apostles will be fulfilled the promise:

"Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, *when* the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—Matt. 19:28.

Then will the Saints realize the truth of Paul's utterance:

"Do ye not know that the Saints shall judge the world?"—1 Cor. 6:2.

These, the tried servants of God, have passed through the trials of life; they have endured the frowns of the world; they have suffered as their Master suffered when he was ^{here}; therefore, when he comes, they shall rest and reign with him, in the kingdom of his Father.

Elder Forscutt closed his argument at the call of "Time."

Elder Shinn, in further support of his proposition, said:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to resume our friendly discussion, by first reviewing my brother's last speech.

He remarks that my arguments were very correct, and that they were strongly savored, if not all over, at least partially so, with what he was pleased to term Mormonism, and remarks that if he had had the inspiration, he would have ordained me one of their Elders. I am very grateful indeed, for I like to be on friendly relations; but would it not have looked a little better, after saying this, if he had not reviewed me quite so closely.

My brother, I wish to make one correction here; for we must understand each other in this discussion. I have repeatedly called his attention to the fact, that I did not believe in a future day of judgment, beyond this life, or beyond the resurrection of the dead. That the day of judgment began; I understand it began with, and is the day of Christ's mediatorial reign; and it will end when that reign is finished, and the kingdom delivered up to God the Father. It is to result in the destruction of every evil, and the purification of all souls.

Precisely the point of difference between my brother and myself is this: where he believes the reign to start, I believe it stops. I believe that judgment ends with the mediatorial reign. I will now state farther, that I believe in a personal coming of the Messiah, which will take place at the end of the mediatorial reign, when judgment ceases. Ps. 62:12, I will call your attention to. I do not clearly understand my brother. I understand him to claim that sometimes men are rewarded in this world; and then again there are persons who indulge in wickedness and sin, who go unpunished in this world; if I understand him correctly, for I do not wish to misrepresent him. This is quite a different understanding from what I have of this passage of Scripture. "Also, unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou *renderest*, [RENDEREST], to every man according to his works." I will call your attention now to another passage of Scripture, which treats directly upon this subject:

Prov. 11:31.—"Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner."

Certainly; also, the wicked and the sinner. Again, I will quote:

John 15:20.—"The wicked man travaileth with pain all his days, and the number of years is hid to the oppressor."

Isaiah 57:20, 21.—"But the wicked *are* like the troubled sea, when it can not rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." "But the wicked *ARE* like the troubled sea. * * * There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."

They are certainly punished, then, in this life.

Gal. 6: 7, 8.—“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh, [now mark], shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.”

We quote again in this connection, Ps. 62: 12:

“Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou *renderest*, [in the present tense, *renderest*], to every man according to his works.”

We have an abundance of evidence to present upon this point, if it is required. I would remark in this connection, “Though the wicked be hand joined in hand, they shall not go unpunished.

The brother spoke of Daniel 2, and thinks I will encounter some difficulty here, perhaps, from the language, “In the days of these kings,” perhaps as much as he will in regard to the quotation I made from Matthew, in regard to there being some standing here, that shall not taste of death until Jesus comes. I will now call your attention to Daniel’s interpretation again. I read from Rev. Thomas Whitmore’s Commentary on Rev. 13: 1, where he refers to Daniel’s vision of the beasts:

“In explaining these figures Daniel expressly says, ‘These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.’—17*v.* Beasts, wild and ferocious in their character, are used to represent earthly kings or kingdoms. ‘The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down and break it in pieces.’—23*v.* This must be the Roman Empire, for no other ever had such wide dominion. Hence, Daniel’s beast, like that of the Apocalypse, had *ten horns*, which he explains to be *ten kings*, that shall arise.—24*v.* The four kingdoms, represented in 7th of Daniel by *four beasts*, are represented in the second chapter of that prophecy, by the *different parts* of the *great image*, the legs and the feet thereof being of iron, and representing the fourth kingdom which was as strong as iron. But as the Roman Empire was composed of heterogeneous materials, so the feet of the image were in part of iron and part of clay, which showed the divisions of the kingdom, and the cause of its fall. Now, it was when the Roman Empire was in its fullest glory, that Christ appeared to establish his spiritual kingdom, and Daniel therefore says, ‘*In the days of these kings*, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, etc., which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.’—Dan. 2: 44. This kingdom which the God of heaven set up, was the kingdom of Christ, represented, not by a wild beast, but by the stone cut out without hands; [that is, without earthly aid, as Christ’s spiritual kingdom was built up.—Heb. 9: 11.] And if the reader will compare carefully the second and seventh chapters of Daniel, he will see that it was the intention of that prophet to show, that Christianity was to arise in the time of the *fourth* kingdom, terrible and powerful, which was the Roman Empire. Then Christianity did arise; and without any manifest aid from men, it prevailed over all human opposition, and shall stand forever.”

He says, “My kingdom is not of this world,” making a quotation from Jesus. Then makes the argument to prove that Christ will reign as a temporal king, at his second, personal coming. Now right here, my brother, is where some one is mistaken in regard to this matter. For right where my brother thinks he will begin to assume the government and reign as king, I believe he will deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, which I believe he will do at his personal coming, at the end of his mediatorial reign. 1 Cor. 15, beginning with the 24th verse:

“Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”

Then his reign is to cease with the resurrection of the dead, or with the destruction of death, as I understand it; for he hath put all things under his feet; all things shall be subdued unto him that put all things under him. Thus, you see, I believe that the time of his personal coming will be at the end of his mediatorial reign, and that then he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father. There is not one single syllable, or word recorded about a judgment in connec-

tion with his personal coming. That is wholly confined to his spiritual, and that is what I have been presenting to you. But I have an argument to make on this point by and by.

My brother says that Christ is coming to reign upon the literal throne of David. Talk about a throne of glory, does my brother! For his Christ will reign literally, upon a literal throne. The coming and reign I believe I am speaking of, which is to take place in connection with judgment, is a spiritual reign, spiritual coming; a coming in the clouds in his kingdom; a coming in glory; a coming to reward mankind, every one according to his works.

Acts 10:40.—“Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, even unto us, who did eat and drink with him, after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, should receive remission of sins.”

Certainly it has reference to his spiritual reign, “To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins.”

Again; 2 Timothy 4:10, my brother emphasizes the word *shall*:

“I charge thee before God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall* judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom.”

My brother, his kingdom was not fully established at that time, and the coming of the judge was in the future, at the time the language was spoken. Now, the kingdom of the Messiah was gradual in being established, as the old Jewish order of things was gradual in passing away. The Christian dispensation was gradual in coming in; the dispensation of Messiah's reign was brought in gradually. Alexander Campbell says:

“But as the erection of the Jewish tabernacle, after the commencement of the first kingdom of God, was the work of some time, and of united and combined effort on the part of those raised up and qualified for the work; so was the complete erection of the *new temple* of God. The apostles, as wise master builders, laid the foundation, promulgated the constitution, laws, and institutions of the king, and raised the standard of the king in many towns, cities and countries, for the space of forty years.”—Christian System, page 178.

Ps. 2:7. We will see before this discussion closes, whether Jesus did not take vengeance, retribution, on his enemies, and dash all his enemies to pieces during his spiritual reign. Revelation 19:11, refers to the same spiritual coming:

“And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and *make war*.”

Here is war in connection with this coming, and this is certainly a spiritual coming.

“His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is the Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.”

This language is highly figurative, I must admit; but it certainly has reference to the establishment of Messiah's kingdom. In regard to the Apocalypse, my brother, I want to make an assertion right now. I affirm that that book was written before the establishing of the kingdom of the Messiah here upon the earth. I affirm that that book was written before the destruction of the city of Jerusalem; and I am prepared to prove these assertions by the learned men of the world, and from the internal evidences of the book. If it is found necessary, I will do this in this discussion. As this book speaks of judgment and

resurrection, he has to rely so much upon it to prove his position in this discussion; while we claim that many of those events spoken of in this book, were fulfilled nearly eighteen hundred years ago.

The brother says the Jews will be gathered, and says they are now being gathered. Thank heaven, my brother, they are being gathered now; but I do not think they will be finally gathered, until the deliverer comes up out of Zion, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. I agree with you that all Israel will be saved. I am happy to agree with you upon that ground. I hope to meet at least half way. I hope we will finally meet with the redeemed; and be gathered in the kingdom of our blessed Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Elder Forscutt here said aloud, "Amen."

Elder Shinn continued,—But I will give you my view upon this matter, of his servants assisting in the judgment:

2 Timothy 2: 11, 12.—"It is a faithful saying: for if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: if we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us."

I read from Rev. Thomas Whitmore's Commentary on Rev. 20: 4; having referred to Rev. 5: 9:

"For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign *on the earth*."

St. Paul said: It is a faithful saying; for if we be *dead* with him, we shall also *live* with him; if we suffer, we shall also *reign* with him.—2 Tim. 2: 11, 12. The revelator, of course, as was his custom, puts these things into a much more metaphorical form. He says, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment, [or the power of judging, or reigning], was given unto them. This agrees precisely with what Jesus told his disciples before his death:

"Verily, I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, *when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; that is, spiritual Israel."—Matt. 19: 28.

It was in this way that the Saints were to judge the world.—1 Cor. 6: 2. Hence Jesus said to the church at Thyatira:

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my words unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter, shall they be broken to shivers; even as I received of my Father."—Rev. 2: 26, 27.

And again to the church at Laodicia:

"To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my father in his throne."—3: 21.

The New Testament is full of these figures. The thrones which John saw were metaphorical, and so was the great white throne mentioned in verse eleven.

The kingdom of Christ itself was not real and outward, but metaphorical and spiritual. The martyrs who had been beheaded, *lived and reigned on the earth*. Christ lives and reigns on the earth *now*, and so do the martyrs, and every faithful christian, the knowledge of whom has reached us. How little is there of the good that can really die? Abel "*being dead, yet speaketh*."—Heb. 11: 4. The poet has forcibly expressed this idea, on a slightly different subject:

"They never fail who die in a good cause;
The block may soak their gore;
Their heads may sodden in the sun; their limbs
Be strung to city gates and castle walls;
But still their spirit walks abroad. Though years
Elapse, and others share as dark a doom,
They but augment the deep and swelling thoughts,
Which overpower all others, and conduct
The world at last to *Freedom*."

When it is said of any, therefore, that they reign with Christ, it is because they are co-workers, or co-sufferers with him; for "if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him."—2 Tim. 2:12.

I now resume my arguments. Christ's coming in glory, in power, with his angels, to reward mankind according to their works, etc. His coming, we noticed, took place during the natural life time of some of those who heard him utter these words. Matthew twenty-fifth chapter, beginning with the twenty-third verse, "And he shall separate them, [the nations.]" Now, my brother knows that this can not refer to the future life, for all nations will not be sentenced at a time. It is certainly figurative language. If it is not figurative, then it refers to literal sheep and goats, and we will have to have literal sheep and goats in this discussion. If it is figurative, then the sheep and goats may represent men.

"Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the king shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting, [or age lasting] fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not."

Remember, now, that this is a parable. I will call it the parable of the sheep and the goats, for reasons already mentioned. Remember, it was to have its fulfillment "when the Son of man shall come in his glory," and when he was to sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him should be gathered all nations; and he should separate, or judge them, one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. It was to have its fulfillment at that time. I read in this connection, Matthew 16:27, 28:

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

The same coming, precisely. The same coming in his kingdom, which was to take place during the natural lifetime of some of those who were standing there, and heard Jesus utter these words. Once more, Mark 8:38.

"Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels."

This is the same coming spoken of in Mark 9:1:

"And he said unto them, Verily, I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."

Was not this coming with power; was not this coming in his kingdom, in his glory; coming with angels, coming to reward mankind according to their works. This coming too, was to take place during the natural lifetime of those who heard Jesus utter these words:

Luke 9:26.—"For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God."

John 21:21-24.—"Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me."

Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

Matthew 10:16-23.—"Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves. But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and scourge you in their synagogues. And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father, which speaketh in you. And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake; but he that endureth to the end, shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

This is the same coming that was to take place during the natural lifetime of those who heard Jesus utter these words: it must have been, or I am incapable of understanding the plainest kind of language. I give some authority upon this matter, 178, *Christian System*, Alexander Campbell, that noted and scholarly man that we have referred to before; that great reformer:

"Some of them not only saw the Son of man enter upon his reign, and the kingdom of God COMMENCE on Pentecost, and carry his conquests over Judea, Samaria, and the uttermost parts of the earth; but they saw the Lord 'come with power,' and awful glory, and accomplish all his predictions on the deserted and devoted temple, city and people. Thus they saw a bright display of the golden scepter of his grace in forgiving those who bowed to his authority, and an appalling exhibition of the iron rod of his wrath, in taking vengeance on his enemies who would not have him to reign over them."—*Christian System*, page 179.

Mr. Lewis and others present the same thoughts.
He closed with the call "Time."

Elder Forscutt's third reply was as follows;

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am sorry that my friend has used so much of his time, this afternoon, in replying to my last speech. I had hoped that I should have a vast array of new matter to consider. I shall be compelled, however, to either correct myself, or correct him, for there is certainly a misunderstanding somewhere in relation to the points of difference between us. If I understand the reading of the resolution aright, the object of this discussion is to determine from *the accepted word of God*, as found in King James' translation, whether or not Jesus has yet come the second time to judge the world.

It does not very materially affect the question what Mr. Lewis has to say, or what peculiar statements have been made by Alexander Campbell, or any one else. The question is, *What does the word of God teach in relation to this matter?* If we are to bring Mr. Campbell on the stand in this case, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Irwin, Mr. James, and others who were writer's against Mr. Campbell's views, will have to be brought also; who, instead of accrediting him with a great degree of learning, speak of him as being lacking in that qualification, and assign this as one of the reasons why he left the Baptist Church. However, I shall not now discuss Mr. Campbell, or his claims; that is not the object of this debate. No doubt he did a good work, according to the ability that God gave to him.

Elder Shinn should confine himself to arguments based on quotations from the Bible, arguments to be made by himself; not using arguments made by others as though the authors of them were my opponents. I am here to debate with him, not with either Mr. Lewis or Campbell; their views, merely as men's opinions, are of no more value to me in this debate than the views of Elder Lake,

my chairman, would be of any value to him. It is well you should know who these authors are. Their testimony is allowable; but *not evidence*.

Now to the main question at issue. Has there been a revelation of the word of God unto us at any time, teaching that there shall be a coming of Christ in the future, personally, to introduce what we may call the judgment age? That is the gist of the whole discussion now pending.

The testimonies presented to us by our friend, in relation to this matter, are, it seems to me, supportive of the theory that Jesus Christ *will come* the second time, in power. And, as the gentleman has intimated, the chief difference between him and me consists in this; that I regard his future coming as being the introduction of his reign, while he regards his coming again, in person, as the end of his "mediatorial reign."

I do not understand, if I understand the language correctly, that a "mediator," as such, does reign. A mediator is one who mediates between two parties; in the case of Jesus, between the monarch who saves or condemns, and he who is to be saved or condemned. When we speak of this mediation, we speak of an act performed by an individual who comes between a monarch and a subject, between the ruler and one who is ruled. What scriptural right have we to speak of Christ's mediatorship as a "mediatorial reign?" Such words are not in God's book, nor such a thought, any where. Where is the authority for their use, if they are not found in that book? When Jesus reigns, his present mediatorial office will cease. He will then have ceased to stand as mediator between us and God; for the office work of his mediatorship will have been ended. He will then come to take vengeance on those who shall not have accepted his mediatorial work; to approve and exalt those who looked up to him as the Mediator, and honored him by keeping his laws.

The gentleman thinks I have taken, in my last speech, a position which is very strange. Probably it may seem so to him. The position objected to is that Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight," and yet that after quoting this, I should declare that he will reign as a temporal prince. Again, Sir, I call your attention to the meaning of words. What does the word temporal signify? That which is limited, not eternal; primarily, it relates to time. During the millennial age, which is for a limited time, a specified time, Christ will reign. *Tempus* is the root of the word, signifying, time; temporal is from that root, and indicates that which is not permanent; something that will last only for a time. But I never said that Jesus would reign as a temporal prince; but I did say, and I repeat it, that he now reigns as a Prince; for God hath exalted him to be a Prince and a Savior; he is "Prince of Peace," "Prince of Life," according to the testimony of God's word, and he is now ruling under the Father as Prince, while he also sits as Mediator between us and God. He is to come, not to rule as a Prince, but to reign as "King of kings;" and not King of kings only, but as "Lord of lords;" "God blessed for ever." He ceases his princely rights, they are ended then, and his kingly rights begin.

To show that what our friend calls his "mediatorial reign," or the reign of Christ in his kingly rights, will end with the introduction of his coming on the earth, we are referred by Mr. Shinn to the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, twenty-second and twenty-third verses. There are some very beautiful thoughts here which have already been presented by my brother, in relation to the resurrection of the dead, and to which I will again refer. We read:

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ, shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

Surely, if all these testimonies that have been collated for, and presented to us, respecting the coming of Christ, indicate his coming at the time when the brother intimates these words of Paul were to have their fulfillment; surely, if this was *the coming referred to*, we should look for a grand resurrection to have taken place at that time, in which all God's people became Christ's; wickedness, too, should have ended; but was it so? The apostle speaks first of the resurrection of the dead, Christ the first fruits; then right following, "They that are Christ's at his coming." Afterwards cometh the end. Here in the twenty-fourth verse, we have the adverbs *then* and *when*, connecting the two events there named, the end and the delivering up of the kingdom. In the twenty-third verse, we have the resurrection connected with the coming of Christ, by the adverb *at*; and in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses, we have his reign, connected with the coming of the end, and the giving up of the kingdom to God, by the adverbs *then* and *when*.

First: The first resurrection, and they that are Christ's at his coming.

Second: His reign, and the conquest of all enemies.

Third: The end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power; for *he must reign UNTIL he hath put all enemies under his feet*.

Let us now enquire concerning these events, and see whether the testimony of the apostle corroborates the statement made, that at Christ's coming all the dead are to be raised.

I think the gentleman is laboring under a mistake here. In the first place, the apostle is reasoning on the subject of the resurrection; but I must not say much about this subject now, as we expect to debate that two days from this time, at which time we expect to adduce what evidence we can in support of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. We only pause to remark here, that the apostle's teaching shows us that what we have lost by Adam, we shall gain by Christ; "For as in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This is a general statement of the resurrection. "But every man in his own order."

He does not tell us here, whether it is to take an hour, ten years, or ten thousand years to raise all these dead. But we think we shall be able to gather this information from other testimonies, if necessary, when the proper time comes to examine that question. We think we shall be able to show that the resurrection does not take place at any one time; but for the accomplishment of the great purpose for which Jesus died, they that are Christ's, shall be raised at his coming, and after the raising of the dead in Christ, then cometh the end, etc.

The different classes in the resurrection will be easily distinguished from each other, in consequence of the judgment that shall be passed upon them; for some are to arise, we are told in the forty to the forty-third verses of this fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, with bodies whose glory is typified by the sun, and their glory is to be one; others are to have bodies less glorious than these, typified by the moon, and the glory of these is to be one; others still are to have bodies, whose glory is typified by the stars in the firmament of heaven; and "as one star differs from another star in glory, so also shall be the resurrection of the dead," placing it, you see, in the future tense.

The judgment to be rendered then is not in this life, but at some future time, when we shall be judged according to the gospel law, administered by divine hands. This gospel law has come unto us in this life, and if we shall have lived in accordance therewith, by being obedient unto God, we shall receive a reward for our obedience.

But shall every one receive the same glory? No, no; God is too just for that. There are some who will arise to one glory, and some to another. Just

as diversified as our lives have been here, will our glory be hereafter. Just as our faith to God has been, and the interest we have manifested in yielding obedience unto him; so will our reward and glory be in the kingdom of our God, when he comes to reign, whose right it is to reign. In the justice of this future judgment will our fidelity or disobedience be rewarded.

We are referred again to Acts 10:40-43, which I had before reviewed; and though I do not like to recapitulate, I must call your attention to the thought expressed with it:

"Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

The thought expressed by Brother Shinn, in connection with the latter part of this quotation, I can most fully and readily endorse. Yes, Sir; it is by and through Christ; through faith in and obedience to him, we do receive remission of our sins. Through Christ and Christ only, we may receive this blessing; but that does not affect the meaning of the preceding verse, that he was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Nor will it do to argue, as our friend does, that this judgment is continuous, and not special, or that it is special, affecting us here only, and not general and specific in its relations to the future. The ordination and appointment had been given; but the time when Christ "*shall judge* the quick and the dead" is to be "*at his appearing and kingdom.*"

It is evident too that the highly favored and inspired Peter, (see his second Epistle 2:9), understood this judgment to be a future one, when he wrote, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to *reserve* the unjust unto the *day of judgment*, to be punished." With Peter agrees Jesus, also, in John 12:48, "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him, [or be the basis of judgment], *in the last day.*"

The theory of a future judgment was admitted by all the Jewish nation, excepting the Sadducees; even the Samaritans, in a certain sense, endorsed it. The whole of the Chasidim branch of the Jewish church, and a portion of the Zadikim branch received the doctrine; the latter as founded on the testimony of the prophets, the former as founded on the testimony of inspiration as well as the tradition of the Elders. As a nation, they looked for the Messiah, as evidenced by history, by the form and subject matter of questions propounded to Jesus, and by the Talmud. Bousset, Bishop of Dauphin, (on the Talmud), in his Universal History, relates that the Jews expected a great prophet like Moses to be raised up to prepare the way of the Lord, to be followed by the Messiah himself, who should sit in judgment and execute justice, punish their foes, and restore their national greatness and prestige with God. Josephus is not silent upon this question.

Yes, Sir; people ages ago looked for one who should come, who should be some great one, and who should rule the nations, and sit as a judge over them, to divide rewards unto them. This, Sir, was believed, long before this declaration was made by the apostle, "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the judge of quick and dead." Why should he say, "It is he *which was ordained of God,*" unless some idea was in their minds of such a one having been appointed? The fact is, they did believe in such a one, and all that remained for the apostles to do, was to prove that this Jesus was the anticipated one.

Upon this expectation, rests the theory of a future judgment with Israel. The apostles were of those who expected such a Messiah, and though the time

seemed to them to be deferred by his instructions, the manner in which they learned this expectation would be realized, coupled with their experience in the past while with Jesus, gave them confidence to teach a future judgment.

We turn again to the testimony of Paul, writing to Timothy his Son, in the gospel, second epistle, fourth chapter, and first verse:

"I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom."

Now, if this appearing and kingdom were in the days of the destruction of Jerusalem, by Titus Vespasian, I want the brother to answer the question, In what peculiar sense did the kingdom of God then come?

The gentleman, after making this statement in support of his views, read to us Alexander Campbell's testimony. Unfortunately for him, Mr. Campbell makes the kingdom to have come prior to that time, namely, on the day of Pentecost. Whether this is correct or not, Mr. Campbell and my friend must determine. If it came upon the day of Pentecost, it did not need to come when Jerusalem was destroyed.

That it was established on the day of Pentecost more permanently as a spiritual kingdom, I am not disposed for one moment to dispute; for the apostles then gave the evidence that they were commanded by God to preach unto the people, and commenced then, by successful and earnest effort, to labor for the accomplishment of the great purposes of Jesus. They had been endowed with power from on high, after that Jesus had ascended on high, in order to the promulgation of the gospel. But there was no personal coming of Christ on the day of Pentecost.

I suppose that the brother will maintain that the coming of the Roman army, at the destruction of Jerusalem, was the coming of the Lord. Strange representation of the Son of God coming in clouds, with the holy angels! Titus, with the Roman hosts, the Lord and his angels!

The Roman power was represented by the iron part of the image which Nebuchadnezzar saw. It was described by Daniel as a power that should break in pieces and bruise, a characteristic of the Roman power well represented by the iron. These Roman soldiers to be the angels, and the coming of the Roman army to take Jerusalem, the coming of Jesus Christ to reign in power and glory! Strange glory, this! Strange condition of things this! If we are thus to understand the word of God, and thus to interpret the Holy Scriptures, the hopes of the good and great in all ages will be blasted.

That the kingdom of God was commenced in the days of Christ and the apostles, I do not doubt. I believe that the spiritual kingdom was *commenced*, when Jesus *began* to preach the things of the kingdom of God. I believe that that spiritual kingdom, more properly called the church, was an organization, but it was not the kingdom promised. When Jesus was here he taught his disciples to pray thus: "Our Father, who art in heaven; hallowed be thy name; *thy kingdom come!*" Why should Jesus teach them to pray, "Thy kingdom come," if it had been established? Why should the apostle Paul write and tell the brethren to look forward to the time of the coming of the Lord, and *wait* for his coming and kingdom, if that kingdom had already come?

Jesus certainly did not instruct them that the coming of the Roman army should be his coming; for he said:

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how oft would I have gathered you, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."

The mistake which the Jews made then, is the mistake which you are now making. This coming of which you speak, was the very coming their prophets

prophesied of; the very theme their poets sung of; the very subject their Psalmist wrote about; they were all anticipating that coming.

Paul suffered death under the tyrant Nero about the year 66 of the Christian era, Jerusalem was taken by Titus in the year 70; was this the "coming of the Lord" he waited for, hoped for?

Was that judgment upon the Jewish nation the judgment prophesied of in Scripture? Jesus said to his apostles:

"Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

If, Sir, that was the time when the judgment was given to him, as prophesied of in Scripture, what position, please, did the apostles occupy? His promise to them was, that *when* he came in his glory, they should sit with him and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Here, Sir, the servant's thrones were located with the throne of Jesus, their Master.

If this was fulfilled at the taking of Jerusalem by the Roman army, tell us how, and where the brethren, the twelve apostles, then sat.

If Jesus *then* came to judgment, tell us all how the judgment was passed upon them.

If the books were *then* opened; tell us how and what books they were.

Tell us how the records of heaven were then read.

Tell us how the people were presented at the court of truth before which they were then tried.

Tell us how the good and the bad were separated, as they are to be separated at the great judgment day.

If that be the time of Christ's judgment, please tell us who were judged.

These things did not transpire, at the taking of Jerusalem by the Roman army, as they should have done, had that been the judgment day. If they are not to take place at the judgment day, what, we enquire, do the promises and threats of inspiration mean?

We are referred again to the nineteenth chapter of Revelations, which we before read. The brother states, and earnestly too, that this language is highly figurative, symbolical language; yet he knows, as you know, that all symbolical language, to have clear ideas conveyed by it, must be correct in the harmony of all its parts. There must be no disunity of parts.

John tell us in this chapter, that he saw heaven opened; and one of the objects which he saw in heaven was Jesus. Now, according to the chronology of the Bible, whatever evidences you may bring to the contrary, this book was not written until sixty-three years after Jesus had ascended to heaven; and he was in heaven at the time this was written, which was about twenty-five years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

The voice said to John, "Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be *hereafter*." If Jesus was *then* in heaven, his coming was a *future event at that time*. The nineteenth chapter of Revelations begins thus: "And *after these things*." After *what* things? The things described in the preceding chapters, among which is the destruction of some great city called Babylon; a city, too, which should make all nations drunk with the wine of the wrath of her fornication. Jerusalem never did that. History did not then present a precedent for such a history as this. Even Tyre, that great maritime power, to which many of the nations sought for their luxuries, and their beautiful wares, never had such power as this city was to have. This city was to have commerce with all the nations of the earth, by means of her wickedness; by means of her sorceries; by means of the power she should wield. This Jerusalem never had.

After the description of the city's destruction, the nineteenth chapter opens with the language:

"And after these things, I heard a great noise of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God. For true and righteous are his judgments; for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever."

Following this, we come down to the quotation made for us, "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war." Twenty-five years, if the chronology be correct,—and it is supported by the concurring testimony of twenty-six authors,—if their testimony be correct, Sir, the destruction of Jerusalem had taken place twenty-five years before this testimony was written. And when this revelation was given, the testimony in connection therewith was, "I will shew thee things which *must be hereafter.*"

Among these things, John also saw heaven opened, and this Faithful and True One, whose coming to judge is future yet, was seen clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the Word of God. * * * "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

After all this, Sir, the angel cries, "Come up hither to the feast of the kings and nobles of the earth." What is there to happen now? Why, the testimony of ancient prophets is here confirmed that when this great one shall come that is to come, he will make war with the nations. The prophets of old tell us that the Saints shall be gathered, and the nations too shall be gathered around them, and that the Lord shall *then* go forth and deliver them. "He shall fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle."

In the thirty-ninth chapter of Ezekiel, we read of a people coming up against Israel, who are to be slain, and to the flesh of the mighty, and the blood of princes, the fowls of heaven and the beasts of the field are to be invited! A preparation for that terrible day is being now made. View the aggregate forces of Europe, the strength of Russia, the consolidation of the powers of Germany into one. See the work of God with Turkey, and with Spain, yet occupying their seats of power, from which they are then to be hurled. If we understand these things, and the signs of the times, we can see, that when those northern nations, of which the prophet foretold, that every one should take its place, before the coming of Jesus in power, and the very testimony in the nineteenth chapter of Revelations quoted against our position, will be fulfilled, and we will be proven right, for Christ will come to commence his judgment.

"Time" was called, and Elder Forscutt sat down.

Elder Shinn's fourth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother seems to be under the impression, that the testimony of scholarly men like Alexander Campbell, has nothing to do with, and I do not know as I would be going too far to say, is of no force in this discussion. I beg leave to differ from my brother in regard to this matter. If the testimony of learned men upon a passage of Scripture, is decidedly in my favor, I have a perfect right to receive that testimony; and it is of force, too, as the brother will find before the close of this discussion. What these scholarly men have said upon these passages of Scripture, he will find to be of *force*, before this discussion closes. It is to be presumed that a person who has devoted nearly his entire lifetime to the study of the Scriptures, to the obtaining of knowledge, and study of the

Bible, would be apt to know something of it. When their testimony agrees with me, I have a perfect right to use it.

He says, Jesus Christ will reign as a temporal King, and tries to prove it from first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, commencing with the twenty-second verse, he reads for this purpose, and tries to prove that Jesus will reign as temporal King at the end of his mediatorial reign; or at the end of his reign; I will leave out the word mediatorial, since the brother objects to it. Twenty-third verse of this chapter reads, "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Then take the brother's explanation of the adverb of time, "Then, cometh the end," the end of Christ's reign, "when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." Now, precisely at the time my brother says he is to come and begin to reign, the apostle says, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power." Even these ten kings, the brother emphasized in his speech this morning, are to be put down.

"For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet: the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

This is the end of the Messiah's reign, his spiritual reign, when all men shall have been constituted pure and holy, under the Messiah's reign, blessed, forever blessed.

But my brother supposes that he makes a point right here. I do not understand him plainly. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive: but every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits."

Now, my brother, there are but two orders in the resurrection, "Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming." All mankind shall be his at that coming, as I have shown you from this testimony you have introduced here. My brother refers again, to Acts 10:42, 2 Timothy 4:1. His coming at the destruction of Jerusalem. Here my brother emphasizes this matter particularly, to make it appear out of place, and places a great degree of stress upon the destruction of Jerusalem, when I have told him time and again, that the kingdom of heaven was to come in gradually.

Rev. 19. I will have to call my brother's attention to the date of the Apocalypse. We might as well fix that up right away. My brother is aware that this is a matter of great importance to him, the date of the Apocalypse; for he must rely upon the Apocalypse being written before the destruction of Jerusalem, for his strong arguments in this discussion. I shall introduce a few evidences in regard to this matter now, and more by and by. We find reference made in the Apocalypse to the city of Jerusalem, as still standing at the time that book was written. Speaking of those two who had been slain for the testimony of Jesus, the revelator says:

"And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified."—Rev. 5:8.

It was the custom with the sacred writers, to call one city by the name of another, to signify some particular point. Jerusalem was called Sodom and Egypt, on account of its wickedness. "Spiritually called Sodom and Egypt." But our quotation settles all doubt as to the place referred to, by adding to this, "Where also our Lord was crucified." The bodies of these two witnesses were to lie in the streets of Jerusalem. How could this be, if the city had been destroyed at the time? After three days and a half, the Spirit of life from God,

is to enter into them, according to the description of the Revelator. All this is to take place in the city where our Lord was crucified. How could the Revelator have given this description, unless he had written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Another argument, founded upon the mention made of the temple made in eleventh chapter. After the mighty angel had sworn time should be no longer, and John had received a commission to preach and prophesy before many nations, then the temple was to be measured and prepared for its destruction.

"And there was given me a reed like unto a rod; and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months."

Our Lord said Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles.— Luke 21:24. We have the testimony of learned men to bring forward if necessary. I am now through with my brother's speech for the present.

I now reach argument Five.

Matthew 24th and 25th chapters is a continued prophecy or discourse of Jesus to his disciples. Now I remark here, that there has been a great deal of difficulty in deciding upon the verse, or passage of scripture, where the old Jewish order of things ceases, and the Messiah's reign is ushered in. I do not know as two do agree. Daniel's discourses, the prophet's discourses; and, mark it, Jesus' discourses to his disciples. Shall we read them? It is quite an undertaking to read all this Scripture, but I do not see how we can avoid it.

Matthew 24th chapter.—"And Jesus went out and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to show him concerning the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world."

Mark it, brother; the literal word is *aioun*, age.

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, take heed that no man deceive you; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet."

The end of what? The end of the Jewish age.

"For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famine and pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise and deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved."

End of the Jewish age, certainly.

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place. (Whoso readeth, let him understand.) Then let them which be in Judea, flee into the mountains; let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in winter, neither on the sabbath day."

Mark it; ye, my disciples:

"For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor even shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake these days shall be shortened. Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christ's, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were

possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of the heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, [my disciples], when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors."

It. What? His coming; his coming in glory; his coming in clouds; *it* is nigh, even at the doors.

"Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, until all these things be fulfilled."

I will make an argument by and by, on the phrase, "this generation," that my brother can work on all day to-morrow."

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

The old Jewish custom was for the women to do the drudgery:

"Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily, I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion among hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

That this is connected with the twenty-fifth chapter, is evident, from the manner in which the twenty-fifth chapter is introduced: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened to ten virgins," etc. Then comes in the thought of the kingdom of heaven being compared unto a man traveling into a far country, who called his servants unto him, and delivered unto them his goods. This parable continues unto the thirty-first verse, where the parable of the sheep and the goats is introduced.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them, [or judge them, as I have explained], one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left."

It certainly is a fact, that the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew relate to one continuous discourse. Let us notice the context. The twenty-fourth commences thus: "And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple." The thirty-ninth verse of the twenty-third chapter reads thus: "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Signs preceding his coming, were certainly fulfilled. Matthew 24:3:

"And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

The first sign was, many shall come in my name, etc. Mat. 24:4-6:

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many."

Tenth verse.—"Then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another."

Mark 13:5, 6, in this connection:

"And Jesus answering them began to say, Take heed, lest any man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many."

This was literally fulfilled. Luke 21:8:

"And he said, Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore after them."

The second sign of his coming was, "Ye shall hear of wars and rumors." Matthew 24:7:

"For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places."

Mark 13:8.—"For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles: these are the beginnings of sorrows."

Mark 13:7.—"And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be ye not troubled: for such things must needs be; but the end shall not be yet."

Luke 21:9.—"But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified: for these things must first come to pass; but the end is not by and by."

From Matthew 24:7, Mark 13:8, Luke 21:10.

We note again as the third sign of his coming, famines and pestilences, Acts 11:27, 28, is also in this connection.

Fourth sign of his coming was earthquakes. Luke 21:11:

"And great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences, and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven."

Josephus, in his writings, testifies concerning the signs that showed themselves in the heavens. He says, among other things, that preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, a comet, with a tail in the shape of a sword, hung over the city, and did not go down for the space of a year. That one of the ponderous gates which required the united strength of *twenty men* to open it, was known to open of its own accord, (yet not of its own accord, but without human aid.) That a *heifer*, being led to the sacrifice, was known to lie down and give birth to a *lamb*. That fierce, contending armies were seen in the heavens, marching and countermarching, besieging cities, etc.

In this connection you might probably call the fifth sign, fearful sights and great signs from heaven. Fearful and great signs was there to be from heaven.

Matthew 24:9, 10.—"Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another."

Mark 13:9.—"But take heed to yourselves; for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them."

Luke 21:12.—"But before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake."

And thus I believe the signs spoken of here were literally fulfilled. Let us now notice Matthew 24:14:

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness, unto all nations, and then shall the end come."

I claim, my brother, that this is one of the signs of the fulfillment of that

coming, and you will agree with me. I call your attention to the testimony of the Scriptures upon this point.

Rom. 10: 18.—“But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.”

Here we notice the fulfillment of Jesus' words, “This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world.”

Col. 1: 23.—“And be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I, Paul, am made a minister.”

The testimony of Paul then is, that this gospel was preached in all the world, and Jesus' words are, when this is done, “then shall the end come,” or his coming take place.

Elder Shinn yielded the floor to the call of the Moderator.

Elder Forscutt's reply to Elder Shinn's fourth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The testimony that has been presented to us, respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, is testimony so well established that I have neither will nor power to gainsay it; but the argument drawn from it, seems to me to be very far-fetched; to fall very far short of the truth; to be very deficient in illustrating that display of God's power which is prophesied of, and which is recorded in the chapter read to us.

Before I call your attention to the consideration of that chapter, I will notice a very few of the thoughts expressed by our brother, at the opening of his speech.

He tells us that if the testimony of learned men, like Alexander Campbell, will aid him, (I do not pretend to give the words, but the idea), will aid him in his argument, that he will use it in this discussion. Supposing that the testimony of a number of other learned men should militate against his argument, or other testimony of Mr. Campbell should do so, what then? Would he not reason, “I do not want that which militates against me, only that which sustains me?” I imagine his acts would so argue, whether his speech did or not.

“My brother” wishes me to be consistent. I like that idea in his argument; for I admire consistency. If I go to the fountain of learning, I ought to drink deep draughts. “A little learning is a dangerous thing,” is said by a philosopher. If I should take Alexander Campbell's doctrinal evidence upon one passage of Scripture, *as conclusive*, I should upon all. If I regard him as competent to decide upon one point, doctrinally, *because he is a learned man*, I should regard him as being competent to decide upon other points. For instance, Mr. Campbell was very earnest indeed, upon the subject of baptism; declaring, positively, that no man could be saved without it. When he tells us that we are to be immersed for the remission of our sins, and that sprinkling or pouring will not do, my brother does not accept his testimony, because, as he would intimate, it does not suit his argument. “Be consistent.”

It is a rule in court, that when I bring a witness to the stand, in defense of my position, I am bound by the testimony of that witness. We have here several reporters for the courts, and they will tell you I am bound by the testimony of the witness I have introduced in the case. If you introduce, in support of your views, the testimony of Mr. Campbell, respecting the kingdom of God, I shall hold you to his testimony throughout.

Alexander Campbell declares that the kingdom was not organized until the day of Pentecost. He explains to us the work commencing with John the Bap-

tist; but says that the kingdom was organized on the day of Pentecost. Yes, Sir, your witness condemns your argument. When Mr. Campbell or others pat my brother on the shoulder, he replies, "You are right; good fellows;" but when they hit his theory a knock, he says, "Away with you, I want nothing to do with you." If I brought a witness upon the stand, I would stick to him through the trial, at least, or until one of us was dead. Be consistent, brother.

The gentleman made the statement, that I said Christ would enter upon his reign as a *temporal* king. I do not call the brother's attention to this to again review his argument in this connection; but to correct him. I should have corrected him when he made the statement, but I did not wish to interrupt him. You will all remember that I corrected him once before, on the word *temporal*, and traced the word to its origin, to its root, and showed from the very nature and meaning of the word, that Christ would not be a temporal prince, because anything temporal was not lasting. In contradistinction to this, the kingdom will not be temporal, but eternal. The things we now call temporal, will have passed through a change, which will make them eternal before Christ delivers up his kingdom, about which the brother makes quite an argument, which, in some respects, I shall call your attention to again.

I thus review more carefully, because the brother does not give me enough to do in reply to argument on his side. Let me repeat my position. Christ will establish his kingdom never more to be thrown down; his reign over it for the specified time of a thousand years, without opposition, does not imply that opposition will end his reign after that time, and for the "little season," for the season of conflict will be for him a season of conquest, and he will consume his foes unto the end.

"The end!" What is this time of the end when the kingdom will be delivered up? When we examine the testimony given concerning it, it is to discover that Jesus is to have power to call from the dead those who sleep in their tombs, and that they are to live with Christ. Why, Sir, the idea of *living with Christ*, is suggestive of time. You may say it takes but a moment of time, you may reduce it to the smallest minimum possible, the shortest possible period of time, and yet the idea of living, involves the idea of time to live in. Then there is to be time, *after* the resurrection, and *before* he ceases to reign merely as king in time. There is to be a period of time between these two events, whether it be long or short, whether it be a year or a thousand years, as it is spoken of in Scripture, a time in which Jesus shall live with his people.

And that I may make clear my thoughts upon this, I will call your attention to the twentieth chapter of Revelations, although I did not design doing so in debating this proposition, as we will have an opportunity to discuss that more fully in the examination of the resurrection.

Rev. 20:4.—"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. *But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.* This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Yes; the apostles and prophets of God, the holy men of every age, who have part in this blessed, this first resurrection, shall be permitted to "live and reign with him a thousand years."

We discover, too, from this testimony, not only that there shall be a thousand years' reign of those who are called to life at the coming of Christ; "but," that "the rest of the dead lived not again, until the thousand years were

finished." This reign with Christ "a thousand years," is to take place *before the end*.

There is a chain of events spoken of in this chapter, and among these *the judgment*. First, Satan is to be bound through the thousand years' reign, so that he shall have no power over the hearts of the children of men; but at the end of the thousand years, he is to be loosed for a little season. For what purpose? In order that every opportunity may be offered unto man for him to receive or reject the truth, before condemnation is passed upon him; for the whole scheme, the whole polity of the gospel of Christ, the government of God among men, from the beginning of the world, down to to-day, is based upon the moral agency of man. This millennium, or thousand years' reign, shall be what the Scriptures testify, a reign on the earth.

These nations or peoples who are presented to our notice, will be gathered before him. There will be children born through that age, as well as now, and as the doctrine of man's moral agency, which we have announced, is necessarily true, the moral agency of these then born among the nations must be honored, and the opportunity given for development in evil as well as in goodness. In that glorious time predicted by Isaiah, in his sixty-fifth chapter, from the eighteenth verse to the end, we discover that children will be born to Israel when God creates "Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy;" when "the wolf," "the lion" and "the serpent" "shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." Jeremiah also describes in other language the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem with the palace thereof, when "their children shall be as aforetime. * * * And ye shall be my people, and I will be your God." Read carefully Jeremiah 30 : 18-24, Isaiah 27 : 6, and Ezekiel 36 : 8-15. The nations who are not of Israel shall also exist, at the time of the end, though a great change will have been wrought among and upon them during the millennium, and they have been made tributary to Israel, which could not be if none were born unto them during that time, for their generation would all have died. Nor does it follow that they who have died during the millennium will not have been tried, for only to Zion and the locality called in Scripture prophecy "my holy mountain," does the promise extend, "Nothing shall hurt nor destroy." Other nations will exist, and the gospel will be presented to them. Satan also will work among these nations for a little season, for the purpose of trying them and those newly born, and seeing whether they will abide in the truth, and walk in the ways of God. After the thousand years' reign, and the intervention of the "little season," "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that he may be all in all."

We can not profit by reference to the Scriptures, if we take one isolated passage, and make all our argument upon that; we should let one passage explain another passage, and in this way only can we arrive at proper conclusions. If I call up Paul as a witness, as my brother has called up Alexander Campbell, I must take his testimony throughout.

I must notice one more thing the brother says, and that is in regard to the time when the Apocalypse was written. In all candor, notwithstanding his criticism, which I think can be answered satisfactorily, let me ask my brother, Where this book, called the Apocalypse, was written? Was it not upon the Isle of Patmos? Let me ask again, my brother, What do historians tell us concerning the time when John was banished to the Isle of Patmos? I have not only the testimony of one man, but the testimony of probably twenty-five learned men such as Horne, Le Clerc, Basnage, Dr. Mills, Dr. Lardner, Bishop Tomline and others, all of whom testify to the one same truth,—(if it is wanted, I will give other names),

—all these testify that John was banished to the Isle of Patmos by Domitian, about the ninety-fifth year of the Christian era.

If he wrote the Apocalypse *on the Isle of Patmos*, and *did not go there until the year 95*, I should like to know by what evidence my brother will be able to prove that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

We have the testimony also, that John returned in the year 97. The care of Mary, the mother of Jesus, was committed to him, and he doubtless remained in the province of Judea till her death, or till about the year 65. From the 65th to the 95th year of the Christian era, John doubtless, according to the best human authorities we have, labored in Ephesus and Asia Minor, having there an opportunity of communicating with all the churches, Ephesus being the metropolis of proconsular Asia, and having very extensive commercial connections, such opportunity being necessary for him as the Revelator to the Church, Peter and John being both dead. In or about the year 95, he was banished thence to the Isle of Patmos, by order of the Emperor Domitian, and remained there until the year 97, when, Nerva having become Emperor, he returned to Ephesus, where he wrote his gospel, it being written after the Apocalypse.

Now comes the question again: If John wrote this Apocalypse on the Isle of Patmos, and himself says he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, on that Island where he had been banished for the gospel's sake; if, twenty-five years after Jerusalem was destroyed the angel came to him and showed to him as stated in the introduction to this book, chapter one, verse one, "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants *things which must shortly come to pass*; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record," how could this "revelation," given *twenty-five years after* the destruction of Jerusalem, be a prophecy of things shortly to "come to pass," if it related to that event? The prophecy is future, and in this book John beheld Jesus coming in his kingdom.

I did not know what the brother's peculiar faith was in regard to the kingdom of God, but I supposed from his rendering of the words of Jesus to the Pharisees, in regard to his kingdom, that he had a very just and true conception of what it took to constitute the kingdom of God. But from his last speech, and the arguments and quotations made, I learn that he believes it is a spiritual work in the hearts of the children of men.

Now this, we think, is a very great mistake; for there never was such a thing as a kingdom, there never will be, never can be, without a king to govern, subjects to be governed, laws to govern by, officers to administer those laws, a locality and a name. The idea that an organization of this kind was in the heart, or can be in the heart, is too preposterous to be for a moment received.

The belief that the kingdom of God is spiritual, is founded upon a declaration of Jesus made to the Pharisees, "the kingdom is within you." This, my brother stated, he believed, was more correctly rendered in the margin, "*among you*." If Jesus meant that his kingdom, the fruit of which is "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," was within those whom he addressed, then these wicked Pharisees, of whom Jesus enquired, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell," had peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Our brother likes consistency!

The kingdom of God is an organization into which people can enter, and this kingdom in its ultimate triumph is to come, when Jesus shall be "King of kings, and Lord of lords." The expectations of Israel for that kingdom are shared by us, Sir, in relation to the coming of Jesus, in some very important particulars. It did not come when Jesus was here before; it is yet future, and with it, *the judgment*. Varied will be the scenes not yet enacted on the earth

before then; the preparation of God's people, and the filling up of the cup of the iniquity of their enemies whose doom is foretold in the sacred record, before the judgment age sets in, are among the works necessary in order to fulfill prophecy.

To refer many of these prophecies to the events that transpired when Jerusalem was destroyed, is to furnish doubt to the mind of the believer, and weapons of great power, offensive weapons too, to the sceptic, for *in those events these prophecies were not fulfilled*. The testimony concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, seems to be very conclusive, in some respects; and it seems to some of you, perhaps, as though it would be impossible to avoid the conclusion Elder Shinn has arrived at, from the explanation *which he has given*. If this is the complete explanation, all the explanation which he is intending to give of this event, it leaves out a great many of the events which have yet to take place, which are yet to be fulfilled, which are yet in the far distant future.

My brother introduces to our notice here, some testimony concerning the end, and quotes for us what is said concerning this end by other writers, and what is given as the proper rendering of the Greek word, "*Aion*." The congregation present will gather a much clearer idea of our views on the question in dispute from the English, than they can from the Greek. Yet, and what his object may be I have no right to judge, our friend refers so much to the Greek that I feel compelled to notice it.

To Elder Shinn.—I suppose you read from the Diaglott?

Elder Shinn.—Yes, Sir. The Emphatic Diaglott.

Elder Forscutt.—Griesbach's?

Elder Shinn.—Yes, Sir.

Elder Forscutt.—I am a little acquainted with it. Griesbach's Greek text has been adopted by Mr. Benjamin Wilson, and Mr. Wilson, in his very excellent and useful Emphatic version, gives the literal meaning of this word; according to the best and standard authors, as also does the Rev. John Groves, Horsely, Greenfield, Dr. Adam Clarke, Scott, Campbell, Henry, De Wette, Jacobus, Livermore, Tholuck, Bloomfield, Wesley, Benson, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and Barnes, and as they give the varied shades of meaning attached to this word, I will give you that meaning as summarized from the united testimony of these seventeen learned men. *Aion* signifies, primarily, ever being; from *aei* ever, an *on* being; also a space or period of time; time; through lifetime; a period; life; one's time of life; eternity; young in age; age; an age; a revolution of ages; duration, or continuance of time; a dispensation; a dispensation of providence; this world; this present life; the world, or life to come; one's lot in life; a long space of time; forever; an era; period of a dispensation; for one's life long; generation; duration, finite or infinite; unlimited duration; a period of duration, past or future.

The effort of Elder Shinn to attach specific significations to this word, significations supportive of his own peculiar views, may be or seem to be laudable; but if such application of specific and arbitrary meanings to words found in the original was allowable as evidence in this debate, I could, with less difficulty than my friend experiences on his side, unite several of the definitions given by our learned expositors, to the overthrow of his favorite theme now under discussion; but such evidence is not permissible. I must confine myself, as much as my friend's wanderings will allow me to do so, to the evidence found in Kign James' version; and I once more call his attention to the fact that *that version, and neither the Diaglott nor any other but that, is the standard of reference*.

Whatever meaning may be attached by "Brother Shinn" to the word *Aion*, or its derivative, the adjective, *aionias*, the audience, I trust, will not be influenced thereby, unless such meaning agree with the context. Correlative pas-

sages, and thoughts correlating to those in the passage quoted, as well as the contextual relation of whatever occurs before and after the quotation made, must be duly considered. How, then, of the twenty-seven meanings of this Greek word, or different shades of meaning, which we have given, can we consistently select one only; and if but one, which one must we select? By what right does my friend select one, to the exclusion of all the rest? I think that the rendering given to this word by the learned bishops who translated this, (holding up King James' version), is sufficiently correct. The term age, however, is suggestive of some period.

We pass from this to again notice the testimony concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. Josephus, Sir, has given to us testimony relating to this. Some you have presented, and some you have not. He speaks of one Jesus, the son of Ananias, who for four years was seen and heard as one crying unto the people, until finally he was smitten by the enemy at the siege, uttering a lamentable "Woe, woe to the city again, and to the people, and to the holy house!" Several different authors have given their testimony concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, forming an array of testimony which shows the fearful troubles and calamities that came upon the Jews.

I have, Sir, a little book, published by the Young Men's Bible Society, designed for the instruction of the young men who attend the theological seminary, and in this book the testimony of these authors is given to us, showing plainly the manner in which the peculiar items of prophecy recorded in God's book against Jerusalem were fulfilled during the time of the troubles of the Jews. Yet, Sir, notwithstanding this, I fail to see that that destruction is the destruction spoken of as the destruction of the world. For instance, I read in Matthew 24 : 26, 27 :

"Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

If the Roman army represented the coming of Jesus, they should have come from the east to the west; but instead of this, they came from the west to the east. If this is to be understood literally, you had better examine your map a little. Was the coming of the Roman army like the lightning shining from the east, even unto the west? When Jesus comes, as the lightning shineth forth from the east, even unto the west, so his power will not be confined to Jerusalem; but his glory shall go through all the earth. This will be literally, truly, a shining from the east unto the west.

Again, in evidence, we notice the testimony given by Matthew concerning the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars before he comes to judgment; also read in connection Mark 13 : 24-26, and Luke 21 : 25-27 :

"But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory."

"And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory."

There is no account published concerning the solar and planetary system that would justify the assertion, that the sun was darkened, and the stars fell from heaven, in any special or seemingly miraculous sense, (I use the term miraculous in a theological sense), after the prophecy and prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. No direct testimony is given to show anything that would justify such a conclusion.

The great comet of 1843, whose train is said to have been two hundred millions of miles in length, and which "approached so near to the sun as almost to graze his surface, and yet was of such intense brilliancy that it was seen in open day light, was something that has not yet been satisfactorily accounted for by the eminently scientific astronomers of our day; who only declare by way of explanation that there are but "one or two similar cases on record." This, whatever its origin, mission or object, is certainly, in the light of that philosophy which existed when the prophecy of Jesus was delivered, a "sign in the heavens above," and, I hesitate not to affirm, one of the signs that was to be seen *before he comes "in the throne of his Father's glory.*" The celebrated comet of Dr. Halley, observed in 1682, he was able to trace as the same that had appeared in 1456, 1531, and 1607, and could on the basis of this computation predict the reappearance of it again in 1759, failing only in between one and two years. This same comet appeared again in 1835, and can now be traced back as far as eleven years before Christ; its periodical return aiding us in determining with some degree of accuracy the correctness of our chronology. The comets known as Olber's, Faye's, Brorsen's, and De Vico's are traceable. Encke's comet can be confidently looked for once in about three and a half years, and Biela's once in six and three-fourth years; but that of 1843 is yet an unsolved mystery. Donati's return is predicted; but on this all are silent.

There is no evidence of any darkening of the sun, or falling of the stars having taken place, when this destruction came upon Jerusalem. This was to happen; yes, Sir, this darkening of the sun was one of the events which was to precede the coming of the Lord.

Astronomy teaches us firstly that, owing to the necessity of the moon being in the plane of the ecliptic in order that she may pass neither above nor below the cone of the earth's shadow; total eclipses of the sun are less frequent than they would be if she had not an angular inclination of about five degrees; secondly, that eclipses are of three kinds, 1st, *annular*, when a ring is visible round the body of the moon; 2d, *partial*, when only a portion of the sun is invisible; 3d, *total*, when the sun is entirely covered by the dark disc of the moon; and thirdly, that, therefore, a total eclipse of the sun is a very rare occurrence. If, therefore, our "brother" should argue against the literality of this prophecy, it will not avail him; no, not even though he should attempt to prove that these things "happen according to law," for he who created them is their Law-giver, and his own Son who predicted these events as landmarks to us poor mariners on the ocean of time, pointing to the period of his glorious return, is he by whom they were also created.

In speaking of the darkening of the sun on May 19th, 1780, the editor of the *Portsmouth Journal* declared that there has been nothing like it recorded in the history of man. It was a total eclipse of the sun in the Eastern States. How much further the eclipse was visible we are not advised. It was looked upon then both by the religious and irreligious as one of the signs of an impending judgment. Nor was this the view of that event had by the uneducated alone, if our history be reliable. Do you not remember in reading your school boy history, that at that time there was one in the halls of Congress who has since become justly celebrated for his firmness, when through fear it was proposed to adjourn, as the day of judgment had surely come, and who then arose, the advocate of a special faith in God, and said, "If the day of judgment is come, let it find us at our posts, doing our duty, for we can not be better employed." The sun was darkened, and "fear took hold upon the people, as of a woman in travail."

But still later than this, have appeared "signs in the sun," premonitory of the Savior's return. In the year 1816, they were visible to the naked eye for many months, so history informs us at least; nor do we find any special record or explanation of those unseen *by the naked eye* earlier than this in any scientific works. The attempt at special classification was made in our language in the English translation of Guillemin's "Heavens," published in London, in 1866, and on this, on Professors Airy's and Hind's "Astronomy" and "Solar System," are our present text-books on the theory of "sun-spots based. Our American astronomical works do not claim any thorough investigation of this phenomenon till within forty-five years past, nor at any date prior to 1816 do we find them investigated or more than mentioned. These, Sir, we also accept as another evidence of the future coming and judgment, for they precede that in the order of events in the Savior's prophecy.

There have been several important "signs in the heavens;" but I pass these to consider the question involved in that part of the prophecy which teaches that "the stars of heaven shall fall." What does this signify? Like the remaining part of the prophecy, I regard this, Sir, as literal also; not literal in the light of modern science, but literal in the light of usages of both the Savior's time and our own. The falling of meteors was then called the falling of stars, and by the common people is so called still. Yes, Sir, even our astronomical works speak of "those evanescent meteors which dart across the sky at night in all directions" as *shooting stars*, and the luminous shower of August, called by the untutored Hibernian, "St. Lawrence's tears," is recognized as the "shower of *falling stars*." Surely then we may allow to Jesus the use of an expression which, when made, conveyed, and still conveys a correct idea of the phenomenon illustrated by the meteoric shower of 1833, which fell on the 12th of November, which by multiplication of the actual number counted in a given time in Boston alone, averaged thirty-nine thousand an hour, or an aggregate of nearly three hundred thousand. The Latter Day Saints, Sir, will ever remember that grand display, for they were then encamped in the open air, driven from their homes by an infuriated mob led by "religious" zealots. To them it was "a sign," to me it is one still, one of the signs of the last days before the coming of Jesus to that judgment and reign which our brother is vainly trying to prove is in the past. Sir J. Herschel, Baron Humboldt, Professors Carrington, Philips, Dawes, Hind, Mayer, Thomson, and Tyndal have given evidence on this question in their lectures and teachings of astronomy and meteorology, as also Helmholtz, the able contributor to physical science who has written so ably on the theory of solar heat, based on the Nebular hypothesis of Laplace, and among others, our own Professor Olmstead, who, speaking of that time, says: The falling stars or meteoric shower of 1833 was "such as to cover no inconsiderable portion of the earth's surface"—these all, Sir, regard the phenomenon of 1833 as one of the most interesting of all meteorological phenomena, and some of them regard it as the grandest display of this nature ever witnessed. The only recorded meteoric display approaching towards it is that described by Humboldt, as having taken place thirty-four years previously. Regard it, Sir, as you will; taken in connection with the signs in the sun in 1816, the darkening of the moon in 1848, and of the sun in 1857, the unexplained comet of 1843, with its two hundred millions miles of train, the position and movements among the nations, the preaching of the primitive gospel, with all its ordinances, gifts and blessings by the Latter Day Saints throughout the world, and the gathering of Israel to their long forsaken home, to me it indicates the future coming, judgment and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ.

To the call of the Moderator Elder Forscutt yielded the floor.

Elder Shinn's fifth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appear before you again this morning, to continue our friendly discussion. I shall first briefly review my brother's last speech. He feels a little disposed to complain, because I appeal to Alexander Campbell and some others. I did not introduce these men, only for the purpose of showing their teaching upon the point which I presented, and I am under no obligation to receive their testimony upon anything else. I presume my brother is willing to endorse all that those learned men have said, whom he has introduced here to testify in relation to particular points. If I find men, who hold, in most of points, views differing from mine, and who still agree with me upon one point, their view upon that point is certainly of force, and is an evidence of candor and honesty upon their part.

"Christ's kingdom not temporal, but eternal." We pass that by for the present.

"Does not have enough to do." My brother seems to feel that I ought to branch out. Well now I do not think this is just the right way to treat my arguments. Does not this congregation know full well, that yesterday my brother acknowledged mankind were judged in this world, and in this life. Have they forgotten the passages of Scripture that I read? That "I will judge them in the land of their nativity, in the place where they were created?" That the nation that they should serve, "afterwards will I judge that nation." He admits that this judgment is in this life. I noted the passage of Scripture, that under the Mosaic law, "every transgression and disobedience received, [past tense], a just recompense of reward." Having admitted that men were all judged in this life, he afterward declared that he did not believe in a re-judgment, which we called attention to in this discussion. Now, you can not judge them again. Concerning the coming of Christ to judge mankind, his coming in glory, in the clouds, I proved that it was to take place during the natural lifetime of some of those who heard Jesus speak. I told him my position was, that if he could not prove that some were living now, who were living then, he must utterly fail in this discussion. Has he answered these arguments? I have prosecuted this discussion calmly, and have introduced these arguments calmly and deliberately, and have given him an opportunity to answer them. Rev. 20:4-6. I wish to say, that I believe man is a free moral agent now, and will be forever. I believe that God works in harmony with men's will, to accomplish his salvation. I believe that salvation will forever be wrought out in harmony with men's free moral agency.

My brother, upon the subject of the literal resurrection of the dead, you will never be able to prove that the Bible teaches any such a doctrine. There is too much concurrent testimony against the idea. A literal resurrection, you will never be able to prove, in this discussion. But that matter will be canvassed in due time.

"Date of the Apocalypse." I have something to say in regard to that. He seems to be of the impression, that it was written in the year 96:

"We feel a much stronger confidence in the internal evidences which the Apocalypse furnishes of its date, than we do in the historical testimony. It is for this reason, we think, that the number of those who believe that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem is steadily increasing, among men of sound learning. Professor Stuart has added the weight of his great learning and influence, to the support of that opinion."—Whittemore's Introduction, page 38.

"In respect to the historical testimony, the first thing that strikes the mind of the inquirer is, that it is contradictory. Irenaeus, who is the most ancient authority we have upon the subject, seemed to think that the Apocalypse made its appearance about the end of Domitian's

reign, say A. D. 95. Epiphanius said repeatedly, that John wrote the revelation during the time of Claudius, the predecessor of Nero; and if this be true, it must have been written before A. D. 54. Tertullian, and, after him, Jerome, are supposed to have taught, that John was banished to Patmos during the reign of Nero; and in the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, the title page explicitly declares that it was written in Patmos, whither John was sent by Nero Cæsar. If the Apocalypse was written during the reign of Nero, it was but a few years before the Jewish war; and it would render very natural the language of that book in respect to the immediateness of the threatened judgment. Among other writers who have supposed the book to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, may be mentioned Sir Isaac Newton, in his 'Observations on the prophecies and the Apocalypse of St. John,' London, 1733; Dr. Hammond, in his Commentary; the learned Lightfoot's works, (edited by J. R. Pitman, London, 1825), vol. 3, pp. 331-371, and various other places. Bishop Thomas Newton, in his Dissertations on the prophecies, London, 1832, pp. 444, 447, and to these we may add, we are told, the authority of Grotius, Wetstein, Eishrom, and many other learned men. The opinion is now becoming more and more general, that the Apocalypse was written previously to the destruction of Jerusalem. Dr. Adam Clark, in closing his notes on the Apocalypse, says, 'I think the book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and not in the year 95 or 96.'—Whittemore's Introduction, page 39.

"Irenæus, it will be remembered, did not live until about a century after St. John. The language of that father does not seem to be intended to define *the time when* the Apocalypse was written, *so much as the time* of its first appearance, so far as he knew. The words are these: 'The Apocalypse was seen not long ago, but almost in our generation, near the end of Domitian's reign.' Supposing Irenæus here to have intended that the Apocalypse, so far as he knew, did not appear until near the end of Domitian's reign, would this prove that it was not written until that time? or that none others had seen it until then? We think not. The passage from Irenæus is evidently ambiguous; some authors take one view of it, and some another."—Whittemore's Introduction, page 40.

Internal evidences of the book:

"The single question which we shall seek to *settle now* is, Was the Apocalypse written before the destruction of Jerusalem? Let it be observed that *it was* addressed to the seven churches in Asia. We are not sure that these only were addressed. They may have been used symbolically, for the churches at large; seven being separated as a sample of the whole, for the same reason that John speaks of the *seven* spirits, the *seven* lamps of fire, *seven* seals, *seven* angels, *seven* trumpets, *seven* thunders, etc. But the special point to be observed under this head of our subject is, that the style of address to the churches of Asia, does not differ greatly from that of the epistles of Paul and Peter. The revelator urges the church at Ephesus, to labor to overcome their enemies, to sustain themselves well in the midst of persecutions. And Paul surely urges the same thing in substance, on the same churches. He exhorted them to be 'strong in the Lord, and the power of his might;' to put on the whole armor of God, etc. Precisely the same state of the church is described in the second epistle of Peter, with that described in the Apocalypse. It is such, it would almost seem, that these two books were written about the same time; and the same remarks may be made to the brief epistle of Jude."—Introduction to Apocalypse, by Thomas Whittemore, pages, 41-43.

Other evidences I have to introduce, but do not care to introduce them now; but will do so hereafter, if it is necessary.

"Kingdom of God in the heart." This, my brother, is the spiritual reign of Christ in the hearts of men.

He says, "Any kingdom must have laws, subjects, territory," etc. Yes, so we say of a literal kingdom; but of the spiritual kingdom here, we say it may be in the hearts of men; a spiritual reign of Christ within them. Again we say it is in the hearts of men, because "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Can we not have righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit within the heart? This is the spiritual reign of Jesus in the hearts of men, not a literal reign, as I have shown by the authority quoted from Romans 14:17. As defined by my brother a word is to be taken in its most primary, natural sense. Precisely then, as I quoted in Corinthians 15:24.

Here is a little matter that troubles my brother. Precisely where he thinks Christ commences to reign, and judgment takes place; yes, Sir, right at that time Christ delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and not a single syl-

lable is said about judgment at that time. My brother tries to make it appear, that after his coming he is to reign with his people on the earth, and be their King. I repeat that the reign of judgment commenced with the reign of Christ, and will cease when that reign ceases, and he "delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that he may be all in all;" precisely where my brother says his reign of judgment commences. Let us read this passage again:

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Call it whatever you will, my brother, there are but two orders in the resurrection.

"But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Here is the *end* of Christ's reign as Judge, instead of the beginning of his reign as Judge. There is quite a difference between me and my brother in regard to this matter.

"Argument from Matthew 24:27." "If the Roman army came from the east," etc. That this indicates his judgment, and that his coming to reign over mankind is a figurative coming, is all I claim.

"Dark Days. May 19th, 1780, is known in the history of New England as the Dark Day. Between the hours of 10 and 11 A.M. the sky became obscured with dense clouds of a smoky hue that drifted from the southwest. The fowls went to roost, the birds sang their evening songs and settled themselves to sleep in their hidden retreats, candles were lighted in all the houses, while a silence and dimness as of night rested upon the face of all nature. A similar darkness was experienced October 21st, 1716, O. S. On this occasion, the day was so dark that people were forced to light candles to eat their dinners by. This could not be from any eclipse, the solar eclipse being the fourth of that month. On October 19th, 1762, a remarkable dark day was observed at Detroit. An officer stationed there described the day in a letter to a friend, in these words: 'The 19th of this month was the most extraordinary dark day, perhaps, ever seen in the world.' The cause of the unnatural darkness prevailing on these several days was probably the extensive burning of western prairies and woodlands."—*The Ohio*, H. S. Livingstone, Publisher, Galesburg, Illinois.

This is all, I believe, of my brother's speech. I now reach my sixth argument.

His coming was at a time of great trouble. Matthew 24:16:

"Then let them which be in Judea, flee into the mountains."

Dan. 12:1.—"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of great trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."

For a parallel we cite you to Matthew 24:17-22:

"Let him which is on the housetop, not come down to take anything out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days: but pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day; for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

Joel 2:1, 2.—"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is *nigh* at hand."

Does that mean two, three, or ten thousand years in the future?

"A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains; a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations."

Ezekiel 5:9, 10, in this connection:

"And I will do in thee that which I have not done, and whereunto I will not do any more the like, because of all thine abominations. Therefore the fathers shall eat the sons in the midst of thee, and the sons shall eat their fathers; and I will execute judgments in thee, and the whole remnant of thee will I scatter into all the winds."

Matthew 24, in this connection, 27th verse. Now mark it:

"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

The brother has either misunderstood Father Campbell, or he does not wish to understand him. I will read, showing that he places this coming here spoken of, as having been fulfilled, and his authority is worth something as an able and learned man. He is not the only one who is upon the part of the position we take; we can bring many more.

"Some of them not only saw the Son of man enter upon his reign, and the kingdom of God commence on Pentecost, and carry his conquests over Judea, Samaria and the uttermost parts of the earth; but they saw the Lord 'come with power' and awful glory, and accomplish all his predictions on the deserted and devoted temple, city, and people."—Christian System, by A. Campbell, page 179.

Therefore it is in harmony with the teachings of this eminent man, as well as many others that we have here ready to bring forward, if it is necessary, that the kingdom was gradual in being established, in being set up. Dr. Adam Clark is in harmony with this. So is Dr. Lightfoot, and many other learned orthodox critics, those who believed in the doctrine of future endless punishment, those who believed in a day of future judgment, these did not believe that the coming indicated here, was any other than a spiritual coming; a coming in power and glory, as I have shown.

I do not know but it would be as well to give some other testimony here, in regard to this matter. My brother speaks something about the stars falling from heaven. I want to give Dr. Adam Clark's view upon that subject. We have it here some place—I guess I have lost it for the present—I thought I had it in this book—I will find it somewhere else.

"Verse 27, of Matthew 16.—"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works."

Verse 28.—"Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

I will read a parallel upon this, and call my brother's special attention to the argument made upon it. Dr. Adam Clark says:

"This seems to refer to Daniel 7:13, 14, 'Behold one like the Son of man came, to the Ancient of Days, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him.' This was the glorious mediatorial kingdom which Jesus was about to set up, by the destruction of the Jewish nation and polity, and the diffusion of his gospel through the whole world. If the words be taken in this sense, the *angels* or messengers may signify the apostles and successors in the sacred ministry, preaching the gospel in the power of the *Holy Ghost*. Verse 28.—This verse seems to confirm the above explanation, as our Lord evidently speaks of the establishment of the Christian Church, after the day of Pentecost, and its final triumph, *after* the destruction of the Jewish polity; as if he said, 'Some of you, my disciples, shall continue to live till these things take place.'"—Adam Clark, (Methodist), D.D.

Page's Selection of Eminent Commentators.

Dr. Hammond also agrees with Dr. Clark.

John 21:33.—"Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

"Matthew 24:32-34.—"Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

Now, I call my brother's attention to another criticism here. All this falling of stars from heaven, and the darkening of the sun, before the coming of Christ in clouds, his coming in glory, his coming to reward mankind, to judge mankind, was to be fulfilled, during the time of that generation. But I have an argument to bring forward in regard to that matter presently. I am now ready to present my seventh affirmative argument.

The coming of Christ was near at hand, over eighteen hundred years ago, as shown by the following unmistakable language and phraseologies:

Rev. 22:12.—“And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.”

“Mat. 16:27, 28.—“For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.”

Rev. 1:3.—“Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is *at hand*.”

Here the revelator testifies, and this is another of the internal evidences of the book, showing it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, that this coming was “*at hand*.”

Rev. 1:7.—“Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so. Amen.”

Here the revelator speaks of the same coming spoken of in Matthew 16:27, 28. Matthew testifies that it shall take place during the natural lifetime of those who heard him speak. My brother may be able to dispose of these strong arguments, but I predict now that he will never be able to do it.

Time was called.

Elder Forscutt's reply to Elder Shinn's fifth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have listened this morning to a recapitulation of a part of the evidences of yesterday, and have heard, I suppose, some of the new and promised evidences which my “brother” threatened me with yesterday, several times, and which he thought would certainly overwhelm me. I do not know what condition I may seem to be in; but I am pleased to say that I feel just as tall now as I did before these overwhelming evidences came.

It does not seem to me that there has been one particle of evidence presented, this morning, in support of the proposition. I will call the attention of the audience to the proposition, and let them judge: “The Bible teaches that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past.”

In the review of the arguments of yesterday, our friend has introduced to us again this thought; that Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, was to be during the lifetime of some of those then living. This thought is based upon the declaration which is given to us as having been uttered by the Savior, (which declaration I too believe to have been uttered by him), “Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” This is the language, and it is suggestive of two or three ideas other than that which the brother has presented. There is such a power within the possession of Deity as that which can cause life to be prolonged. The brother quoted for us the testimony concerning John, the Revelator, and the apostles understood,—whether they were less wise than my brother or not, I am not prepared to say,—but they certainly understood that the promise was made by Jesus, that John should not taste of death. It seems that they had been questioning Jesus concerning John, to which he made this

significant reply, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee." And, Sir, you will not be able to establish that they were in error in believing that John's life would be prolonged; unless you can show from history an authenticated account of his death. But supposing that writers testify that he did die, that they even give an account of his death as having taken place a short time after he wrote the Apocalypse, I shall then wish to know *who* these writers are, and whether they were *witnesses* of his death, or whether they simply record *traditions and impressions* concerning him, or *facts*, "*stubborn facts*." No such witnesses as are reliable witnesses on this case have yet been produced. It will not do to produce, as witnesses of his death, those who themselves did not live till from one hundred to seventeen hundred years after the death they record took place. Such witnesses would not be accepted in any court, nor could their testimony have weight with any jurors in the most trivial case; they can have no weight here, Sir, against the testimony of Jesus, and the faith of his apostles.

I apprehend you will not find any reliable historical account of the death of John, the apostle; if there is such an account, it being an authoritative one, then I should ask those who wrote that account, if they were here, to explain to me why Jesus was sent to teach all truth, and did not correct the mistake of the apostles, when they had received the idea that John was to remain. Instead of correcting it, he makes it more positive by saying, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee."

The gentleman may say, that it is very strange a man should live so long a time; but the same God that raised up Jesus from the dead; that gave the power and life by which he still lives, and by which he will live forever; the same God who has made the promise, as the apostle tells us, that when Jesus comes he will translate those who shall then be living, and that they shall be forever with the Lord;—that same God could immortalize, or so change the body of John, as would confer on him such power of continuity of life as that he could remain according to the statement of Jesus, "If I will that he *tarry till I come*, what is that to thee." I submit that point.

The brother says I "shall never be able to prove a second resurrection of the dead." Had he made this statement early on yesterday, I might have had serious fears; but as in every speech since then, and upon every point presented, almost, he has threatened me with that which would so seriously overwhelm me, I have become used to it; and this has so much of the same spirit in it, that really I begin to cease to have any fears; I am really losing all my apprehension concerning trouble. Whether I am to make this failure or not, will be seen when we come to debate on that proposition. I am not accustomed to make threats beforehand; but to work when the time for work comes.

The brother asks the question, "Was the fact that the Apocalypse was seen at the close of the reign of Domitian any evidence that the book was not written before that time?" In answer to this, I propound another question, Is the fact of its having been seen at the close of Domitian's reign, any evidence that it had not then been *recently* written? One question is just as worthy of consideration as the other; no force in either worth the naming.

The "Kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." It is true in the sense in which the apostle uses the language. These are the *fruits* of the kingdom of God; but the apostle did not say the kingdom of God was in the heart; he had too much sound sense, and was too good a logician for that. The kingdom is an organization, the fruits of which are "righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost," and these *fruits* ought to be in the human heart. If our hearts *contain* the kingdom, instead of the kingdom containing us, we never shall, never can enter into that kingdom, neith-

er in a literal nor in a spiritual sense. Jesus reigns in the hearts of those who do his will, by the power of his love, but that is not his kingdom. He has promised that those who do his will and triumph over every opposing power and influence, shall *dwell with him in his kingdom*; not his kingdom *in them*.

The brother tells you again, calling your attention to the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, that I still certify that the reign of Christ is to begin exactly where it is to end. I do not know on what hypothesis he finds this argument, unless it be in the testimony culminating in the word *end*. Here, I judge, the position is taken on account of his translation of the Greek word *aionos*, which he renders age; "*sunteleias tou aionos*, end of the age. Whether it be the end of that age, or the end of the world, does not materially affect the question at issue just now.

That the reign of Christ was to end at the time when I think it is to commence, I have yet to hear the evidences of. On the contrary side, the Scriptures abound with testimony, and if I were on the affirmative side of this question, I should present that testimony to prove the affirmative of that view, which I can now, as negating an opposite view of Elder Shinn, only advance as counter evidence. It is not my right to present that testimony now. True, I might jump out of the traces, and attempt to lead Elder Shinn; but it is not my privilege so to do; I can but rebut his testimony, and attempt to prove the opposite of the position taken by him. Were I on the affirmative, I repeat, I would bring forward such an array of testimony, that I believe, if your hearts are honest, and you desire *truth*, you would at once be able to see that the coming of Christ to reign, and to judgment, will be when we suppose; it has not yet been. Of this vast amount of evidence in the Scriptures, to prove this position to be true, I submit:

That the Saints were to rest with Christ and the apostles, until the coming of Christ in power and great glory.

That Christ was to be revealed in the future.

That there was to be a *future* day, in the which God *would judge* the world, according to the gospel.

That time was not when the apostle wrote; it was *in the future*. The apostle, in writing to the Thessalonians, places the coming of Christ in the future.

2 Thess. 2: 2, 3, 4.—"That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there be a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

I would like to know the name of the man who did this before the destruction of Jerusalem. I would like to learn it either from history or the Bible.

I think the brother is laboring under a mistake, by not noticing the *conditions* under which the testimony contained in Matthew 24, was given to the disciples. The apostles presented to him a three-fold question, instead of a question that was a unit. If you will turn to the previous chapter, you will learn what "*these things*" are, about which Jesus was interrogated by his disciples.

Matt. 23: 34-39.—"Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!

Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

"Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." You will remember that a good deal of the argument in this debate on "Brother" Shinn's side, has been about the present tense. I do not know what he will do with the tense here, "is left unto you desolate," and this, too, a number of years before Jerusalem was destroyed.

Jesus said, "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The disciples wondering when these things were to transpire, came to Jesus to show him the buildings of the magnificent temple, when Jesus replied, "See ye not all these things? Verily, I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Then the disciples came unto him and said, "Tell us *when shall these things be?*" This was the part of the three-fold question that referred to the things that had been before told; things concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. Second question, "What will be the sign of thy coming?" Third question, elliptical, "And of the end of the world?" Here we now have before us this three-fold question, referring to three different facts, three different periods of time. First, the destruction of Jerusalem, or the accomplishing of all those things which were before told them; second, the reign of the coming of Jesus Christ; third, the end of the world.

Jesus then commenced to explain to them, as was common among the Jews, giving to them the testimony in its entirety, and answering as though it were but one question, instead of three different ones. But as the question is three-fold, so is the answer; and the question to be determined is, which part of the prophecy was to be fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem; which part at the coming of Christ, and which part at the end of the world, the general judgment approaching. In defining the matter, we notice that Jesus names an irregular series of events which were to take place. The brother has referred us already to many of them, and told us what was seen in the heavens before the destruction of Jerusalem, but there are many others spoken of as preceding the coming of Jesus Christ, which have not received their fulfillment.

Firstly; I call your attention to the fact that it is said, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders." What were the great signs and wonders which they showed, prior to the destruction of Jerusalem? Where is the history that relates to us the peculiar signs and wonders shown by the false Christs and false prophets, to lead the people astray, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Secondly, Jesus says:

"Then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo here is Christ, or there; believe it not. * * * Behold I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth. Behold he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. * * * Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."—Matt. 24: 23-30.

The brother talks a great deal about certain terms in which is used the present tense. The Scriptures furnish a great many terms used in the present tense, which describe events which did not have their fulfillment for long periods of time. I do not know whether this is one of them or not; I am not prepared to say. I dare not be so positive upon that point as my brother is. If the Scriptures warrant me in being positive, I will be so; if they do not, I dare not be.

But there is certainly something very strange, and to me almost ridiculous, (my brother will notice the phrase, I am not calling him ridiculous), something strange and almost ridiculous in the idea that the destruction of Jerusalem, was the coming of the Son of man, in power and great glory. It is still more strange, still more ridiculous, to say that the coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, was the fulfillment of the prophecy, that he should come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

As to the quotation from Mr. Campbell, I have only this to say; Mr. Campbell did not do aught else of interest in this quotation than reason on what was written, and his statements are therefore his opinions only; we ought to receive them as you will receive Mr. Shinn's opinions and my own, and subject them to the same crucial tests, the word of God and the light thrown thereon by the revelations of history. Mr. Campbell's opinions are of no more value in this discussion than are the opinions of Whittemore, the "learned gentleman" whose arguments friend Shinn has borrowed so extensively in this debate, and to whom he has sought to refer you so often as to one so well qualified to determine points at issue, without telling you from whom he quoted, or that his author, Mr. Whittemore, is one of the stars of *Universalism*. Mr. Campbell may confirm Elder Shinn in his views; but simply because Mr. Campbell said this or that, his saying so does not prove it to be truth. Ten thousand Campbell's "say so" is of no value as testimony in this debate; but the Bible and the Bible only. Learned men have their opinions, differing from one another; each one holding his views, and some times opposite and very distinct opinions from some other, or from all other learned men.

The Savior promised to his followers an influence that should guide them, a reliable guide, into all truth, and make them one. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come." He told them he would send the Comforter; that he would leave, but the Comforter would come. He also commanded them to tarry at Jerusalem, until they were endowed with power *from on high*. They did tarry, in obedience to this command, until this power came from on high. Was that the coming of Jesus? When the apostles were assembled, on the day of Pentecost, "There came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind." Was Jesus to come personally and in glory; or as with the sound of a mighty rushing wind? I repeat it, "As of a rushing mighty wind."

Jesus had promised to send the Holy Ghost, and had given this as the condition of the fulfillment of that promise, that if he went not away from them, the Comforter would not come. This Comforter was to be with the church, if they were faithful; to remain with the church; to comfort the church, and to teach the church until Jesus should return in power and glory, in fulfillment of the prophecy contained in the first chapter of Acts, where his return is spoken of as being on the same principle as his departure.

He said to his disciples:

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, HE was taken up, and a cloud received HIM out of their sight."—Acts 1: 7, 8, 9.

What was this that was taken up? Was it the power and influence?

Or was it the person?

Let us read further, and see again what the record says about him. When he appeared unto the disciples, one of them could not believe it was he. Others thought it was Christ, but this one could not believe until he felt the side where the spear had pierced, and put his hands in the prints of the nails, and after he had done these things he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." See John 20: 24-29.

To others who seemed to think he was not a person, but a spirit, he made this significant remark :

"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."

Who was that Jesus? What was this said of him? "Thou shalt * * * bring forth a son, and shalt call *his name* JESUS."—Luke 1 : 31; also 35th verse, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that *holy thing which shall be born of thee*, shall be called the Son of God." This was the word of the angel to his mother. That *same "holy thing,"* "his name Jesus," was crucified; and after the crucifixion and resurrection, *that same Jesus* appeared unto the apostles; *that same Jesus* was with them forty days; *that same Jesus* was taken up into heaven, and the disciples gazed *after him*; for though he had told them he should leave them they were loth to part with him. But we read further :

"And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven *as HE went up*, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come IN LIKE MANNER as ye have seen him go into heaven."—Acts 1:10-12.

Just as he went away, just so was he to return.

How did he go?

"A cloud received him out of their sight."

How shall he return?

In the clouds.

How did he go?

With his body.

How shall he return?

With his body.

We read in Zechariah 13 : 6, that after his return with his body, the Jews shall look upon him, "And shall say unto him, What are those wounds in thy hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends." This same body that Jesus had before, he is to come with; the same wounds, the same prints of the nails are to be there, and are to be seen—the same Jesus, the "holy thing," the body born of Mary. He is to come too with the holy angels; and we read in the testimony of Jude, that he is to come "with ten thousand of his Saints; he will come in power and glory; he will come to take vengeance on his enemies, and to reign over his kingdom in the midst of his people.

The brother refers to my remarks yesterday, in regard to the dark day, and intimates that my argument amounted to nothing, from the fact that there had been other dark days; and he names three dark days from some work, and read us the report of that. I am surprised that the gentleman did not notice the testimony, as shown in the statement about these dark days, to which I referred. It speaks of their having transpired, and the conclusions drawn from them by the writer. In the account read by the brother, we are told at its close, after reading about all these dark days, that *perhaps it was occasioned by the burning of the western prairies*. Wonderful darkness! This first day I referred to yesterday, is described by a writer who witnessed it, as being a time of such intense darkness "that a sheet of white paper held before the eye, was indistinguishable from the blackest velvet." It is true, as Brother Shinn reasons, that with the increase of knowledge many things once considered miraculous are now anticipated, and with an accuracy greater even than he has intimated, eclipses are foretold years beforehand almost to within a second of their occurrence. It is a blessing to our age that intelligence has spread so wide, and that truth is assuming by

right the vantage ground of speculation; but in the enjoyment of our increased privileges, let us not forget that He who guides Nature by his immutable laws, also guided his Son, his prophets, and his servants to foretell *hundreds of years in advance of science*, the events of our times. Scepticism may delight in natural law and human discovery thereof, and become self-consequential; but faith delights equally as much in the discovery, and the more satisfactorily, because she sees fresh cause of gratitude to the author of all truth, and looks from Nature up to Nature's God. It is much better to acknowledge God therein than to say, "It was, perhaps, caused by the burning of the western prairies," as Brother Shinn has done.

We are now referred to Daniel, twelfth chapter, and first verse. We are told in the beginning the testimony of this verse:

"That at that time Michael shall stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people."

Does the gentleman suppose that this was fulfilled at the coming of Vespasian and Titus to destroy Jerusalem? At the time when the Roman army came against the children of Daniel's people? Is that standing for them? At which part of this eventful time Michael stood up for them, the gentleman did not define. I should also like to know at which of these times referred to by Daniel in this verse, the gentleman places the coming referred to. He referred to it in his argument, as though it was fulfilled at the coming of the Roman army. If it was, there is something very strange in the testimony.

From the prophet we learn that this is to be an event to transpire at what he calls, and what I call, the "time of the end."

"At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake."

We might venture into the examination of the previous chapter, because it should be connected with this; but we have not time.

Taking this in connection with the testimony given to us, (and which we have before referred to), in the second chapter of Joel, first to twelfth verses, we will be better able to understand its bearings.

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains; a great people and a strong; there hath not been even the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations."

Now if you will come with me to the first chapter of Joel, perhaps we may come to a better understanding of this matter, commencing at verse one.

"The word of the Lord that came to Joel, the son of Pethuel. Hear this, ye old men, and give ear all ye inhabitants of the land. Hath this been in your days, or even in the days of your fathers? Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation. That which the palmer-worm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten; and that which the cankerworm hath left hath the caterpillar eaten."

In this comes to us the testimony, that Jerusalem and Judea were first to suffer before the events spoken of in the second chapter should take place, and in the far distant future only could that then have been.

Joel was one of the prophets of God to Judah; there is no question about that.

We find in referring to this chapter further, that it gives an historical account of the events that shall transpire; and from the very nature of them, we conclude that they are not to take place until the time when Israel shall be restored

to their own land. This is evident from the twenty-fifth verse of the second chapter, "And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm and the caterpillar, and the palmer-worm, my great army which I sent among you," followed by the twenty-sixth verse which closes with the declaration, "And my people shall *never* be ashamed.

"Time," called the speaker to a close.

Elder Shinn's sixth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

According to the custom which I have adopted throughout this discussion, I shall notice my brother's arguments, before proceeding with my affirmative argument. I would first notice Matthew 16 : 27, 28. The brother has referred to this argument at last, and you will notice the manner in which he attempts to avoid the force of that argument, is to throw upon me the burden of proving, from some reliable historian, that the disciple John ever did die. Why, my brother, are not you aware that can be done. I presume Dr. Fleetwood would be considered reliable in this matter. Now this is the only force, as sure as you are living, it is the only way he can do anything against my strong argument in regard to Christ's coming taking place during the natural lifetime of those who heard him, is to challenge us here, to bring forward from reliable historians, that John the revelator did die.

"St. John died, and was buried near Ephesus, in the beginning of Trajan's reign, in the ninety-eighth year of his age."—Life of Christ, by John Fleetwood, D.D., page 567.

The very thing the brother said we could not do. I call your attention again to that passage of Scripture:

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Now, then, he was to come in that kingdom, and reward mankind according to their works. A positive declaration that he is to come during the natural lifetime of those who heard him. We have proved that coming to have been quickly; not eight or ten thousand years to come, and for the brother to attempt to get rid of this, by claiming that John is still living, looks very much like straining a point. Now, the brother must support the idea, by proving to this intelligent congregation that John is still living. His success or failure depends upon his proving that the disciple, John, is still living in the body. Matthew twenty-fourth chapter; he reads two or three verses here, and speaks about the signs that were to precede the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have something short to quote in regard to that. I hold in my hand a work, written by a noted and scholarly Methodist Presiding Elder, Brother Goodwin. My brother seems to look over the fact, from what he has said, that he being of a different view from me, his evidence, which is given in favor of the position which I occupy, is doubly strong, and candor and honesty require that I should receive it, and I assure you, that my view must be sustained by these principles.

"There are three questions in one, yet but *one question*. Those who have a theory to maintain, assume that in the minds of the disciples, the coming of Christ, and the end of the world, were to be synchronous, and the destruction of the temple another event; hence they *arbitrarily*, divide the triple question into two, whereas it is *certain*, that all were associated together as composing *one grand transaction*."—Mode of Man's Immortality, by T. A. Goodwin, A.M., page 127.

This is the testimony of the noted Doctor, and a more scholarly man the Methodist Church does not to-day afford. This view which he presents, I endorse. My brother says that the true Jesus is the body. What a position!

What a dilemma my brother will find himself in, when he takes up his other question. Then I presume the body of Jesus came down from heaven.

John 3:13.—“And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven even the Son of man which is in heaven.”

I believe Jesus came down from heaven. He was with the Father, yet my brother will say, his body came down from heaven. Something more in regard to that point, before this discussion closes.

He refers to the sun being darkened, and the moon, etc. Matthew 24. I wish to read a little there again; there is a way to settle this question from the Bible itself:

Matthew 24:30.—“And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet.”

Now mark, the coming of the Son of man spoken of here, is his coming in the clouds of heaven, in his kingdom with power and great glory, with his angels; a coming to reward mankind, to judge them. My brother, is it an event that was not to take place for a thousand or ten thousand years in the future? Or is it an event that is near at hand? This is the point between my brother and me. It is all important that we should settle this point. Matthew continues, 24:32:

“Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, [my disciples], when ye shall see all these things, [Now mark you, these disciples were to see all these things], know that it is near, even at the door.”

Does that mean ten thousand years yet in the future? Further:

“Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.”

He genea ante, translated, “this generation.” Does that mean for two or ten thousand years yet in the future? Then the darkening of the sun and moon; the falling of the stars here, have reference, not to the literal sun and moon and stars, but to something of which they were typical. In regard to this matter we submit a quotation from Dr. Adam Clark's Commentary on Matthew 24:29:

“In the prophetic language, great commotions upon the earth, are often represented under the notion of commotions and changes in the heavens: the fall of Babylon is represented by the stars and constellations of heaven withdrawing their light: and the sun and moon being darkened. See Isaiah 13:9, 10. The destruction of Egypt, by the heavens being covered, the sun being eclipsed with a cloud, and the moon withholding her light. Ezekiel 32:7, 8. The destruction of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, is represented by *casting down some of the host of heaven* and the stars to the ground. Daniel 8:10. And this very destruction of Jerusalem is represented by the prophet Joel, chapter 2:30, 31, by showing wonders in heaven and in earth, *darkening the sun*, and turning the moon into blood. This general mode of describing these judgments, *leaves us no room to doubt the propriety of its application in the present case.*”

“The *Jewish heaven* shall finish, and the *sun and moon*, of its glory and happiness shall be darkened,—brought to nothing. The sun is the religion of the *church*; the moon is the government of the *state*; and the stars are the judges and doctors of both. Compare Isaiah 13:10; Ezekiel 32:7, 8.”—Lightfoot, as quoted by Dr. Adam Clark, on Matthew 24:29.

We have other authority also. We give Brother Goodwin, and many other learned orthodox commentators. The best talent and learning of the world are in favor of this position, and my brother knows it.

I now resume my affirmative argument. I introduce my seventh argument.

“James 5:7, 8, 9.—“Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth *before the door.*”

Does that mean two or ten thousand years yet in the future? Were they to look forward for two or ten thousand years?

1 Peter 4: 5-7.—“Who shall give an account unto 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. But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer.”

Over eighteen hundred years ago the “end of all things” was at hand. I suppose that means two or ten thousand years yet in the future, does it? I suppose it must be so, if my brother is not defeated in this discussion.

Acts 10: 41, 42.—“Not to all people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead.”

My brother spoke something yesterday, about ordaining me a Mormon Elder. Had he done so, would not I have been one immediately after I was ordained? Jesus was ordained the judge of quick and dead over eighteen hundred years ago. According to the testimony in 2 Timothy 4; he was to judge the world at *his appearing and kingdom*.

Matthew 10: 23.—“When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son man of be come.”

Heb. 10: 24, 25.—“And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching.”

Heb. 10: 36, 37.—“For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.”

Does that mean that his coming will take place away in the future, yet several centuries? Again:

2 Peter 3: 10-14.—“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. The earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.”

Not the literal heavens, my brother; not the literal elements; it was something unto which they were hastening, coming unto rapidly.

“Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent, that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless.”

1 Peter 4: 17.—“For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God.”

Mark it, now, the apostle says the time *is come*. Then the time was at hand centuries ago, that judgment did begin at the house of God. This closes my seventh affirmative argument.

My eighth argument is, The coming of Christ was to take place in the generation in which he lived. Matthew 24: 27-35:

“For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven:

and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors."

Now, mark the language that follows, my brother; it is certain, unmistakable, clear as can be. It can not be misunderstood:

"Verily, I say unto you, this generation, [THIS generation], shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away."

In this language we learn that his coming in power and glory, to judge mankind, and reward them according to their works, was to take place during that generation. We have some criticisms upon that, which we will read you by and by. Mark thirteenth chapter. I do not know but I ought to read the whole chapter:

"And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings are here! And Jesus answering said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled? And Jesus answering them, began to say, Take heed lest any man deceive you: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be ye not troubled: for such things must needs be; but the end shall not be yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles: these are the beginnings of sorrows. But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them. And the gospel must first be published among all nations. But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son: and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake; but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand), then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains: and let him that is on the house-top not go down into the house, neither enter therein to take anything out of his house: and let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. But wo to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter. For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. And except the Lord hath shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days. And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, he is there; believe him not; for false Christ's, and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things. But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven. Now learn a parable of the fig-tree: when her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near. So ye in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work; and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when

the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."

These things settle the matter almost as did Dr. Goodwin. Does not history prove, that many did come in the name of Christ back there in those days? In the twenty-ninth verse of this chapter the language used, unmistakably shows, that these things of which Jesus there speaks were to take place during the lifetime of the apostles, for they were to see them. "When ye shall see these things," ye, my disciples, "Verily I say unto you." Here I clinch the argument for ever in my favor in this discussion. "Verily I say unto you, that THIS generation, [THIS generation], shall not pass until all these things be done." I am willing to risk the entire discussion upon the meaning of the phrase, "This generation." The brother has complained that he had not enough to do. I think I will be able to meet him upon this matter. Let him take hold of this strong argument I have presented here; let him take hold of the meaning of the phrase, "This generation," let him prove, if he can, that it means anything more than the natural lifetime, or the period of thirty years, or the end of the age. Let him come up to the work like a man. If he is not able to do this, he will fail, and the proposition must stand forever against him. I have introduced Matthew 24, and Mark 13 in this connection. Now I quote Luke 21:20-33:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But wo unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days: for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon his people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. And he spake to them a parable; behold the fig-tree, and all the trees; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves, that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, THIS generation shall not pass away, until all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."

Matt. 23:34, 35.—"Wherefore, Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zecharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar."

Right here I stake my argument upon the meaning of the phrase, "This generation." Take it from me if you dare. Hence we have brought the matter down to a single point, the meaning of the phrase, "This generation." Let us see what the Bible view is in regard to it:

Matt. 1:17.—"So all the generations from Abraham to Daniel, are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon, are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, are fourteen generations."

"The original word has for its first or primary meaning, family or generation, meaning the offspring or children of one parentage; second, an age or race of men, including a space of about thirty years."—Greenfield.

Time was called, and Elder Shinn closed his argument.

Elder Forscutt's sixth reply.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend has grown quite earnest; he is anxious that we "come down to our work like men." I think, if we have not done so, it is about time we did; for, if we have not been *working*, we certainly have been *playing* long enough.

The testimonies that have been quoted during the latter part of the Elder's speech, I shall leave for the present, and proceed to notice, first, his statements that I had challenged him to produce evidence that John the Revelator had died; on which he comes with a great show of "force," and some flourish of trumpets, and confidently enquires, "Does not my brother know that I can do it?" I answer, I did not, and I have not learned it yet.

After asking that question in this manner, he presents us the testimony of Dr. Fleetwood, who lived perhaps from twenty-five to fifty years ago. What wonderful testimony! John, he says, died near eighteen hundred years ago, and a man born seventeen hundred years after he died is brought on the stand to bear witness that he did die. Wonderfully reliable account this! Wonderful evidence this!

Are we to bring individuals living only, and not until now, Sir, to answer questions concerning occurrences which are said to have taken place near eighteen hundred years ago! Such testimony, unless corroborated by witnesses then living, I would not receive, neither would you, nor would any man in his sane mind. Dr. Fleetwood simply gave his opinion; and all the weight there is attached to his statements is the weight of *a man's opinion*. It makes no difference how learned or good Mr. Fleetwood may have been, it does not help my friend one particle.

He tells me that it devolves upon me to prove that John the Revelator is still living; and that if I fail in this, I fail throughout. This is a new principle in argument. If a man should fail in one point, he fails in everything. In such peculiar condition do we find mankind to-day, that I do not believe there is a man living but what fails some times in some things. If it be true that man fails in everything, when and because he fails in one thing, I am sorry for the race. If I fail in one point, by not proving that John still lives, and consequently fail in everything; I fear, Sir, you will fail totally by not sustaining your position, by not proving that John did die. But I will let this novel idea of failure, urged by the Elder, pass for what it is worth. The *onus probandi* is yours, Sir. You assume that all have died who heard the Savior declare that "there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," and it *rests with you* to prove that *they did die*, and especially that John died, of whom the Savior said to Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee."

Dr. Goodwin is quoted, a Methodist gentleman, who gives his view, like the rest have done, about what was meant by Jesus in his testimonies to his disciples, and that view is *brought as evidence* that Jesus did mean just what Dr. Good-

win supposed him to have meant. Sir, you may bring Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Campbell, and any or all the doctors you please, and their testimony does not weigh as much as the weight of a straw with me, unless that testimony accords with the word of God. Theirs is the testimony of men only, and may be received and valued *as man's testimony only*.

The brother tells you, that I shall find myself in a very difficult place, because I say that the body was Jesus. Well the angel is just in the same place, so I shall be in good company there.

"Behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. *She shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS.*"

Was not that the body, Elder Shinn?

I presume Brother Shinn, even, would not venture the argument, that Jesus never had an existence in spirit before this life. If he had had an existence before the existence in the body, then the phrases, "that *holy thing* which shall be *born of thee*," and "thou shalt call his name Jesus," had reference to the body, for that so born was the body, and nothing but the body. My brother may find himself in the difficult place he assigns to me.

As to the question of his coming down from heaven, Christ said, "I came forth from the Father."—John 16:28. "Before Abraham was, I am."—John 8:58. What do we understand by this?—That his body was before Abraham? Where is the sane man that could be made to believe such an argument, as that Jesus meant that his body existed before Abraham lived? It was something then beside the body, it was the spirit that came down from the Father; not the body, but the spirit then within the body.

The same kind of testimony was borne of John:

"There was a man *sent from God*, whose name was John."—John 1:6.

Similar testimony is borne also concerning Jeremiah. Jer. 1:5:

"*Before I formed thee * * * I knew thee; and before thou comest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and ordained thee to be a prophet unto the nations.*"

Nothing more strange in the case of Jesus, than in these cases.

Again, we are referred to the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew. The brother tells us he rests his whole argument on the phrase, rendered in King James' translation, "This generation."

I do not know that it very particularly concerns me as to what he rests his argument upon, but is his argument truth? is the question with me; what "this generation" indicates, whether the generation *then living*, or the generation that *should live* when these things should come to pass, is the point of difference between us. I think if we will examine carefully the testimony given in this chapter, we will conclude that it does not refer to the generation then living, but the generation that should live when these things should come to pass.

As the brother has referred you to the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, for evidence, I also refer to that, commencing with the thirty-first verse, desiring you to bear in mind that the brother said this refers to the time of "this generation," in the twenty-fourth chapter, to the same time "*when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.*"

Now, Sir, at or after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, was there *then* gathered before Jesus all nations? If it be referred to the *time when Jeru-*

salem was taken by Titus; or if it be referred to the time when Jerusalem was besieged by the forces under the generals of the Roman army, did Jesus then sit upon the throne of his glory? It is certainly a very strange position to take; for instead of all nations being gathered, not even the Christians were there, as the gentleman himself told us yesterday; for in obedience to the commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ, they had fled to Pella, because Jesus had instructed them, that when they should see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, they were to flee to the mountains. I think we are safe in saying that all nations were not gathered at that time. Some of the minor nations, under one of the great nations, namely, the Roman nation, were represented there by the Roman army, that army representing, perhaps, the proudest nation upon the earth. And why were they there? To bring destruction upon Jerusalem, upon the people of God. Surely, Sir, this furnishes no argument that this was a fulfillment of the declaration that all nations shall be gathered before him, when he shall reward the righteous, and bring condemnation upon the wicked. Surely, Sir, none will presume to say, that the Jews were the only wicked people upon the earth, and therefore the only people to be brought to judgment. True, they were wicked, and they were made to feel the chastising hand of God; but at the time prophesied of by Jesus, not the Jews only, but ALL nations are to be gathered before him; and all *were not gathered* at nor after the destruction of Jerusalem.

When he comes in glory with his angels, he is to sit upon the throne of his glory, to judge the nations, all of which have to be brought before him, and the wicked, *all* the wicked, are to be punished. At the taking of Jerusalem, this was at best only partly fulfilled.

We learn from what was read to us in the last speech we listened to, that when Jesus comes to sit in judgment, his sign is to appear in heaven, and all the tribes of the earth are to mourn. But, are "all the tribes of the earth" the few people who were gathered together in Jerusalem? Does "all the tribes of the earth" comprise only that part of the Israelitish nation that was there, two and a half tribes? Are they the "all the tribes of the earth" that were to mourn when they see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. The gentleman takes strange ground in presenting to us such an incongruous idea.

The latter part of this verse is directly connected with the first part by the conjunction "and," and the adverb "then."

"*And then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: *and then* shall all the tribes of the earth mourn: *and they shall see* the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."—Matt. 24: 30.

"*When* the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered *all* nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."—Matt. 25: 31, 32.

Did *all the tribes* of the earth named in Matthew 24, and *all the nations* of the earth mentioned in Matthew 25, see the Son of man come with power and great glory, at the time when Jerusalem was taken? Did they see the Son of man come with power and great glory, when the Holy Ghost was sent upon the day of Pentecost? Decidedly not. When the people live who are spoken of in the Savior's prophecy as "this generation," they are to see *all these things* fulfilled; that generation *did not* see all these things fulfilled. The argument presented by my brother, is one that scepticism may delight to receive; for it furnishes a firm basis for the falsity of prophecy, and it is one too which sceptics have used effectively. Let us now consider these scriptural evidences in juxtaposition, and we shall discover that they are synchronistic:

Matt. 24 : 20. "The sun be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven."

27. "As the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west."

Zech. 14 : 5. "And the Lord my God shall come."

Matt. 25:31. "When the Son of man shall come."

26. "And then shall they see the Son of man coming."

1 Thes. 4:16. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven."

2 Thes. 2:1. "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of Christ;" 1:8. "In our Lord, Jesus our Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven."

31. "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet."

"And they shall gather together his elect."

27. "And then shall he send his angels."

34 to 36. "Two shall be in the bed, * * the field, * * one shall be taken, the other left."

16. "With the voice of the archangel."

2:1. "And by our gathering together, together with him," 1:10. "He glorified in his saints which are alive * * and * * admire in all them that believe."

2. "I will gather all nations."

30. "All the tribes of the earth."

32. "And before him shall be gathered all nations."

37. "They answered, * * Where, Lord. And he said, Whosoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together."

14. "Them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

1:7. "With his mighty angels."

9. "The Lord shall be king over all the earth."

30. "Shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."

31. "In his glory."

26. "In the clouds with power and glory."

27. "In a cloud with power and great glory."

1:10. "He shall come to be glorified."

31. "Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."

30. "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

30. "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be done."

31. "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand."

32. "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

In Luke 21:25. "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon and in the stars."

In Luke 17:24. "As the lightning that lighteth out of the one part of heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven,"

24. "So shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

27. "Then shall they see the Son of man coming."

34 to 36. "Two shall be in the bed, * * the field, * * one shall be taken, the other left."

16. "With the voice of the archangel."

2:1. "And by our gathering together, together with him," 1:10. "He glorified in his saints which are alive * * and * * admire in all them that believe."

We have the declarations affected by this clause, "this generation," yet to be fulfilled. There were many of the events referred to in these chapters fulfilled in the history of the destruction of Jerusalem; there have been others of them fulfilled in the history of events since that time. It is argued by Elder Shinn that all these events spoken of, were to take place at the destruction of Jerusalem; if this were true, I should reject the Bible as not being an inspired record, for all these things were not fulfilled at that time. The first part of them only was fulfilled then; but the words of Jesus were true. The second part has been fulfilled since, and the remaining part is yet to be fulfilled.

At the time when Jesus comes in power and great glory, some great events will take place; *before* it, the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars; distress of nations; unusual perplexity of the mind from fear; the sea heaving herself with convulsive sighs and bursting beyond her limits; and if you will allow my personal opinion, based on a study of prophecy, a deep-laid plot for Catholic supremacy will create a confederacy of forces for confederacy of interest in Catholic unity; and while Turkey's effeminacy makes her become a prey to Russian intrepidity, amid the dynastic changes of the old world, there will be felt the bondage of debt to the Jews by the governments of Europe, which some of them will redeem themselves from by payment, while others, unwilling or unable to pay, will gladly join in an enterprise that looks to "a spoil and a prey" from Israel and promises release from unpaid obligations. These are all pre-figured in prophecy, and as past events have taken place as prophesied of, so we believe that every future event spoken of will have a like literal fulfillment; "for no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation."

The testimony of the prophets concerning events of old was literally fulfilled; it will be also concerning events of the last days, making of course due allowance for such descriptions as are metaphorical, such phrases as are metonymical, in reference both to fulfilled prophecy of the past, and predictions of the future. To illustrate:—When the prophets spoke about the destruction of Babylon, they foretold the manner of its being besieged, the name of Cyrus before he was yet born, as he who should conquer its people and possess its strongholds, the manner and fact of its decline, even to the names of certain animals which should inhabit it; and, Sir, they are found there to-day—literally there, the very birds and beasts which the prophets said should inhabit the ruins of Babylon. The prophecies of scripture which have been fulfilled in this age, have had a literal fulfillment also, which is known to many now present.

Dr. Adam Clark is presented to us again. If the brother had, in this connection, read or quoted Dr. Adam Clark a little further, he would have seen that the Doctor declares his belief in a future *day of judgment*, and that that future judgment will take place at the coming of Jesus Christ in glory. The brother did not quote that point.

Elder Shinn tells us that the end spoken of in Matthew twenty-fourth chapter was the end of the Mosaic order of things; that the departure of the old heaven and the old earth, was the end of the Mosaic order of things. I suppose he concludes that the earth and the heavens were to pass away. What the earth is he has not told us; but the heavens, he says, were "the Mosaic order of things." Has not the Mosaic order been among the Jews since these "heavens" passed away? If the testimony given to us in this chapter be true, there is to be a sudden, not a gradual passing away.

"For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark. And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."—Matt. 25: 38, 39.

After the tribulation of the Jews, during the continuance of which we learn from history that one million one hundred thousand perished, while more than a million were sold as slaves, they were scattered all over the inhabited earth, in fulfillment of prophecy concerning them; but they are to be gathered together again, as testified by the prophet Joel, in his second chapter, before the terrible "*day of the Lord.*" Hear the prophetic command:

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my^{holy}mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. . . . And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it? . . . Then will the Lord be jealous for his land, and pity his people. Yea, the Lord will answer and say unto his people, Behold, I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith: and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen. . . . Fear not, O land; be glad and rejoice: for the Lord will do great things. Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field: for the pastures of the wilderness do spring, for the tree beareth her fruit, the fig-tree and the vine do yield their strength. Be glad then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God: for he hath given you the former rain moderately, and he will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain, and the latter rain in the first month. And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil. And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the canker-worm, and the caterpillar, and the palmer-worm, my great army which I sent among you. And ye shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you: and my people shall never be ashamed. And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed. And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit. And I will shew wonders in the heaven and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and the remnant whom the Lord shall call."—Joel 2: 1, 11, 18, 19, 21–32.

Whatever, Sir, may have been, or may now be Zion's desolation and Jerusalem's sorrow, the day of their redemption cometh. And *after* their restoration, *after* fruitfulness is again upon their land, which thank God has already come, *afterwards* the Lord will pour out his Spirit upon them, and miraculous gifts and heavenly blessings shall attend them, and they shall nevermore be afraid nor ashamed. How cheering the prospect; how much grander this thought than that of Elder Shinn, that their national judgment is past, and their national destiny ended. I will give the brother a few passages relevant to this:

2 Samuel 7: 10.—"Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more as beforetime."

Isa. 33: 17.—"Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off. * * * Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. But there the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams, wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our King; he will save us."—20–22*vs.*

Jer. 33: 10–17.—"Thus saith the Lord: Again there shall be heard in this place, which ye say shall be desolate without man and without beast, even in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, that are desolate, without man, and without inhabitants, and without beast, the voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the voice of them that shall say, Praise the Lord of hosts: for the Lord is good; for his mercy endureth forever: and of them that shall bring the sacrifice of praise into the house of the Lord. For I will cause to return the captivity of the land, as at the first, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Again in this place, which is desolate without man and without beast, and in all the cities thereof, shall be a habitation of shepherds causing their flocks to lie down. In the cities of the mountains, in the cities of the vale, and in the cities of

the south, and in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, shall the flocks pass again under the hands of him that telleth them, saith the Lord. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness. For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel."

Isa. 1: 24-27.—"Therefore, saith the Lord, the Lord of hosts, the mighty One of Israel, Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies. And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin: and I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called, The city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness."

Jer. 23: 5-8.—"Behold, the day is come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land."

Jesus is now in heaven, where he must remain till the times of the Gentiles are full, till the times of restitution, as Peter declares in Acts 3: 21:

"Whom the heavens must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

He is now, we are told in Rev. 3: 21, on his father's throne; but he will return to judge and reign, as we read in Isaiah 9: 2-4. His coming to judge is not *past*, Elder Shinn, but future. The preparation is being made for his return now.

The preparation is gradual and progressive; but the end, or coming of Christ, is to be sudden.

1. The sun is to be darkened.
2. The moon is to refuse to give her light.
3. The stars are to fall from heaven.
4. The powers of the heavens are to be shaken.
5. The sign of the Son of man is to appear in heaven.
6. All the tribes of the earth are to mourn.
7. All the tribes are to see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven,

with power and great glory.

"Tell us what shall be the sign of thy coming and the end of the world." In answer to this latter part of the apostles' three-fold question, Jesus said, "Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, *when ye shall see all these things*, know that it is near, even at the doors."—Matt. 24: 32, 33. So will be the coming and the end, even at the doors;

When the predictions concerning the sun and moon and stars shall have received their fulfillment;

When the sign of the Son of man is seen in heaven;

When ALL the tribes of the earth shall mourn;

When, (as John tells us), the great and the mighty shall call for the rocks and the mountains to fall on them, and hide them from the face of him who shall come.

When these things are fulfilled, *then* it will be nigh, even at the doors. It will be just as Jesus said, "*When ye see all these things*," not now, but "*when ye see all these things*, know that it is near, even at the doors;" which is equiva-

lent to when these things will be fulfilled. If you take the adverb *then*, you must also take the adverb *when* with it.

The gentleman quotes for us 1 Peter 4:17, 18:

"The time *is come*, when judgment must begin at the house of God. * * * And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

This I think to be a very proper quotation indeed, and though in the present tense, does not affect the future judgment; for judgment had begun at the house of God. The house of Israel is called his house, and he had decreed that Israel should be cast out of their city, and that it should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. They were to lose their inheritance, and be scattered to the different parts of the earth. Jesus had declared all these things concerning that house; the Holy Spirit declared too, through the apostle, as you have heard it read to us this morning, that judgment had begun at the house of God at that time. The Jews, as of Israel, were the house of God at that time, and *they* were to be punished; but *when he shall come*, "where shall *the wicked* and *the ungodly* appear?" Those that have not been numbered among God's people?

Does it follow from this declaration, that the *great judgment*, the "*day of judgment*," spoken of in the word of God, has been fulfilled, or was then fulfilled upon them? No, sir, if the judgment was then fulfilled, God's people, his chosen people, whom he has covenanted and sworn to save, are lost. If the great judgment had then been fulfilled, his people would not have been scattered and driven from their homes; but would have met a different kind of punishment than a national one, in fulfillment of Jesus' declarations. We find many descriptions prophetic of their redemption, and their restoration to Palestine, in Bible prophecies, yet to be fulfilled; notwithstanding, therefore, the reference made to judgment on the house of God, (an expression then used, and properly used to describe Israel), the chosen people of God will yet be restored.

The prophets of old, the prophets of God had dreams and the interpretation of dreams, the gift of prophecy, visions, ministration of angels, the word of the Lord by the Holy Ghost, for we are told by Peter, that "holy men of old spake as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost."

The Holy Ghost declared things that should come to pass, not things that needed a private interpretation, for Peter adds, "that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." The things which were revealed were to have a literal fulfillment, as history shows that the declarations of the prophets, referring to what is now past, did have. So is it all through the Bible, even to the last book, the book of revelations. In this book, metaphorical, and filled with beautiful imagery as it is, we read the testimony of John to the seven churches in Asia, and though his book is filled with symbols of deep and mystic import, like the words about the candlesticks being moved out of their places, yet the metaphors employed symbolize that which was literally true, which have been or shall be accomplished; for "these words are true and faithful." If the events spoken of in the Bible that have already been fulfilled, have had a literal fulfillment, confirming that which is either plainly predicted, or symbolically presaged, will not those which are yet to be fulfilled have the same kind of a fulfillment?

Coming back to the question of the time when Jesus was to set up his kingdom, (and I call your attention to it again, Sir, that you may clear this point up, or confess your inability to do so), I call your attention to the fact that *at* the time when Jesus was upon the earth, there was no division of the Roman empire, in the sense of its territory being divided into independent kingdoms. It was one, and only one. I quote here from Dr. Nelson on Infidelity, whose

able work was written with a view to convince unbelievers of the truth of scripture. I quote from his description of the divisions of the Roman government in the eighth century, not *as scriptural*, but as *historical evidence*.

"This fourth empire was governed in another manner, by other maxims, than any of the preceding, and in process of time it was divided into ten kingdoms, which have been thus numbered in the eighth century. 1. The Senate of Rome; 2. The Greeks at Ravenna; 3. The Lombards in Lombardy; 4. The Huns in Hungary; 5. The Alemanes in Germany; 6. The Franks in France; 7. The Burgundians in Burgundy; 8. The Goths in Spain; 9. The Britons; 10. The Saxons in Britain. They are indeed reckoned up in several ways, by different writers, according to the date assigned to their enumeration, but in general, it is clear that they were nearly the same with the principal kingdoms in Europe at this day. It is certain that the Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms, and though they might be sometimes more and sometimes fewer, yet they were still known by the name of the ten kingdoms of the Western empire."

Bishop Lloyd gives them thus:—The Huns, about A.D. 356; Ostrogoths, 377; Visigoths, 378; Franks, 407; Vandals, 407; Sueves and Alans, 407; Burgundians, 407; Herules and Rugians, 476; Saxons, 476; Longobards, from 426 to 483.

Mr. Mede, thus:—Brittons, Saxons in Britain, Franks, Burgundians in France, Visigoths in South of France and part of Spain, Sueves and Alans, Vandals, Alemanes, Ostrogoths and Greeks.

Sir Isaac Newton, thus:—Vandals and Alans, Suevians, Visigoths, Alans in Gallia, Burgundians, Franks, Brittons, Huns, Lombards, Ravennas.

The continually changing dynasties of this period and the scantiness of historic details, make it difficult to determine accurately the names of the ten divisions; but the division is on all sides conceded to have taken place. Mr. Nelson, still further elaborating this subject, gives many testimonies concerning the time of the setting up of the little kingdom before whom three others were to fall, as well as other data on which I might base a lengthy argument, if this was the subject of debate. As, however, I only follow Elder Shinn on this subject to prove that the scriptures teach that *this division must take place before the time of the preparation for Christ's return*, I can not amplify.

After all these things shall have been fulfilled; after the time and times and dividing of times that this little horn should reign; *after* all this Daniel says:

"I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. * * * I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."—Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14.

Here we learn that the Son of man was seen to come in the clouds, and after he came, there was given to him a kingdom, *not before*, but *after this twelve hundred and sixty days*; *after this time*, times and dividing of times had passed away; after this Daniel saw given to this Son of man a kingdom, and then "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High."—Daniel 7:27. "And they shall possess it forever and ever."—18v.

Sir, was this fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem? Were the Saints then put in possession of the kingdom? Has Jesus ever ruled as King over all the earth since that time? Have his Saints ruled?

My friend has said that the gospel was to be preached in all the world, before the reign of Jesus began, and as what Elder Shinn calls "his mediatorial

reign" commenced when he ascended to heaven, the gospel must have been preached in all the world as early as the year 33 of the Christian era. What think you?

It is true that in Col. 1:23, the apostle testifies that the hope of, or the gospel, it is not clear which, was preached in all the world; but when considering this testimony, we must remember that but a portion of the world was then known. That which was the world to them, is but a portion of the world to us. A great many nations were not known to them. Paul also says in Hebrews third chapter in connection with fourth chapter that the gospel was preached to the Israelites under Moses; both of these utterances must be taken in a qualified sense. If the gospel was preached to all nations, tell me who went to the Indies and preached the gospel to the inhabitants thereof? Who went to Australasia, until our own time, to preach the gospel? Tell me, Sir, who came to the aborigines of this country? Who went to farther India and preached the gospel? Tell me, Sir, who went to China, and preached the word of God in China? Who preached the gospel to the Japanese? Tell me, Sir, when, and by whom the Islanders of the Pacific, the peoples of Oceanica, heard the gospel preached unto them? The truth is, it had not been preached in those lands; some of them will but open their doors partially for it to be preached unto them even now.

Did not Paul tell the truth where the gentleman quotes? Yes, he told the truth in the same sense in which it is told, where we are informed that John was baptizing in Jordan, and *all the people* went out and were baptized of him. Now the gentleman will not believe a word of it, I know, as a literal truth, that *all the people* were baptized. It is simply a synecdochical form of speech, putting the whole for a part, and used to indicate that a great many of the people, a great multitude came to John's baptism here, as before it indicates the extensiveness of the preaching done. We can not believe it in its literal sense fully; *firstly*, because when the Pharisees came to his baptism, John called them a "generation of vipers;" *secondly*, because when Jesus asked the Pharisees this question, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?" They were afraid to answer him, lest if they said it was from heaven, he should condemn them, *because they had not obeyed it*, and if they said it was of men, they feared the people, because so many believed on John; so they dared not answer him; and, *thirdly*, Luke tells us that "the Pharisees and lawyers *rejected* the counsel of God against themselves, *not being baptized with John's baptism.*"

We discover then, when the scriptures states that all the people were baptized of him, the writer does not mean to convey the idea that all the people, in the broadest acceptation of this phrase, were baptized of him; for some were condemned for not being baptized of him.

I wish to refer again to Thessalonians, and see whether the coming of Christ there spoken of was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem:

2 Thess. 1:7-10.—"And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day."

What do we understand from this? Is it not that those who were distressed, troubled, and suffering, should rest with the apostle, *until the time* when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God? Sir, the very opposite of this took place at the destruction of Jerusalem.

This apostle, in another place, speaks of the heathen as those "who know

not God." The heathen were not taken vengeance on, but Jerusalem was taken, and the Jews, who were the people of God, were scattered; and, Sir, the heathen were the instruments who did this work. They were the instruments of God's vengeance on those who, as a nation, believed on him; the very opposite, Sir, I repeat, to what is spoken of by the apostle, "Taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." When is this to be? "*When he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.*"

In the opening portion of the next chapter, this same apostle writes:

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter as from us, *as that the day of Christ is at hand.*"

Now, brother, you and Paul differ widely this time, you have told us that the day of Christ was then right at hand, and have urged upon us that your understanding of those words was right; emphatically, you say, "at once; not a thousand or ten thousand years in the future; not a long way off." Now, Sir, it is "you and Paul for it."

"Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as that the day of Christ is at hand;" that is to say, Be not troubled, it is not at hand yet, "For that day shall not come except there be a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." This must all be fulfilled before the day of Christ, before Jesus comes; he, therefore, *did not come* at the destruction of Jerusalem.

Elder Forscutt yielded to the call of "Time."

Elder Shinn's seventh argument was as follows.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Again we continue our friendly discussion. I shall first review my brother's last speech, before I introduce my other affirmative arguments, or proceed to finish the one last under consideration. My brother seems to question the evidence I introduced, in regard to John not being now living. If you remember, I introduced evidence from Dr. Fleetwood. Of course the evidence of Mr. Fleetwood, in regard to that matter, is not what is given, simply, but it was the strongest evidence in that direction; the best testimony given by ancient historians. I introduce now the authority of Eusebius, upon the death of John:

"In this manner St. John continued to labor in the vineyard of his great Master, until *death* put an end to all his toils, and sufferings, which happened in the beginning² of Trajan's reign, in the ninety-eighth year of his age."

And according to Eusebius, his remains were buried near Ephesus. Sacred Biography and History, by J. W. Harding, D. D.

This is the evidence of that ancient historian, in regard to this matter. If John is living, I remark again, that my brother must stand or fall upon that point. If John is not living to-day, then my brother's argument, I repeat it, must fall. If John has met his death, then my brother must evidently relinquish his position. But if John is not dead, if he is still living, where is he? Why is not some one able to point him out? I can tell you there is a great many men, in this day and age of the world, who would be very anxious to see John. Again I remark, if John is still living in this world, here, in mortality, it certainly would be known; some one would certainly be able to point him out. I notice Brother Manford, in his "Twenty-Five Years in the West," in a

discussion with a gentleman belonging to the same denomination as my brother does, upon this very point he claimed that John was still living; and when pressed as to where he is, he replied by saying, "He is up north." Again I remark, my brother, your success or failure depends on your making the point clear, that John is still living in mortality. We consider the position he has taken to be, that John was not to die. Again I call my brother's attention to the argument which I presented from Matthew 16 : 27, 28 :

"Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

He claims that John was one that was standing there, and was not to taste of death, until he should see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. He places that kingdom still in the future, and wants to make us believe that John is still living. But there must be more than John, brother, for there be *some* standing here, which shall not taste of death, until they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. The word *some* means more than one. The declaration is here, there be *some* standing here, which shall not taste of death, until they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. Again to analyze that matter, the word is equivalent to the word generation; as when it is said, "This generation shall not all pass away until all these things be fulfilled," it means more than one individual at least, and places the coming of Christ as a past event. Let us see the Bible testimony in regard to this matter :

John 21 : 21-23.—"Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but if I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee."

The Jews supposed that Jesus was a king, to come and reign as a literal king, a temporal king. In this they were disappointed; and my brother is laboring under the same mistake that the Jews were then.

"Yet Jesus said not unto them, he shall not die;" Jesus never said he should not die; this was only a saying that went out, a misapprehension of the Jews, in regard to the nature of the reign of the Messiah, supposing it would be a temporal reign. "Jesus said not unto them he shall not die, but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" If there was some standing there who should not taste of death, until they should see the son of man coming in his kingdom, then that event is in the past.

"All nations," my brother says, "were not gathered together at Jerusalem." What does he mean by this? He makes reference to where it is said, "All Jerusalem and Judea went out to Jordan, and were baptized of John in the river Jordan, confessing their sins," etc., and then wants to know what sort of definition I would attach to it. I would use it precisely in the very sense in which it is used in the Bible. Let us see what sense it is used in. The brother says positively in his last speech, that the gospel was not preached in all the world, only in a limited sense. Then you deny the positive words of the apostle Paul. I here affirm, that precisely in the same sense all nations were gathered together at Jerusalem, that all the people went out and were baptized of John in Jordan, and the gospel was preached in all the world. Is the word "all" to have a different signification in the passage in dispute, from what it does in these others?

Matt. 25 : 31, 32.—"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

Matt. 24 : 14 —"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come."

"I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle."

How does it happen that the word *all* in this passage is a mistake, or has a different meaning from what it has in the other passages? It can not be. We understand it to be in the familiar sense, precisely in the same sense in which we understand Matthew twenty-five. The same as the *all* in the other passages. It was an event to transpire during that generation I have shown. My brother defined the word *all*, and defined it correctly too, and says it means a great many. He being the standard, I believe this matter decided. As for me it is all that I claim.

"That generation never did see these things." I am a little astonished at my brother, when I have shown and established that all these events were to take place during that generation. "Verily I say unto you, all of these things shall come upon this generation." Again, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till these things be fulfilled." Does the word *this* mean that? He would make it appear that "this generation" means a generation to come into the world, in eight or ten centuries. The word *this* never means that. This generation, or the generation living, never has any other meaning than a period of thirty years, or the lifetime of man, and these things did take place during that generation. I take the view infidels take, my brother says. The view that infidels take is precisely the view, that same view that you take, my brother, in this discussion; for they view the stars there spoken of as literal stars; the darkening of the sun, as the darkening of the literal sun. They say, "We see by the Bible, that the literal moon has to be darkened." Thus you see that infidels take the same literal view that my brother does of this matter. Do you know the meaning of literal? Dare you take the position that the stars of heaven shall fall? Your position crowds you to say that the literal stars of heaven will fall. We say still, that this is highly figurative language. My brother referred to the stars of heaven falling. I remember an account of that, which states that an old man said, he saw the north star fall right plump into his yard, yet we know no such a thing took place. The idea of my brother leads to this.

But before this age, ancient people thought they saw the stars fall from heaven, and how ridiculous it does seem.

"The end of the world." I want to look at that matter a little.

"Dr. Adam Clark, who believed with the best of modern Biblical scholars, that the book of Revelation was written before the destruction, thus disposes of three favorite proof texts of this dogma, 'Behold he cometh with clouds.'—Rev. 1:7. This relates, perhaps, to his coming to destroy Jerusalem. 'Behold I come quickly.'—Rev. 22:12. I come to establish my cause; comfort and support my followers, and punish the wicked. 'Surely I come quickly.'—Rev. 22:20. 'This may be truly said to every person in every age.' We repeat that the phrases, 'the end,' 'end of the world,' 'last day,' 'day of the Lord,' and kindred phrases, nowhere occur in the Bible, referring to the closing up of earthly affairs. They can not be so applied, without doing violence to the opinion of eminent commentators, both ancient and modern, who are entitled to a respectful consideration."—T. A. Goodwin, *Mode of Man's Immortality*, page 141.

Dr. Adam Clark says, the end of the world means the end of the age. We have still a more ancient commentator, namely, Paul, who speaks in Hebrews 9:26 of the end of the world as the end of the age; also in Hebrews 11:2, "Hath in these *last* days spoken unto us by his Son."

Now the argument of my brother from Acts. I call his attention to the fact, that Peter says, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel," this Pentecostal season, this outpouring of the Holy Spirit; "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, saying, in the last days;" that is, it was fulfilled, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." Now the brother comes with an argument upon Joel, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, saying, in the last days it shall come to pass," etc. This was fulfilled up-

on the day of Pentecost; this prophecy of Joel. Dr. Adam Clark and Goodwin both take this view; and many others of the learned orthodox commentators, and it shows candor and honesty upon their part. So away goes his argument on Joel.

"Holy men of old," says my brother, "spake as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost," in support of the view he takes of the ten kings. I have explained, as you will see by reading Daniel, second chapter, in connection with the seventh chapter, that the kingdom of heaven was to be set up during the time of the four kings, and that this is what is meant by the declaration, "In the days of these kings." By reading those parallels closely, you will see that this is the true meaning.

My brother says the gospel has not been preached in all the world. I have noticed this before, twice. Calls our attention to the first chapter of second Thessalonians, seventh verse:

"And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels."

We see this is the same revelation, the same coming, which I have shown you is confined to the natural lifetime of those who heard him. The same coming with his angels, that is to take place during that generation, to take vengeance upon the ungodly. He calls our attention to the second chapter:

"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."

The Diaglott says, "as the day of the Lord was present." It was sixteen years off, this great judgment spoken of as much as sixteen or eighteen years off. There would be great propriety in his saying, be not soon shaken in mind, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of the Lord was present." It was not present for sixteen or eighteen years yet.

I am now ready to resume my affirmative arguments. This generation:

"*He genea ante*, this generation. Notwithstanding the dissent of some, this phrase can only mean this very generation, the race of men living."—Bloomfield's Greek Testament, with English notes.

"Our Lord himself limits the interval within which Jerusalem shall be destroyed, and his coming take place, to that same generation, 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled.' The language here, is plain, definite and express; it can not be misunderstood, nor perverted."—From Dr. Robinson, quoted by Crosby, page 142.

"This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled."—Matt. 24:34. All who are at present living, shall not be dead when this shall come to pass. There are some at this day living, who shall be witnesses of the evils I have foretold shall befall the Jews. The men of this generation, the men now living."—Cruden's Concordance.

Thus we might go on and multiply testimony.

"Precisely parallel to this verse is chapter 23:36, 'Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation;' and by 'these things' of that verse were plainly meant the destruction of the city and state. And this parallelism, it might be remarked by the way, goes to show the incorrectness of the interpretation which some have adopted, by which the word *generation* is made to signify *race*. Were it to signify race, what *race* is indicated? It might mean the human race, or the Jewish race, or the Christian, as Dr. Clark supposes; and thus we are thrown into a state of perfect vagueness. But this rendering of the word has met with but little favor among scholars."—Dr. D. D. Whedon, Com., Matthew 24:34.

Those are all the testimonies or the affirmative arguments, except in relation to Christ's personal coming at the end of his reign, his spiritual reign, which is not connected with the judgment.

Acts 1:9-11.—"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye

men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

My brother has advanced the idea that this coming was at the end of the world, or at the end of his reign. I shall first proceed to notice 1 Cor. 15:24:

"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power."

This is the work to be done at the end of Messiah's reign. He is to deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, at the time of his personal coming, which is at the end of his reign. Not a word nor a syllable said about judgment. We read on in 1 Corinthians 15:21:

"Behold, I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. [Shall have been raised, is the correct translation.] For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

This is to be in the future, at the end of Messiah's reign, as I before showed you. With this we pass to 1 Thess. 14:13. Notice this parallel, my brother:

"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

This is the order of that personal coming; and this personal coming is to take place at the end of Messiah's reign, when he shall have subdued all things unto himself, when the last enemy, death, shall have been destroyed.

"Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Then the living that remain upon the earth, are to be changed, to undergo a change equivalent to death, and are to be caught up with the Lord in the air. This is to be at the end of his reign, when he is to "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that he may be all in all; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that is to be destroyed is death." The argument is complete. There is not a single syllable, not a word said about judgment in connection with that personal coming, at the end of Messiah's reign. But the other coming, his spiritual coming, his coming in power and glory, his coming in clouds, to reward mankind according to their works, I have shown you was to take place during the generation in which Jesus lived. I have shown you that Jesus said some who were then living should not taste of death, until they saw the "Son of man coming in his kingdom," to reward mankind according to their works; that this coming did take place at what is called the end of the world. Matthew 23:34, 35, 36:

"Wherefore, behold, I send you prophets and wise men. * * * Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation."

Mark it, "Upon this generation," which evidently meant the generation then living; the persons who heard Jesus make this declaration. Mark 13. You remember I introduced from the twenty-fourth to the thirtieth verses, and I maintained that was figurative. I want to give you Clark's view upon this.

Elder Shinn did not finish his quotation, as the call of Time was heard, and he yielded the floor.

To Elder Shinn's seventh argument Elder Forscutt replied:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am charged with affirming in the fore part of this discussion, that judgment is inflicted in this life, and yet that there will be a future judgment. This has been repeated three times and I have not noticed it; but now I think it due to myself that I should notice it. In noticing it, I am aware that I am noticing it before those who heard just what I did say, and I am satisfied that both they and the record of the reporters will deny that I made any such statement. The statement that I made was this, and the only statement I made, and the only reference I made to it was supportive of the idea I sought to impress upon you by giving an illustration from our experiences, and the experiences of others, that "if a man doeth wrong, his own conscience condemneth him." *That* judgment is now, because his conscience condemns him now; but that is not the judgment that is to come, when *the* Judge shall sit, and the books shall be opened. I wish this correction to stand, and if it be necessary to examine the record, it is before us in phonography, I am pleased to say.

MR. SHINN. Do I understand you to say that men were not judged in this life, only by their consciences?

MR. FORSCUTT. Judgments came upon men and nations at times, which I have before said may be called temporal judgments.

We are referred by the gentleman, in support of the theory that John died, to Eusebius. He has gone back now fifteen hundred years further, and produced us a new witness. Eusebius did not live till the third and wrote in the fourth century. This the congregation may not all be aware of. Now of what value is Eusebius as a witness that John died? He did not live until nearly two hundred years after John wrote. This is the heaviest witness we have on this question, and he did not live until nearly two hundred years after the event about which he is called to testify had transpired, *if it transpired at all*. The brother is anxious to prove that John died, because some then living were to live till the kingdom should come with power; and if all then living are now dead, the coming of the kingdom is in the past. He tells us that Jesus did not say that John should not die; but he might as well have said so, brother, as to have said to Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

In relation to the Savior's testimony, "There be some standing here, which shall not taste death," &c., the gentleman tells us, that the word some does not mean one; but more than one. I will have to go back to my dictionary. I early learned that the word some was indefinite, applying to one or more; but I have something new to learn in regard to this, if this new interpretation be correct. I have no dictionary here.

The brother informs us that in the very same sense as "all the world," and "all baptized," in the passages I referred to, apply to "all the world" and "all baptized;" so does the word all in the passage before presented by me, apply to "all nations." I expected this retort, and I purpose to examine it to see whether it does apply in the same sense. I am glad that my brother has given me credit for the honesty of my statement, respecting the gospel being preached in all the world. I shall not try to take a very serious advantage of the testimony that the gospel was preached in all the world. You will remember that I made the statement, that the gospel was not preached in many nations.

I have at home an ancient geography, which, at the time of its publication,

in the eighteenth century, is said to have cost two hundred and fifty dollars. It is biographical, chronological, geographical, historical, genealogical, pantalogical, and synchronistic in its wonderful comprehensiveness. It gives an account of all the nations of the earth, and their history as far as possible, as well as the history of every important event connected with them, embracing all lands known from the Arctic to the tropical regions, after the plan of the celebrated M. Lavisgne. After a careful examination of that work, and a study of the positions of localities, with their ancient as well as their modern names, I am forced to the conclusion that there are many nations which I did not name to-day at all, of whom the people living in the days of the apostles had no knowledge whatever. They and their countries have been since discovered; and their manners and customs indicate, unmistakably, that the story of the gospel had never been told among them, had never reached them at the time of their discovery. When the apostle spoke of preaching the gospel in all the world, it was in all the parts then known.

Now in regard to this "all nations." We have examined that so much already that the friends perhaps will get tired of it; but they must remember, that my brother told me last night that he would give me an argument that I could work on a whole day; so you must expect me to expend a little extra time upon it.

You will remember, I trust, the statement I made concerning "all nations being gathered together." This statement is one of positive prophecy, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto *all nations*, and then shall the end come." I submit the thought in connection with this statement, that if there were nations of the earth then undiscovered, if there were nations then unknown, the gospel certainly was not preached in undiscovered and unknown nations; but at the time when the end is to come, the gospel is to have been preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, that they may be brought to trial, and proven worthy or unworthy of the blessing or condemnation then to be given.

The brother, in noticing the argument in regard to all nations being gathered before him, and endeavoring to prove it was at the destruction of Jerusalem, quotes for us a prophecy of Zechariah in regard to all nations being gathered to Jerusalem to battle. A good quotation.

The statement in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, however, is very clear, and very distinct from this, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels* with him;" *not* the Roman legions; *not* the wicked heathen; *not* heathen idolators, but "all the HOLY ANGELS with him, he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." The result of this judgment, we learn, is to bring to them upon his right hand the blessing described in the following words, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." While to those who have not done good deeds, will come the damnatory clause, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." This sounds very much like the judgment decree, when *all* the nations are to be gathered before him, and he who is found worthy is to inherit the kingdom, while he who is unworthy is to depart into everlasting fire.

Either the judgment did very gross injustice, as the brother has told you *our view* of the judgment would do, or else the gathering at Jerusalem was *not* the gathering here spoken of.

In regard to Joel, the brother has quoted what Peter said on the day of Pentecost, and then adds, Away goes his argument on Joel. Well we will see

whether it goes away or not. I thank my brother for calling attention to it, for I think I can make it a little stronger now.

The statement is made that the Spirit was received by the apostles, and that they were enabled to preach to other nations and people who had come to Jerusalem. These tongues which they spake they had not learned; for it was by the power of God they were enabled to speak them. Some supposed they were drunken. "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said, Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words, for these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." Peter understood this matter, Sir, as I do. Hear him:

"This is *that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."

We will pass all the rest of the declarations to notice the elliptical one with which it is introduced, "This is *that*." That what, Sir? Here we have something indicated, but not clearly pointed out; an elipsis unsupplied. "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." What was spoken of by the prophet Joel? Peter tells us, "I will pour out of my Spirit." Does that supply the elipsis? Yes, sir. "This is that" Spirit "which was spoken" of "by the prophet Joel." It is not drunkenness that affects these; but it is that Spirit prophesied of.

But does our friend take the usual position that Joel's prophecy was *fulfilled* on the day of Pentecost? If you maintain it was, Sir, you will find yourself in a very sorry position. Joel gave the prophecy; and if Peter quotes it correctly, it was that Spirit spoken of by Joel, that was received on the day of Pentecost, which God, by the prophet Joel, had promised to pour out. Let us go back if you please to Joel, second chapter, twenty-eighth verse, and see how this will fit our friend's theory, "And it shall come to pass a-f-t-e-r-w-a-r-d," "afterward?" After what? We read in the context before it, that God before then will have scattered his people among the heathen, in all the nations of the earth; and also that, according to his promise, *after* their having been so scattered, he will gather them. And it shall come to pass "*afterward*," after they are gathered from their scattered condition, and restored to their own land, "that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Was all flesh there upon the day of Pentecost? To confine this prophecy to those gathered at Jerusalem, is a very strange kind of rendering of the phrase, "all flesh;" a very poor conception of God pouring out his Spirit upon all flesh!

But, again, "And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." Yes, sir; "prophesy." "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy. Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." Pray tell us, Sir, if *this* was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. *Who* were the old men who dreamed dreams on the day of Pentecost? *Who* were they who had these dreams while they were standing or sitting there, "*wide awake*," listening to Peter. Strange way of dreaming, Sir, is this wide awake style! *Who* were the young men who saw *visions* on that day? Is there a record of such a thing as either a dream or a vision on the day of Pentecost? No, sir, there is not.

The servants and the handmaids of Israel were to have the Spirit poured out upon them, so that they should prophesy; did any of them so prophesy on that day? The only statement we have on record as having been made that day, of even the nature of a prophecy, is the statement made in the sermon of Peter, given by inspiration, that should they observe to do that which he com-

manded them, they should receive the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. Peter was right. It was that Spirit promised through Joel; but not the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel. Joel's prophecy of spiritual gifts can not be fulfilled until Israel are gathered to their own land again, and established in the home of their fathers; for these gifts are to be poured out "AFTERWARD," and ON ALL FLESH.

The brother has presented in his last speech, quite an array of commentators' comments on the various passages of Scripture that have been quoted in this debate, or on some of them at least. Once more I call his attention to the article of debate. Let us read it:—"Resolved that the *commentators* teach that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past." Is that the question, Sir? No, Sir. But, "Resolved that the BIBLE teaches that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past." It does not matter *what* the opinion of this man is, or that man; men's views are not involved in this question at all. The question, and the only question is, what the *Bible* teaches. I do not care what the opinions of men are in regard to the matter, nor does this audience; we only want to know what the Bible teaches, and we are here to show what it does teach in regard to it.

The Elder says that the kingdom spoken of by Daniel, which was to be established in the days of "these kings," was to be established in the days of *the four kings*. I do not see where he gathers this idea from. As set forth in Daniel 7:7, the fourth beast (or kingdom) is shown to be diverse from all the others. We are told by the prophet that this beast shall devour and break in pieces. This beast had ten horns, and the prophet writes, 8th verse:

"I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things."

Daniel was unable to understand the matter, but had great anxiety to learn about the fourth beast, and in answer to his enquiry; the following interpretation was given in the vision:

"Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the Saints of the Most High; and the time came that the Saints possessed the kingdom. And he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominion shall serve and obey him."

It would seem to be sufficiently clear that the kingdom was not to arise in the time of the fourth beast; but in the time of the ten kings; (24v.) to arise after the beast, yet out from him, and after the eleventh horn, (*not a king*, but diverse from the ten who are called kings) shall have subdued three of the kings, and shall have reigned,—as you argue, Sir, for a few years, or until the destruction of Jerusalem, a period of six hundred and twenty-five years? No, Sir; but *until a time and times and the dividing of times*. The Jewish year is said to consist of three hundred and sixty days; a time represents one day, one day, a year; "time" therefore represents a year, "times" plural, two or more years, dividing of time, half a year. Add time, one year, and times, two years, to the dividing of time, half a year, and we have three and a half years; multiply by three years and a half, the number, 360, the number of days for each year, and we have the number 1260, 1260 days, and according to the testimony of the

angel to Daniel, in 10:13, (when the hindrances had been twenty-one years, he calls it twenty-one days), we reckon one day for a year, and we have 1260 years as the period during which that power should exercise dominion over all the earth.

It was to be *after* this power should arise and have ruled 1260 years, and that would not arise till *after* these kings came into authority, further yet than than even now, yet in the very days of these kings or governments, the little horn will perish, and the kingdom of heaven will be set up.

In the second chapter of Daniel we read of a great image that was presented in dream to king Nebuchadnezzar, and to Daniel. The image had two legs, and two feet, and on the feet ten toes. From the interpretation given by Daniel, we learn that the legs represented the fourth power, which we recognize as the Roman power. The divisions of the Roman empire commenced in about the year 356, and since the time when the Roman empire commenced to be divided, these toes have been forming on the image; gradually forming, we notice them as we view one kingdom after another split off from the Empire. Thus we see that as the Roman power is represented by Daniel's fourth beast and the legs and feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, so the ten kingdoms are represented alike by the ten horns on the beast, and the ten toes of the image.

That part of the prophecy based on Daniel's vision, which speaks of another little horn arising, before whom three of the ten were plucked up by the roots, was fulfilled, without doubt, in my mind, when the Pope obtained temporal power, when he subdued three kings. He was a temporal prince, as well as a spiritual supervisor. All the parts of the two visions synchronize; but to Daniel's vision, he being a prophet, there was added the representation of an ecclesiasticism, which had no correlative in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. He was a king; and to him was shown only political matters, and the setting up of the *Great Kingdom* of Christ—the universal kingdom, yet to be established, whose king shall reign in righteousness, and judge with equity.

The dream of Nebuchadnezzar was had B.C. 603, and his was the first of the four empires, and he the head of gold; 2d, the Medes and Persians took Babylon B.C. 538, and under Cyrus represented the breast and arms of silver; 3d, the Macedonian or Grecian empire, established by Alexander the Great invading Persia B. C. 335, represented the belly and thighs of brass; 4th, the Romans reduced Greece into a Roman province, naming it Achaia B. C. 146, Cappadocia in 31, Egypt in 30, and Augustus Cæsar was made emperor of Rome 28 B. C., thus establishing the Roman Empire, represented by the legs of the image of iron, and the feet, part of iron and part of clay. If, Sir, this fourth empire was to possess its dominions for time, times, and dividing of time, add to 28 B. C. the period of 1260 years, and where, Sir, is your theory of the coming of Christ over eighteen hundred years ago, at the taking of Jerusalem. Even if your own strange theory were true, that the kingdom had to be set up when the Roman empire was a unit, instead of when divided into ten, inasmuch as there had to be 1260 years of occupancy before the kingdom is possessed by the Son of man, it could not have been then set up. But, Sir, your theory is not true, there had *first* to be the division of the Roman power into ten governments; *secondly*, another power had to possess three of these ten; and *thirdly*, this last power had to occupy 1260 years before that can take place; but, glorious hope! then cometh the end, when this mighty image shall be destroyed, the kingdom of heaven fill the whole earth, and peace and righteousness flow as a river. Then, Sir, will be fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah 1:25-27, redemption to Zion, and restoration of the seats of the judges of Israel.

The brother repeats to us again, that Christ will come at the end of his

mediatorial or spiritual reign. He says the dead in Christ will then have been raised. He refers to 1 Cor. 15:51:

"Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but, we shall all be changed."

I ought to read the previous verse, and see how it agrees with the theory of the kingdom being *now* inherited by us. I think I will do this.

"Now this, I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

If this be true, the kingdom of God, *as a kingdom*, is not established yet, at least we are not members of it; we are yet flesh and blood.

The question may arise in the minds of some, How shall we obtain salvation, if flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God? I reply, that the promise of inheritance refers yet to the future. We look for it. We look for the time to come, when, "*at his appearing and kingdom*," this mortal shall put on immortality, and we be made fit to inherit the kingdom of God.

"Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep; but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trump shall sound and the dead shall be raised, [not *shall have been* raised], incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."—1 Cor. 15:51-53.

We understand from this testimony, that there will be a time when Jesus will come to establish his kingdom, and that this time of the coming of Jesus will be accompanied by the raising of the righteous dead.

The brother quoted for us 1 Thess. 4:14-17. We have read this before:

"If we believe, [says he] that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

I pass this now and leave it to be considered under the head of the resurrection.

We will notice, however, whether there is to be a judgment connected with the coming of Christ. In the fifth chapter of first Thessalonians, second verse, I read:

"For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh *as a thief in the night*. [That is, when unlooked for, suddenly.] For when they shall say peace and safety, then *sudden destruction cometh upon them*, as travail upon a woman with child, and *they shall not escape*. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief."

And in connection with this again we quote:

"And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and *obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*."

Will there be no judgment then? Will not this be a judgment day? But, again, as to the time:

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition."—2 Thess. 2:3.

As much as to say, it shall not come unless this power referred to shall first obtain ascendancy; unless this man of sin be revealed. Do not imagine that that day is close at hand, this power must arise first.

7v.—"For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. 8v.—And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the *Lord shall consume* with the spirit of his mouth, and *shall destroy* with the brightness of his coming."

We all see clearly that there is, or seems to be, some judgment, and some execution of that judgment too. Yes, Sir, these testimonies of Scripture show

plainly that there will be a judgment in connection with this coming. According to the testimony of Paul, those who have not obeyed the gospel, shall be punished; for that which is not in accordance with the will of the Father, Christ will never save. Those who have worked iniquity, who have practiced abominations, who have done contrary to the revelation of God unto them,—they will be consumed; they will be destroyed by the brightness of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We also notice again in connection with the testimony that has been presented to us from the first chapter of Acts, verses six to eight, that the time of the restitution was future, and what do we learn respecting it here? Is it not that the disciples wanted to know whether Jesus would *at that time* restore the kingdom to Israel? What a favorable opportunity to undeceive them, if they were deceived, as Elder Shinn argues they were, by teaching them that God did not intend to establish a literal kingdom at all. But he did not undeceive them, any more than he has undeceived me; on the contrary, instead of correcting their views, he confirmed them by saying:

"It is not for you to know *the times* or the seasons, *which the Father* hath put in his own power. But *ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you*: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and the uttermost part of the earth."

We must now discover, as a correlate to this, what happened when the Holy Ghost had come upon them. Peter says, speaking of Jesus, Acts 3:21:

"Whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouths of all his holy prophets since the world began."

How is this to be understood? Is Jesus to remain there until the times of *restitution*? Were these the "times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by * * all his prophets;" a time of restitution that when desolation came on Israel! If I understand this word correctly, to restore is to bring back that which has been lost, not to destroy that which exists.

Peter says the heavens must receive or retain Jesus, until the times of the restitution spoken of by all the holy prophets, such as Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Joel, who with many others speak of these things of restitution as the times when Israel shall be restored to their own land. All the prophets who speak on this subject, as also the apostles, speak of it as the restoration unto the children of Israel of the kingdom God had promised to David, when he said that there should "never be a man wanting to sit upon his throne." The kingdom had been taken from Israel; they were oppressed by their enemies. But the prophets had declared that the Lord should "establish the throne of David;" should "*order and establish it with justice and with judgment,*" and that he of whom the prophets witnessed should be "king over all the earth." Even the heathen nations are to bow down before him, when he comes to reign as king of Kings and Lord of lords; and all nations and peoples are to submit to his decrees, and join in one loud anthem of praise to his name.

The brother will notice that these and following events that are to transpire, are very successive in the method of their transpiration. Jesus is to come, and in connection with this, the resurrection of the dead is to take place. The dead in Christ are to be raised first. Those that died in Christ are to be raised in Christ, and live and reign with him a thousand years. During that thousand years' reign, they are to be under his direct and personal instruction. After the thousand years' reign shall have passed away, then will come the final overthrow of all nations; then shall the end come. During this time "the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Jesus shall occupy the

throne of his father David. Jesus shall send forth his word, and there shall then come forth from Zion the law to govern the whole earth.

The brother has quoted the testimony of Paul, "*Hath in these last days,*" etc. This was very correct language, from Paul's standpoint. They *were* the last days to him, the same as *these* are the last days to us, or as *this is* the last day of the world, and until to-morrow comes. "In the last days," "In these last days;" the first refers to the last days of man's existence before the end; the second expresses the time of man's experience in the earth whenever spoken. The "these last days" and "these last times" of the apostle Paul referred to the time in which he lived; but the phrase, "the last days" in *his prophecy* referred to the future.

Elder Forscutt's time having expired, he closed his remarks.

Elder Shinn enters his eighth argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appear before you again to continue our friendly discussion. If I have misrepresented my brother, in regard to his views upon the subject of judgment, I have certainly not done it intentionally. He corrects himself, however, or corrects some one, and says, that men are only judged then by their consciences. Now I beg leave to differ with my brother in regard to that. I call the attention of my brother to Genesis 15:13, 14. We will see if this is a judgment of conscience.

"And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and they shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation will I judge."

Again, Ezekiel 21:28-30:

"And thou, Son of man, prophesy and say, Thus saith the Lord God concerning the Ammonites, and concerning their reproach; even say thou, the sword is drawn; for the slaughter it is furnished, to consume because of the glittering. * * * I will judge thee in the place where thou wast created, in the *land of thy nativity.*"

I want to know if that is not more than a judgment of conscience. The difficulty with my brother seems to be this. He has acknowledged a judgment in this life, and has also declared that he did not believe in a rejudgment.

Again I press this question upon my brother, Will they be rejudged? I do maintain you have not answered that question positively. Again the brother turns to Matthew 25:31, 32, and says it has not been fulfilled, because all nations were not gathered together to battle against Jerusalem, if I understand my brother.

In the sense, I take the position, that all nations were to be gathered together, is precisely the sense in which the Bible allows it to be taken. He sets it forth as follows, "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted," etc. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Again, "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle. The city shall be taken, the houses rifled," etc. Precisely in the same sense in which it is used in one instance, I claim it is used in the other. Why should it, my brother, mean only a few in one instance, and all mankind in the other? A little clear criticism upon that would not be amiss. My brother still says John is still living. All I have to say in regard to that is to show him to me. Where is he? Is he up north? I will give all my old boots and shoes if you will bring him on. I want to see him. All my folks want to see him. I expect all would like to see him. If he is here, it may be the Masons know something about him. Probably they can assist you some.

They are a skillful community, and know a good deal about such things. Perhaps they can bring him on. I want to see him, and others want to see him.

My brother runs to Acts 2:16, 17, then to Joel. Well now I want to read you first what Joel said. Joel 2:28, "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Before what we are going to read. "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." The pouring out of his Spirit upon all flesh, is that which is to come to pass afterward. "Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions." The pouring out of the Spirit was that which was to come in afterward. Now Peter upon the day of Pentecost said, "For these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." As I understand it, there was not time to get drunk before that hour of the day, nine o'clock. The pouring of the Spirit, enabling them to speak in all the languages of the earth. "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, saying, in the last days I will pour out of my Spirit."

Let it mean spirit, brother, or what it may, "this is THAT which was spoken by the prophet Joel, saying, in the last days I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." The last days were eighteen hundred years, and over, ago. He says he cares nothing for men's opinions. If we have not respect for other's opinions, how can we expect them to have respect for us? There is the point. When I have the opinion of an honest man upon a passage of Scripture, and it accords with mine, reason and honesty compel me to receive it. He may be a believer in endless punishment; in a special day of judgment beyond this life; yet his view upon this passage of Scripture, agreeing with mine, shows candor and honesty upon their part.

"In the days of these kings." I want to go back to Daniel, and read briefly from his second chapter. The kingdom was to commence, you remember, in the days of the four kings. That was my position. I read from Daniel to prove it. Dan. 2:38:

"Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay."

Daniel goes on and gives the interpretation of these different parts of the image, and says that four kings are represented. Then that in the days of these kings the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom. Now, brother, I can not let you speculate with the days, for in the days of these four kings the kingdom was to be set up. I told you my view was that the feet being composed of heterogeneous materials, represented the divisions of the Roman empire, and the cause of its fall; and that the kingdom was to be set up in "the days of these [four] kings."

First Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, I want to notice one thing in my review. I will call your attention to it in Thessalonians now. The brother read first Thessalonians, fourth chapter, "Now I say unto you by the word of the Lord," etc. The brother read that, and read it precisely in connection with second Thessalonians, where his coming in judgment is spoken of to reward mankind. I do not think that is a very honorable way of conducting controversy. He is speaking of two different comings. One to judgment, the other at the end of his reign. The brother read them and blended them, so as to produce the impression that they were both one coming. But that is not correct, brother. I have shown you that one of these comings is to reward mankind according to their works, and the other at the end of his reign. The apostle besought them that they should not be soon shaken in mind, nor be troubled, neither by spirit nor by letter, as that the day of Christ or the Lord was present. It

was sixteen years off yet. But at the other coming which I have proven, they that live and remain upon the earth, are to be caught up to meet the Lord, but not a single syllable or word about judgment in connection with it.

I now review the course of argument I have followed in this discussion. First, I claimed that the day of judgment began with and is the day of Christ's mediatorial reign. It will end when that reign is finished, and the kingdom delivered up to God the Father. It is to result in the destruction of every evil, and the purification of all souls. I then gave, if you remember, the Bible definition of the word judgment, showing that it was used descriptive of punishment, of government, etc. In my first argument I showed that mankind were judged in the earth, and that God's judgment seat was in the earth. To prove this I introduced various passages of Scripture.

Gen. 15: 13, 14.—"And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance."

"I saw under the sun the place of judgment," etc. "His judgments are in all the earth." "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner," etc. Having introduced an array of Scripture evidences, which the report will show, clearly showing that God judges in the earth.

I remarked, that God would never have changed his judgment seat from the earth, without having first notified his children of the fact, which he has never done; but on the contrary, his Son comes, the kingdom of heaven is among men, the kingdom of heaven is established among men. Jesus is the judge; when the kingdom is established, Jesus is established in his reign as judge. That the Father no longer judgeth any man, but has committed all judgment to his Son, and his Son's testimony is "Now is the judgment of this world," over eighteen hundred years ago. And that Jesus said, "For judgment am I come into this world." With this I introduced an argument in this connection.

My friends, he was ready to judge mankind over eighteen hundred years ago. He was to "judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing and kingdom." The argument was that Christ became judge when he received his kingdom.

Argument four, that Christ's coming in glory, in power, with his angels, to reward mankind according to their works, took place during the natural lifetime of some of those who heard him speak. Under this head I referred you to Matthew 25: 31-46; also Matthew 16: 27, 28, which I read again:

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his work. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

The only way that my brother has to avoid this strong argument, is to stand up before this congregation, here, to have them believe that John is still living in the flesh. Again I quote the parallel passages in this connection. Mark 8: 38:

"Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels."

Now, when should that coming take place in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels? Mark 9: 1.

"And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power."

The brother says he will have to go back to his dictionary to learn that some means more than one. The brother certainly knows that in the sense in which it is used here, that it means more than one. "Verily I say unto you,

there be some standing here." A collection it certainly means here, my brother, more than one; yet I presume my brother will not undertake to prove that more than one of those who heard Jesus speak is now living. If John is living now we all want to see him. I will give all my old boots and shoes to see him. Bring him forward, and I have no more to say on the subject. That is all you have to do. If you are not able to do that, we shall say that your proposition is lost in this discussion. We have now reviewed our fourth argument; namely, that Christ's coming in glory and power, with his angels, to reward mankind, was to take place during the natural lifetime of some of those who heard him speak. I also introduced the testimony of some learned authors, showing that his coming was past.

Argument five. Spoke of the difficulty of learned orthodox divines, in finding a separating place between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew. It is perfectly amusing to see the discussion of orthodox critics upon this point. I claimed that they were one continued discourse of Jesus to his disciples, relative to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Jewish order of things; the destruction of the temple. Then I spoke in regard to the world, you remember. As a proof, you remember, I showed you that the gospel was to be preached in all the world, and then the end was to come.—Matthew 24. I showed from Colossians 1:5, 6, that the gospel had come into "all the world."

Col. 1:23.—"If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature under heaven," etc.

My brother has acknowledged in this discussion, that as soon as the gospel should be preached to every nation, the end should come. The apostle testifies that it has been preached in "*all the world*," to every nation under heaven. The sense in which the apostle used it, I use it, my brother, in this discussion. The reference in this discussion is to King James' translation. The references I have given you will for ever stand out clear and conclusive, that the gospel was preached in all the world, to all the nations of the earth. Referred you to Rev. 1:7.

Sixth argument. His coming at a time of great trouble.

My seventh. His coming was near at hand over eighteen hundred years ago.

Rev. 22:12.—"And, behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his works shall be."

Rev. 1:3.—"Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: *for the time is at hand.*"

Does that mean eighteen hundred or two thousand years yet in the future?

James 5:8.—"Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord *draweth nigh.*"

Does that mean two or ten thousand years yet in the future? Again:

"And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead."

We have shown you that he became judge when he received his kingdom. He received his kingdom and it has been established for centuries. 2 Timothy 4:1, and many passages we introduced in this connection.

Eighth argument. The coming of Christ was to take place in the generation in which he lived. You will remember I introduced several arguments upon this matter, and told my brother that I was willing to risk the entire discussion upon the meaning of the phrase, "this generation," and that it means those living at that time, the people whom Jesus addressed. Those with whom he had this conversation. I read again from Matthew 24:29-35:

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon

shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

You remember that I gave you Br. Campbell's views upon this, showing that it was a past event.

"And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together the elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily, I say unto you, this generation, [now mark it, 'this generation,' not *that* generation to come, '*this* generation,' the generation then living], shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall never pass away."

You remember also the parallels which I introduced in this connection. Mark 13, Luke 21, Matthew 23.

First I gave the Bible view or meaning of this word generation. Matt. 1 :

"So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon, fourteen generations," etc.

You then remember I introduced some authority upon this matter, showing that it is a fact that it means the race of men then living, and my brother did not dispute this. Let me say in no instance in the New Testament, under heaven, among men, will he find it means anything more or less than the men of this age, the generation of people living at the time, including a space of about thirty years. This generation, the present generation, can present to us but one meaning; the men then living, the people who were alive when the words were spoken. No instance in the Bible can be found where it means more than the men then living. Hence Jesus meant this generation of men now living shall not all pass away. Hence that generation was to see the coming of the Son of man, and the rewards of eternal life and everlasting punishment, my brother has spoken of, occurred or took place eighteen hundred years ago. Let him who can, show to the contrary. This matter is proven plainly, let those who choose doubt. In regard to this matter, I have other authority. Alexander Campell, Clark, and a great many. As I have told you, I am willing to risk this discussion upon the meaning of that word "generation."

Has he came up to that mark? It remains for you to decide. My concluding argument was, that a personal coming of the Lord was indicated and clearly taught in the Bible, at the end of his mediatorial reign. In connection with that personal coming he was to deliver up the kingdom. Instead of receiving the kingdom and judging mankind, he was to cease to judge, was no longer to be judge of the world, but was to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. Precisely here is where my brother and I differ. I believe he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father. My brother believes he will take the kingdom. I introduced the following Scripture :

1 Cor. 15.—"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

The destruction of death is the universal resurrection from the dead.

"For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

I have showed that this coming was not in connection with judgment, but at the end of Messiah's reign, when he shall have accomplished his work, the object of his mission, to purify all souls by his truth. Not one word is said

about judgment in connection with this coming. Judgment began with, and is to end with, Messiah's reign. All souls are to be constituted pure and holy under Messiah's reign; then the kingdom is to be delivered up to God, the Father; then the personal coming of Jesus is to take place, but not to judgment.

1 Cor. 15: 51-53.—"Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trump shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Friendly hearers, in connection with this, 1 Thess. 4:15. In the thirteenth verse he says he would not have them ignorant concerning those who are asleep. Read this passage for yourselves.

"For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

All the dead are in Christ at this time, my brother. "Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up in the cloud"—

Time was here called. Upon which call Elder Forscutt said to Elder Shinn, "You can finish your speech. You can have ten minutes to finish it in if you desire it."

Whereupon Elder Shinn continued—"to meet the Lord in the air." Meaning that at this glorious time, they who are alive shall be changed, and caught up to meet the Lord. "And so shall they ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." This is the closing up of Messiah's reign; this is the time of the resurrection of the dead. Mark you, the resurrection of the dead is spoken of by the apostle in the fifteenth of first Corinthians. This is a parallel to that. Here the Messiah ceases to be judge, and delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father, instead of taking the mediatorial thousand years, and becoming judge, as my brother imagines.

This closed Elder Shinn's argument upon the first proposition; leaving the closing effort in reply to Elder Forscutt; which reply is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Arising before you to give the closing speech on the question that has been at issue between Elder Shinn and your speaker, I have brought to my mind by my brother, the entire list of arguments which he has advanced during this debate, to sustain his position, that "the Bible teaches that the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past."

You have heard his nine propositions, by which he purposed to prove that one proposition, "The coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past." You have also had repeated in brief, the arguments and passages which he introduced to support this proposition. I think I may safely leave it with you whether he has proven that which he has attempted to prove, "that the coming of Christ to judge the world," not the Jewish world, "is now past."

You can judge too, from the testimonies he has given, and from the arguments he has produced, whether he has proven that the judgment of the Jews in the past was the judgment of the world.

He tells us, as he did when he commenced the debate, that he does not believe in a personal coming of Christ at the end of his reign to judge the world; but he believes that at the end of his mediatorial reign, he will give up the government to God the Father. In answering this position or argument, whichever you may be pleased to call it, I referred you to some quotations from Matthew twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters; first Thessalonians, fourth chapter;

second Thessalonians, first chapter; first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, as well as to Peter and the prophets, and I think these furnish a sufficient amount of evidence in favor of the position which I take, as negating his proposition; namely, that instead of Christ giving up the reins to the Father when he comes the second time, he will then come, as the Scriptures declare, to judge the world; to execute judgment and justice. He is to come, as I quoted to you from Jude, with ten thousand of his Saints, to *execute judgment* upon all the ungodly, and from other passages, to give rewards, to reward every man according to their works, to bless according to the good they shall have done, or to punish according to the evil they shall have done. If I understand the Scriptures, and the time and object of his coming aright, it will certainly be in the future, at the time when he shall come without sin unto salvation, come as the executioner of this judgment of which the prophets have written concerning him.

The brother has told us that he has proven that God would judge in the earth. In proving this he has only proven the position our people are always accustomed to take. So far as the place of judgment is concerned, he need never have presented the first argument; and so far as I was concerned, it is lost, all lost, every word of it. This is what the Latter Day Saints have been preaching ever since they were a church, and it seems our brother is a believer in the theory of the Saints, as to locality; but not as to manner and time. He claims, however, to have proven to you, that the judgment of God is executed while you are in the flesh, that the judgment is not in the future at all, and that all punishment mankind receives, is the punishment for sin as executed now and continuously in the flesh. Here we differ widely.

At the time when Jesus shall come and call forth the dead, I understand it to teach, in the book of Revelations, that *they* who are to come forth, will come to be judged according to the things written in the books; and that *then* the judgment shall take place,—not in heaven or hell,—but on the earth. According to this, the judgment is to take place *after the dead are raised*, instead of its being confined exclusively to this life, as our friend teaches.

The brother has proven to us that *judgment and justice* are attributes of the Deity, and so far we are agreed there; but there is nothing in his argument to prove that the judgment written is passed upon men in this life. On the contrary, as I argued in the first part of this discussion, we have evidences every where presented, clearly proving that *the righteous are not rewarded fully in this life, nor the wicked fully punished*. If the judgment is in this life only, and is now in the flesh, then the judgment is very unjust, and is neither justice nor judgment. In all the history of mankind, in that of the Lord Jesus Christ not excepted, the wicked have triumphed. It was one of the grand legacies left by Jesus to his faithful Saints, and the Latter Day Saints, Sir, know by sad experience how faithfully it has been honored, "Ye shall be hated of ALL men for my name's sake." The Saints were persecuted and oppressed on every hand, anciently, and are so still; though thank God, not so bitterly as beforetime. Good has almost always had to succumb, while evil has triumphed. If the judgment be here, then do I again declare there is no justice in this judgment.

We are agreed on the term "endless punishment," seeing the brother has accepted the definition I gave of it, or has said to you, that the view I gave of it he would have no objection to. For the benefit of those not here then, I will state what that view is. When the terms "eternal," "endless," "for ever" are used in Scripture, *they have reference to the full period of time in the mind of the speaker*, whether it be man or Deity. A period of three days only, was spoken of by the prophet Jonah as for ever. Eternal judgment may be for a few years, a thousand or a few thousand years' duration. Endless and eternal

are sometimes relative, and do not necessarily signify what our orthodox friends think they do, a condition of things that never shall terminate. They may be absolute, or relative, the context and correlevant passages must be consulted for their meaning.

Another position the brother has attempted to prove, is the establishment of the kingdom spoken of by Daniel in the early days of Christianity. It has formed quite an important link in the chain of "evidences" presented by him. He has claimed that it began to be established on the day of Pentecost, and has been in existence ever since. This is the theory presented, if I did not mistake the statements. I think we can amply prove by the Bible and history, and I should have done so more fully than I have done, had we had further time, that the kingdom spoken of by the prophet Daniel *was not set up, and could not be set up*, by any possibility, until after the toes of the image had been formed. The head appeared first; then the breast and arms; then the lower parts of the body, and lastly down to the feet and toes. The toes, ten in number, are the last part in the image, the last formed. They were to be formed after all the rest of the image had passed away, and then, during their existence, the kingdom of God was to be set up; the kingdom, that kingdom spoken of by Daniel, by the prophets, by Jesus, and by the apostles in the days of Jesus Christ. The kingdom was to be set up in the days of these ten kings, not one of which was in existence in the days of Jesus Christ or his apostles. I think I have recapitulated the proof of this sufficiently, and that my position is successfully established.

The brother asked in relation to some quotation about "at hand," and asked, Does that term signify eighteen hundred years in the future, or two or ten thousand years yet to come? Not with us; but with him with whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," it sometimes does; for example, as he quoted to you from Joel; in the beginning of his second chapter Joel say, "For the day of the Lord cometh, for it is *nigh at hand*." Now, my brother, if you, because the words "at hand" were used by the apostle, say, and can prove, that it must of necessity take place immediately, or very soon, brother Joel's prophecy, delivered eight hundred and sixty-five years before the coming of Christ, must go down into the waste-basket of rejected matter, as false; for he said, "It is *nigh at hand*." The very same phrase, the very same expression, used eight hundred and sixty-five years before even Elder Shinn acknowledges its fulfillment, is used by Joel, as was used by Peter and Paul, and quoted by me. But again we notice that Joel not only used this phrase; but used it in the present tense also, "For it is *nigh at hand*."

We might present a number of passages of like nature. We will quote Isaiah 13:6. Here the exact phrase, "The day of the Lord is at hand," is used, and it is used too concerning an event *not yet fulfilled*. Of Cyrus in Isa. 44:28, the Lord said, "He is my shepherd;" and in 45:1, "To Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden," an event one hundred and seventy-six years off. Jeremiah, also, in his thirty-third to fifty-first chapters, which I have quoted from, is predicting by the testimony of the word of the Lord, the destruction that is to come upon the enemies of Israel, and he states that the time is "very near," "not afar off;" yet these periods of time are very dissimilar; some of them reach out a few years, some a few hundred years, some until long after Christ, and some are not fulfilled even now; yet it was intimated then that the time was near, equivalent to *at hand*. We pass that question.

The brother thinks he makes a strong point on the subject of judgment by the quotation "*Now is the judgment of this world*." I think we had better read that verse, as he did not read it all. It may be politic, whether it be profitable or not, to quote part of an author's statement, and apply a meaning to

the part quoted which the unquoted part would destroy. John 12:31, "Now is the judgment of this world,"—the gentleman read to this and then stopped,— "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." When it is all read we see it refers to some especial circumstance, and that which is predicated thereon. The judgment of *this world*, not of Christ, and as the result of that judgment, "Now shall the Prince of this world be cast out."

Who was the Prince of this world? In Revelation 1:5, Christ declares himself to be "Prince of the kings of the earth;" and in the verse following quotation from John, he says, "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me." 33v. "This he said, signifying what death he should die." Does not this verse which immediately follows the one quoted by Elder Shinn, indicate that he was "the Prince" who would be cast out? I also quote for you from Peter's testimony, as recorded in the fifth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, thirty-first verse. Speaking of Jesus he says, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a *Prince* and a Savior." Who was the Prince? In the first, as in this question, I believe it to be Jesus; and when Jesus was cast out, the judgment was of this world. The judgment rendered by any judge or court, is according to the judgment of him rendering it, and therefore his judgment, not the judgment of the one tried, but judgment on him. Judgment had been decreed when the law had been declared, "Thou shalt not kill." If the brother be right, Jesus should have said, Now is *my* judgment—I will not be taken now. But not so, Sir, "Now is the judgment of this world." In the very same sense it is applicable to, "Now shall the Prince of this world be cast out." To the judgment of the world Jesus Christ was then to be taken, to be judged, condemned and die upon the cross, that you and I through him might find life.

The brother found a little fault with me, because I said in one of my arguments, that the wicked had so much prosperity in the world, and the righteous had so little. He brought a passage of Scripture from Isaiah 57:21 to prove that I was wrong. I did not notice it at the time; for I really thought he was joking, "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked." He might as well have quoted Ps. 37:35, "I have seen the wicked in power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree," right along with it. He understood very well that the Scriptures, as well as our own observation, testify very plainly, that the wicked do prosper and thrive often here, and I thought therefore that his quotation was designed for nothing but as a bit of a by-play, and passed along by it. I can hardly think him serious about it yet.

The brother tells us that the kingdom of God was established on the day of Pentecost, and during the time of Christ and the apostles; but yet, though it was established, it was not perfect.

In a spiritual or ecclesiastical sense, I shall not differ from him; but, in a legal sense, I would like to know, very much, whether, as we had it in the argument presented by him that the judgment is now past, and was continuous from the beginning of the world, I would like to know whether the judgment was passed before the court of the church was organized, as it must have been if the brother be correct in arguing that the kingdom and the church are one and the same. I do not understand that there can be, justly, with a perfect Being, such a thing as recognition of a judgment passed upon transgressors, when there is neither a court to try them by, nor authority to organize such court by law. I do not see how it can possibly be that the law can be executed before the "judgment shall sit." The time is set; and there can be no authority by which the decrees of that law can be executed before judgment is rendered. If, Sir, there was in existence no law governing his spiritual kingdom, or church, how could

there be a judgment passed upon the people for their deeds in relation to that church? How could there be a punishment for the breaking of a condition, when that condition is not known. Either then this law must first be made known to all who have not yet heard it, before they are judged, or there will be injustice.

The gentleman also attempted to prove, because of some evidence I brought from the book of Revelations, establishing the theory that the judgment will be at the coming of Christ, that that book was written long prior to the time when it is said to have been written. You know how well he proved his point! He gave you the *opinion* of some men who are said to be *growing into* this idea; but as the evidence has not been given to us, the *opinions* of his authors weigh nothing in the scale of your judgment. Surely, Sir, the Apocalypse was written on the Island of Patmos, and written by John after he went there, and there is nothing definite in the history either of nations or of the individual, history ecclesiastical or secular, to show that John ever went to the Isle of Patmos before the year 95. There is no *proof* of an opposite view before us anywhere, only bare statements like that presented to us yesterday.

Rollin, Sir, is a standard author of ancient history in England, in France, and in all parts of "Christian" Europe, except, perhaps, in Germany, where one or two others are esteemed equally as reliable collators as he. He is the standard in America, his writings are permanently established as those of a very careful and very thorough historian. This is manifestly the view generally entertained, from the fact that nearly all the leading historians who now prepare our school and academical histories, when referring to the ancients, appeal to Rollin for evidence. And, now Sir, whose view of the prophecies of the past does Rollin sustain; yours, or mine? So far as relates to the four great monarchies, or universal empires, mine most decidedly. You tell us, Sir, that John returned from Patmos, and died. Your authors, Sir, have *not one particle of evidence* to furnish you in proof of your statement, hence you can give us none. They *conjecture* it, and you *admit* it. Rollin, Sir, gives no direct testimony upon this point at all. When, Sir, you give us testimony concerning Nerva; when you say there were certain decrees passed by him, under which John returned, you possibly state the truth; but you can find *nothing, absolutely nothing*, Sir, about John in any history other than an ecclesiastical history, in either the reigns of Nero, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, or Trajan. Coming to ecclesiastical history, we discover a reference to him by Eusebius in his third book, eighteenth chapter; but what is it, Sir? I have proved that Eusebius depended on others' testimony, and *was not*, therefore, a *witness*; and yet, Sir, even your boasted reference from Eusebius is explained by this: "In this persecution, [that by Domitian], *it is HANDED DOWN BY TRADITION*, that the apostle and evangelist John, who was yet living, * * * was condemned to dwell on the Island of Patmos;" and in thirty-first chapter of same book, is your reliable testimony of his death, quoted by Eusebius from an epistle of Polycrates, written not more than twenty years before to Victor, where we are told that "John, a priest that bore the sacerdotal plate, a martyr and teacher, rests at Ephesus," so that *the last testimony that we have that John died is a testimony that was given by a man that did not live till nearly a hundred years after the supposed death took place*; and this testimony our friend sustains (!) by Dr. Fleetwood, who did not live till about seventeen hundred years afterward. So much for this "overwhelming argument." (!)

As, however, our friend has quoted Eusebius, I will introduce him on another point, and being my friend's witness, I will cross-question him. In reply to my first enquiry, *Where did John write the Apocalypse?* Eusebius gives no

answer but the answer of Dionysius, that John, himself, says that it was while "he was on the island, called Patmos, on account of the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus." In reply to my second, *When did John go to Patmos?* Eusebius answers, that tradition says he was exiled during the persecution in the reign of Domitian, (the second Nero in cruelty), and that "those who have accurately noted the time" say it was in the fifteenth year of Domitian's reign, which would be the year 95. In reply to my third, *When did John return to Ephesus from Patmos?* Eusebius says it was "after Nerva succeeded to the government, when the Roman Senate decreed that those who had been unjustly expelled should return to their homes. We have, then, some reason for believing that the testimony of Christ to John in the Apocalypse was received in the year 96, as the chronology of King James' version of the Bible teaches, for it was certainly received on the Isle of Patmos. That fixes the judgment about which John wrote future from that day; and friend Shinn's witness, Eusebius condemns him.

The brother charged me a little wrongly last time; probably it was a mistake; he could not have designed it. He declares that I said, I must go to my dictionary to learn that some means more than one. He either did not intend to say what he did say, or has charged me with what I did not say. I have no such simple idea to learn as the meaning of this word. This is what I did say, in substance, that I had something more to learn from my dictionary, if the gentleman's view was right that the word some meant *only* more than one; not that it did not mean more than one, but that it was indefinite, and applied to one or more. I think you will remember that was my statement, in effect at least.

"The law of conscience!" Some fault was found with me for advocating the law of conscience. I reasoned that the condemnation of conscience was men's condemnation, prior to the day of judgment. Now, Sir, when I made the statement at the outset of this debate; also when, at your request, I explained my meaning of that statement in my last speech in this debate, I explained then that in this life judgment at times came upon nations and men, judgments which might be classed under the name of temporal judgments; for when I argued that temporal laws were given, and temporal punishments offered to them, I quoted in support of that position the testimony of our own experiences, and also urged that while the judgment of our own consciences is *now*, the great judgment which shall affix the penalty will be hereafter, when **THE JUDGMENT shall sit and the books shall be opened.**

It will be remembered that our friend's argument of God's being daily angry with the wicked, is unsupported by any proof that he *punishes them* every day with the only punishment they shall ever receive; and Bible proof being absent, the argument fails.

The "*seven-fold* punishment of Cain" is left unexplained by Elder Shinn, and is unexplainable on the negative hypothesis of no future judgment.

The quotations concerning the "mercy of God," made to destroy your confidence in a future judgment, are illustrative of one attribute of Deity, with whom are Justice and Judgment also; and the gentleman has failed, and ever must fail, to prove that it would be *merciful* either to the righteous or the sinner, to destroy the moral agency of the sinner, by forcing him into the society of the righteous, while between him and them there is no affinity, nothing in common; and equally as signally has he failed, and ever must fail, to prove that men are rewarded *according to their works*, if in the future the righteous are not honored, and the wicked not punished.

The gentleman told us his object was to prove that the kingdom of the Messiah was established; but you are all witnesses that the greater number of

passages quoted by him from the Bible refer to events yet future, and that, therefore, failing his purpose, I took occasion to thank him for furnishing them as evidence to me against his anomolous position.

In his shifting about effort to prove that the coming of Christ to judgment was, first, the coming of the Roman army against Jerusalem; second, the Pentecostal season; and third, the "mediatorial reign;" you have seen how signally he has failed to prove either one of the three; or that anything on earth has yet had aught to do with that judgment which is to be given into the hands of Jesus and his Saints, a judgment reserved for him to execute, and for them, as well as for you and me, to receive the award of. If Jesus be right, every man, whether Jew or Gentile, shall *then* appear before the judgment to give an account for the deeds done in the body, whether they be good, or whether they be evil; and even Brother Shinn will not dare to say that Jesus is wrong.

The gentleman denies a future judgment, a judgment after this life. We that are living since the destruction of Jerusalem are better off than the poor Jews.

ELDER SHINN interposed. "My position is, that judgment belongs to the reign of the Messiah. We are judged daily; judged all the time."

ELDER FORSCUTT. Precisely so! Of course then, if "we are judged daily; judged all the time," and there is but one judgment, there can be no judgment in the future. It would be quite interesting now, to know what kind of a punishment is passed upon a man who goes, cruelly and maliciously, and slays his fellow man; and who, perhaps at the very time while his hands are yet dyed with his victim's blood, turns around and takes his own life. Whence does the judgment come which decrees the punishment affixed to wrong doing in this man's case? Strange position! That this man can do as he pleases in this life, go from it when he pleases, and yet no judgment in the hereafter for him; no condemnation, no recompense! If we are judged as we pass along, judged every day, every moment, for the deeds of that day or moment, and receive then our reward whether we do good or evil, it does not matter, it seems to me, how each day passes, and the old exploded and discarded dogma, "The end justifies the means," had better be revived. But, thank God, it is not so.

ELDER SHINN interposed again. "Allow me to correct you. I have said all day through this discussion, that that judgment belongs to the reign of Christ, and that he reigns over the living and the dead; carry that into the future world, that at last when the time comes, rewards shall be given. I tried to make it clear, that there are two comings of Christ, one coming to judgment,—

ELDER FORSCUTT interrupted with, "The other coming to give rewards?"

ELDER SHINN replied, "Yes, Sir. One coming to judge and reward; another at the close of his reign."

Elder Forscutt resumed, I really understood you differently, and thought you were affirming that "the coming of Christ to judge the world, is now past." I am glad to learn that (though I think your answer mystifies your argument and position) you yet hesitate to deny all future judgment, and that your eyes are opening to discover this ray of truth. Your position *now*, Sir, does both your head and heart more credit than did that of yesterday; so, Sir, we will let that point pass.

"Judgment belongs to the reign of Christ, and he reigns mediatorially now," is our brother's argument still. I would like to know where there is anything in God's book, justifying this opinion. The testimony quoted for you by both Brother Shinn and me tells us that he is now sitting upon "*his* FATHER'S throne; but in the reign of Christ, they who shall have overcome are to sit with him on *HIS* throne." If he is now reigning on *his* throne, and the righteous

at this time are reigning with him, and this spiritual reign is all the reign he and they shall enjoy, then the testimony of the Lord given concerning Israel in thirtieth to thirty-third chapters of Jeremiah, promising, in connection with his reign, the restoration of Israel to their own land, has failed. The promise of God to them, elsewhere recorded, that a man should not be wanting to sit upon the throne of David, to rule over them; that there should be one Lord, and his name one; and he should be King over all the earth, have also failed. If the brother had said that they who have overcome are now enjoying rest and peace in the presence of Christ, who is now on his Father's throne; or that they are awaiting his return to earth to occupy his own throne, he would have been much nearer the scriptural idea. Hear the promise in Isaiah 1:25-27:

"And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin; and I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning; afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness."

The Lord will then restore all Israel to their own land; and then Messiah will have ascended the throne of his father David, and will reign over all the earth. Then he will execute judgment and justice in the earth. If that be true, Sir, the judgment is still future; though it will be upon the earth, it will be either in a future state, or in a future time, under conditions that do not yet obtain.

In reply to the brother's view about the time of Christ's coming, I quoted Acts 3:19-21, showing that the heavens must receive, or retain (as some translators render it) Jesus, until the times of the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets. I proved that Israel had been scattered; but that, when the *restitution* time comes, they will be gathered again, the Jews and Israel be one nation, and Jesus sit upon the throne of his father David as their King, then he will execute the judgment and justice written of him. Then, too, all the wicked nations spoken of will be gathered together, and their judgment be the closing scene of this mission in connection with the coming of Christ to judge the world. This all proves that the coming of Christ to judge the world is *not* in the past; but in the future.

The brother is very anxious to see John. I am glad he is so liberal.(!) I did not know that he had quite so big a heart.(!) He is willing to give all his old boots and shoes to see John! Could you have believed it, if you had not witnessed the measure of his liberality.(!) Well, I apprehend John is not very much in need of your old boots and shoes. Perhaps you'll need them.

In regard to these questions asked concerning John, "Where is he? and what is he? Where his locality, and what his conditions, faith does not determine, and to the believer it does not matter. What does the Bible, the word of God, say about him, is the question, and the only question for us now. I have taken the two testimonies of Scripture, of Jesus, who said, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" I take this, and I take the testimony of Jesus again, where, in reply to the apostle who understood Jesus to intimate that John should not die till the Son of man should come in his kingdom, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Jesus would not deceive. I believe Jesus, Sir. I believe the apostles would not have been allowed to entertain that view concerning John had it not been a correct one, nor would Jesus have confirmed a false impression on them. I, Sir, think too highly of Jesus, to believe him guilty of complicity with deceit. I care not where John is, north, south, east, or west, so far as faith in the word of Jesus is concerned. He is where God permits him to be; but wherever he is, he will be living when Jesus comes;

kept by Omnipotent power. Elijah too, and it may be others who never were permitted to taste of death, will be living when Jesus comes, though undoubtedly they will have undergone a change in their conditions of life, or life forces. There may be a difficulty in the way here for those who disbelieve the testimony of God's word; but for those who believe it there can be none.

When Jesus comes, there will then be a number living, who, we are told, will be changed; others whose lives will be prolonged to the "age of a tree," and who, though they should die, will never sleep. God, the source of life, can prolong life or change its conditions.

Unbelief is not new; nor is Elder Shinn the first who has wanted some one of other than mortal man to create faith in him. Jesus once had a question of this kind under consideration, when he spoke of the rich man in torment wanting Lazarus sent to warn his five brethren on earth; but he replied, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." So say I; if you will not believe Jesus, neither would you believe John. Were he to come here to-day, sir; you would probably ask disdainfully concerning the man to whom you generously proffer your old boots and shoes, "What old fellow is that?" And if he should answer, "John the Revelator," you would reply, "You, John the Revelator! Get away with you." Sir, if you do not believe without seeing him, you would not with.

"Time" was called by the Moderator, and the discussion of the first proposition was over.



Elder Forscutt began the discussion of the second proposition in debate on the morning of the 12th, after the usual exercises, in the following speech:

Proposition. "The Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave."

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I arise this morning to introduce to you the second proposition of this discussion, which reads, "The Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave." In presenting the evidence as the affirmative of this question, I shall endeavor to support it by four propositions, as follows:

First, That the Resurrection is *one of the principles*, and therefore, necessarily, a *constituent part* of the gospel of Christ.

Second, the Resurrection was believed in and foretold by the ancient prophets, and understood by the ancient Saints.

Third, That unless the doctrine of the resurrection be true, the promises found in both the Abrahamic and the Christian covenants will fail.

Fourth, That the righteous will be raised to glory, and the wicked to condemnation; and that, therefore, there will be a resurrection of all men.

In presenting these as the features of what may constitute the discussion on my side of the question, I do so with a consciousness of solemn responsibility before God, the *onus probandi* resting upon me; yet, satisfied as I am, and have been for many years, that unless the doctrine of the resurrection be true, I have no hope in Christ, and can have no hope in eternity; that without it religion would become but a blank, a plaything to pass with the hour, or the service for a time only, I essay the task.

First then, what do we understand by the term "resurrection?" In the

sense in which I shall employ it in this debate, I understand it to mean a rising from the grave, or a bringing back to life of that which has once been dead, and with this view I proceed to notice my first proposition;—That it is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ; and being one of the *principles* of the doctrine of Christ, it becomes a constituent part of the gospel of Christ.

In support of this, I read the testimony of Paul to the Hebrews, which was quoted last evening:

“Therefore leaving the principles of the *doctrine of Christ*, let us go on to perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.”

Our “Six-principle Baptist” friends consider these six principles to be the gospel of Jesus Christ; and in a general sense, so far as the doctrine of Christ is the gospel of Christ, we agree with them. And the apostle certainly has taught, as one of these six principles, that which is here called the “*resurrection of the dead*.”—Heb. 6 : 1, 2. Now, if the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is a doctrine of Christ, then is it truth. For, though I agree with Brother Hughes, that the gospel of Christ is but one, yet we divide that gospel, as a doctrinal system, into parts; and as parts of the doctrine by which the gospel is preached, we sometimes call each of those parts a doctrine of Christ: it will be understood, therefore, that I call it, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, “the doctrine of Christ” in this sense.

In presenting the doctrine of the resurrection, as a constituent part of the doctrine of Christ, as one of the principles of that doctrine; I also present to you this thought. If the doctrine of Christ is *one*, and it is in its entirety, as such, the doctrine of Christ, does it remain the doctrine of Christ, after the taking away or casting out of a part of it? Is not every individual principle of it as essential to its existence, as the existence of any principle of science, is essential to the perfection of that science? Or the existence of every feature, every individual part of the body to the existence of the body, as a perfect body. For, when we speak of that which is of Christ, as of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, we speak of that which is, like Christ, necessarily perfect. When we speak of the doctrine of Christ, we speak of a perfect system. From that which is perfect nothing can be taken away, without disturbing the harmony, without destroying the perfectness of the whole.

I learn further, too, from a consideration of the testimony presented to us in this sacred book, the record of the New Testament, that this doctrine was preached by Jesus, as one of the constituent parts of his gospel. In the fifth chapter of the testimony of John, twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses, he says: (I should read, too, that which precedes it, to make the statement clear to you):

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when *the dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given unto the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which *all who are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth*; they that have done good, unto the *resurrection of life*; and they that have done evil, unto the *resurrection of damnation*.”

The theory of the resurrection, or rather the doctrine of the resurrection, as presented by Paul, seems to have Jesus to support it; and in the testimony we have just read, Christ presents to us two features of the resurrection; the resurrection unto life, and the resurrection unto condemnation, or, as we have it here, damnation.

Again in the sixth chapter of John, thirty-ninth verse:

"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day."

40v.—"And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I *will raise him up* at the last day."

This testimony is very conclusive to my mind, both as to the revelation of the doctrine, and the acknowledgment of it, as being a part of the doctrine of Christ.

Still again in the testimony of John 6:39:

"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day."

I read this before; but now I call your attention to the statement found in it, "*Of all which the Father hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day,*" and will predicate thereon this argument; that if God has given the world to Jesus; if to him he has deeded all men, unless there be express conditions on which the benefits of that gift or deed shall accrue to the party God hath given to him to whom the gift is given, then will Jesus resurrect or raise up the bodies of man from the beginning of the world down to the end of time. I present this in consonance with the same thought presented by the apostle Paul, in the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, twenty-first verse:

"Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. 22. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

And in the thirty-second verse, Paul queries, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, *if the dead rise not?* Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." If there be no resurrection of the dead, Paul considered that there would be no advantage accrue to him from the labors he had bestowed upon the cause of Christ, his labor was in vain; for he would receive no advantage from it. He thought that he might as well have not labored as to have labored, as to have sacrificed all his interest, all his ease in this world, which he had had to do in receiving and accepting Christ, *if there be no resurrection of the dead.*"

Paul says when he is speaking of himself, "I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee." When he makes this statement, he makes known that which covers a great deal of ground; because the Pharisees believed that there were both angels and spirits, and that there would be a resurrection of the dead; and when he makes the statement that he is "a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee," a Pharisee of the Pharisees, he endorses the doctrine of the Pharisaic church or sect on the point in question, and confesses a belief in the doctrine of the existence of spirits, in the doctrine of the existence of angels, as such, and in the doctrine of the restoration to life of those who are dead. Should he fail in any one of those three principles of their doctrine and accept the other two, he is not a Pharisee. If a Pharisee, he embraced these three tenets, in so far as a belief in them is concerned. If he believed only in the doctrine of the existence of angels and not in the existence of spirits, or the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, he would be only a one-third Pharisee, a partial Pharisee; not a Pharisee proper; not a Pharisee of the Pharisees. If he believed in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and in angels, but not in spirits, he would then be only two-thirds a Pharisee, not a Pharisee, and a Pharisee of the Pharisees. It required the acceptance of the three distinguishing principles accepted by the sect of Pharisees, to constitute him, in opposition to the Saducees, a Pharisee, so that *he* might be contradistinguished by their especial name, a Pharisee, and *his hope* in the resurrection of the dead be recognized as that of the Pharisees. Paul then certainly believed in the doctrine of the resurrection.

of the dead, in the same sense, that is to say, in the same general sense in which the Pharisees believed, it and with this acceptance, he seems to be perfectly satisfied; for when he comes into the assembly before which he is accused, and they are divided among themselves, he presents the testimony of his acceptance of that doctrine then, as one of the reasons why his doctrine was called in question. Paul has been charged by some, with "playing off a little;" some have said, "he only made this statement, because he discovered both Pharisees and Sadducees in the assembly, and thought that by this avowal, he should gain the good opinion of the Pharisees in his favor, but Paul was a God-fearing man all his life. Even before he received the gospel of Christ, he did what he did, he tells us himself, in *all good conscience* before God. Paul, therefore, would not make any reference to a doctrine which he did not subscribe to, which he did not fully endorse.

I now refer you to the testimony of Jesus, as relating to the dead. Mark 12:26, 27:

"And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err."

As certified by Luke 20;37; it reads thus:

"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."

And this is carried out the same as presented by Mark 38th verse:

"For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him."

I apprehend that our friends who believe in the unconsciousness of the spirit after the death of the body, would find some difficulty in avoiding the force of the last clause in this statement. It is certainly not to be said by me, whatever it may be by my friend on the left, that Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob, when Moses made the declaration at the bush, had then received a resurrection from the dead. And if they had not received a resurrection from the dead, if the bodies of these men had not been raised, then there had been living within those bodies that which existed after death, not in an unconscious state, but in a state of living unto God, as the statement here made is, "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; *for all live unto him.*" This is an explanatory statement made by Jesus, and recorded by Mark in his twelfth chapter, twenty-seventh verse, relating to these three conditions of man.

First, as man in and of the body.

Second, as conscious man out of the body.

Third, as perfected man in his resurrected state.

That man exists in the body as a man, spirit and body united becoming one living soul; that, at death, the body resolves itself, or is resolved into its primitive elements, to the condition it existed in before it became flesh and blood, and before yet it passed through the conditions requisite to prepare it to become the flesh and blood of mortality, is conceded by all. When the body dies, the spirit still lives, though out of the body, and possesses all the powers which it possessed while in the body, while in connection with the body; as then the spirit does not die, it is not the spirit which is raised from the dead, but the body in which the spirit has once existed.

As also the body possessed powers of life in connection with the spirit; so again it shall be raised to life, and the spirit and the body again be united, and appear before Christ and exist in the hereafter, in a conscious state. Consciousness, they shall have; bringing to them condemnation for past misdeeds; or happiness for past good deeds.

Then, as underlying these three principles, we ask the question here, If there be a resurrection of the dead, what is it that shall be raised from the dead? The spirit certainly is not dead; that possesses power of life within itself. In the statement of Jesus, we learn that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had passed away, had then ceased to exist in the flesh, and yet they lived; but they lived unto God. The spirit then dieth not, but has an existence independently of the body. It was the body, and the body only, which died; and if the body was that part only of man which died, and there is to be a resurrection, and the term resurrection signifies a raising to life, then that which has died is that also which must be raised to life. If the spirit had died, then might we speak of the resurrection as the raising of the spirit to life. In order to sustain our view, we need but to show that the raising to life of the body, is the resurrection of the dead, and this I have done.

I do not know what position my brother may take, nor shall I anticipate him; but I have heard those who, in fact and in principle, declare there is no resurrection of the dead by declaring that when the body dies, the spirit goes to some realm far above, called "heaven;" or to some realm equally far below, called "hell," and that the spirit that goes to either of these places, is doomed to abide there forever and forever. This precludes the possibility of a return to consciousness of the body, inasmuch as the spirit lives independently of the body.

I do not suppose Elder Shinn will deny that the spirit may exist independently of a body, and that, therefore, it may preserve its identity in spirit form. Now, if the body, as I have shown that the body will be restored,—if the body has restored to it the powers of life, and in the enjoyment of those powers, has an existence upon earth, (I know that this may not seem to be relevant to the subject, yet I introduce it here to make myself clearly understood, and because I believe this will be its home), if we are to live here, and this be our home in our future state, this earth, and this earth only, not in its present condition, but in a changed and glorious condition, then we argue therefrom, that a restoration of the spirit to the body is essential. The restoration of the body is the calling of the body from death to life, and it must be prepared for and adapted to an existence on the new earth, that then, as now, the body may be affiliated with the earth on which it dwells. The body has now all the elements in its composition which exist in this earth, so much so, that man was called by some ancient philosopher a "microcosm of the earth," by others "microcosm of the universe."

The law of adaptation is everywhere strikingly manifest now, where the rude hand or vulgar policy of man has not wrought disharmony; it will not be less but more so in the resurrected state; for then, whatever its station or use, each existence will be in perfect harmony with all things in its own sphere, and sustain congruent relations to all things else in a perfected state. If the spirit only should live, it would bear too insufficient relationship to its residence, the earth, for the sympathies of its nature to be called forth by its surroundings. The flowers would bloom, the fruits would ripen, and the luxuriance of the earth adorn its fair face in vain, for its spirit occupants would have nothing in their natures adapted to the enjoyment of its more than Edenic loveliness. The spirit will be in harmony with its origin, and the body the medium by which will be transmitted to it the joys of earth-life; then as now. When you review these thoughts, and consider the bearings of the arguments that may be presented before you, think of this as of one of the reasons why the spirit should not be "unclothed, but clothed upon."

I here return to the promise that there shall be a resurrection. That there shall be a coming forth from the grave, is evidenced by the quotations I have already read, as having been uttered by Jesus:

"Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which *all who are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.*"

There has been an objection urged against the acceptance of this as a literal truth, to this effect; that those who are in their graves in a decomposed state, can not possibly hear; for as they would have none of the faculties or organs of hearing, they would have no power to hear, no power to understand, no power to conceive the meaning of an utterance made by either Jesus or his Father, and that, therefore, the philosophy of the resurrection of the dead, as based upon the declaration that they who are in their graves shall hear his voice, is a philosophy very poorly founded.

While there may be some credit given to this argument; while it may seem to be a very conclusive argument to some, it lacks in the essential which belongs to all arguments which should be used in respect to the things promised by God, and that essential is "Faith in God." All the hopes of the ancients; all the joys and blessings of the promises; all the triumphs of Christ in the gospel, are predicted on the exercise of faith in God. "He that believeth," "According to your faith be it done unto you," etc. Therefore, while we may not be able to comprehend *how* the dead shall be raised, or *how* the dead shall hear his voice, faith in the testimony of Jesus Christ, as the Son of God, the Creator of the world, for by and through him all things were created that do exist; faith in his utterance who first formed man, would lead the true believer to say, that the very same being who first formed man, and gave to him powers of hearing, powers of sight, powers of speech, the joints and limbs that belong to the body, can again call them from the dust, clothe them again with those or similar powers; can cause that which now sleeps in the dust to revive and possess all the functions now belonging to man, and enable man, thus endowed, to exercise all the faculties peculiar to him, that he may hear and live when God shall speak, and all in accordance with the laws of their renewed nature.

The declaration of Jesus that the dead *shall hear*, is an evidence that we shall be raised to life in the exercise of the faculty of hearing, with all the functions of our bodies and faculties of our minds. The condemnation or the blessing of God will come upon us in vain, unless in the exercise of those faculties we can feel the reproof of condemnation, or enjoy the fruits of blessing. They are the very powers in fact that belong to the body in this state, and will belong to it in a resurrected state, or *man* will not be restored.

I now pass to consider my second proposition, which is, that the doctrine of the resurrection "was foretold and believed in by the ancients."

That the oldest book, or that which is supposed to be the oldest book, in the Bible, contains evidence that the ancients did believe in the doctrine of the resurrection, and that therefore Jesus was right when he intimated that Moses believed in this doctrine, I am well satisfied.

We read that Job believed in it, and it is thought by some that Job lived contemporaneously with Abraham. In the Septuagint version his is fifth from Abraham, and it seems according to the testimony of the Septuagint, and the calculations of Ussher, that the book of Job was written before the exodus from Egypt, some twenty-nine years, and that therefore the book of Job is the oldest book in the collection of books called the Bible.

Job, in his nineteenth chapter, commencing at the twenty-third verse, after addressing himself to his friends on their persecution of him, and describing his agony while passing through the trials through which he did pass, says:

"Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! 24. That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! 25. For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. 26. And though

after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. 27. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

Here faith expresses itself at the early day in which Job lived; faith too that has not been excelled even by that of the apostles of Jesus Christ, faith in the existence of his Redeemer, and the power of his resurrection.

It was with no little, no ordinary degree of confidence that Job, in the presence of his spiritual persecutors said, "*I know that my Redeemer liveth;*" when as there would arise before him the possibility of his dying before the Redeemer should come; he yet declares, notwithstanding this, that he knows that he would *stand with him upon the earth in the latter day*. Yes; though skin worms should destroy his body, though his reins should be consumed within him, *yet in his flesh*, IN HIS FLESH, he should see God, and his eyes should behold him, and he should stand in the presence of God, in the presence of Christ, his Redeemer. Although the power of life which he then had should be lost in death, though the powers of his body should be destroyed; yet, he should receive again those powers with his body, with which he should realize all the joy that he had anticipated, and realize it too with his Redeemer in the flesh.

The half hour here expired, the Moderator announced "Time," and Elder Forscutt gave way.

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's first argument is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We continue our friendly discussion this morning, but the laboring oar is in the hand of my brother. I would be very glad, indeed, if there would be clearness of understanding existing between us in regard to the point at issue, especially in regard to the thought of the resurrection of the literal body, of which my brother speaks. Whether it is to be an event that is to take place some time in the future, or whether the resurrection of the animal body is progressing now. I confess I do not clearly understand my brother in regard to that. I will state, however, the question as I understand it.

First I would say in regard to the proposition, under discussion, that the word literal, as therein found, means, according to the letter, primitive, real, not figurative or metaphorical. The natural body, my brother will notice, if he will look at the Diaglott, is translated, and I consider it much better, "animal body;" therefore you will bear in mind, that my brother having affirmed the resurrection of the literal body, has mutually affirmed the resurrection of the animal body. I do not agree with my brother in regard to his definition of the word resurrection. You remember he says the word resurrection, this is translated from the Greek noun *Anastasis*, or it is so often translated resurrection; and my brother says this means a rising or rising from the grave, or the being brought back again to life of that which was dead. I hope I have not misstated my brother here. I have not done so intentionally. According to my idea of the word it has no such meaning.

"The Greek noun (*Anastasis*) is from *ana*, again, and *stasis*, the act or state of standing, or causing to stand, or being caused to stand. *Anastasis*, therefore, signifies the act or state of rising, raising, or being raised."

Greenfield's definition of *anastasis*, "A rising up, a resurrection."

"*Anastasis* never signifies or implies a resurrection of the same body."—Bishop Newton.

"*Anastasis* usually denotes our existence beyond the grave."—Dr. Dwight.

"*Anastasis* denotes properly, no more than a renewal of life to them, (the dead) in whatever manner this happens."—Dr. Campbell.

"Resurrection. A rising again; chiefly, the revival of the dead of the human race."—Webster.

Now the view is before us this morning of the resurrection of the animal body, and I call your attention to that event:

"This summons shall speed through every corner of the universe; and heaven, earth, and hell, and all their inhabitants, shall hear and obey. Now, me thinks I see, I hear the earth heaving, charnel houses rattling, tombs bursting, graves opening. Now the nations underground begin to stir. There is a noise and shaking among the dry bones. The dust is all alive and in motion, and the globe breaks and trembles as with an earthquake, whilst this vast army is working its way through, and bursting into life. The ruins of human bodies are scattered far and wide, and have passed through many and surprising transformations. A limb in one country, another in another; here the head and there the trunk; and the ocean rolling between. But now at the sound of the trumpet, they shall all be collected, wherever they were scattered; all properly sorted and united, however they were composed; atom to its fellow atom, bone to its fellow bone. Now, me thinks, you may see the air darkened with fragments of bodies, flying from country to country, to meet and join their proper parts. Scattered limbs, and all the various bones, obsequious to the call, self-moved advance; the neck perhaps to meet the distant head; the legs the distant feet.

"Dreadful to view, see through the dusky sky,
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly,
To distant regions, journeying there to claim
Deserted members, and complete the frame.
The severed head and trunk shall join once more,
Though realms now rise between and oceans roar,
The trumpet sound each vagrant mote shall hear,
And, whether fixed in earth or free in air,
Shall heed the signal, wafted in the wind,
And not one sleeping atom lag behind."

—The Columbian Orator, pps. 98, 99.

This is the view here given, and I believe it is a correct view, of the popular notion of the resurrection of the literal body. This is the usual way of understanding it. I do not know as my brother understands it precisely so. He may make a different statement of it, but the result is certainly very nearly the same.

He calls our attention to Hebrews 6:1, 2. We will notice our brother's passages:

"Therefore leaving the first principles, not again laying down the foundation for reformation from works causing death and of faith in God, the doctrine of immersions, the imposition of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and age-lasting judgment."

Now, my brother can not possibly fix up this passage of Scripture to apply to the life beyond this present life. He certainly will be unable to do that; because the *aioun* judgment, closes the matter, with the mediatorial reign, and fixes it there. The death spoken of is a moral death. It is something which was to transpire during the mediatorial reign. That is all I wish to notice in regard to it now.

John 5:24-29, my brother reads, beginning with the 24th:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live."

Certainly, my brother will not maintain that this is in the next world. "Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming and *now is*, [mark it], *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." My brother, do you think the dead body is here meant? If you do not, why notice this passage? What is meant here? A close and critical definition will be in place in the commencement of this discussion. Mark, "The hour is coming, and *now is*." Well now, my brother ought to know very well, that these graves are tombs. How many are living in the tombs? Are all

mankind? Will they be in the tombs? Then it would be only a partial resurrection at last; will not embrace all mankind, unless you can show that all will be in the tombs. Tombs means the state or place of the dead. "And shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation, or damnation."

That is all upon this passage. We might add something by way of explanation in regard to this passage. This certainly is a moral resurrection; not a literal resurrection from the dead, beyond a doubt.

As we shall use this, for the purpose of better understanding each other, I will offer something in regard to this matter.

John 6:47.—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

John 6:54.—"Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Luke 20. This the brother quoted in connection.

1 John 3:14.—"We know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

The death and life here spoken of is here in this world. Let the brother prove, if he can, from John 5; it is a resurrection to immortality.

We read again, Colossians 3:1:

"If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."

The believer here, is spoken of as being risen, having received the everlasting life of the gospel. More we have to bring forward on this subject, at the proper time.

John 6:39, 40. He predicates an argument on the meaning of the phrase, "last day," as I understand it. Let us look at that term, and see whether he has a right to predicate an argument upon it, and say that it has reference to the life beyond this life, or the resurrection of the dead to immortality, simply because the last day is indicated or used there. Let us look at the usage of that term.

John 6:44.—"No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day."

I presume, my brother, it would be fair to say, predicates his argument upon the meaning of the phrase, "last day."

John 6:39, 40.—"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

Now let us see what is meant by the last days, whether life beyond this life, immortal life, or whether it can not be applied to this life.

Heb. 1:1, 2.—"God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these *last days* spoken unto us by his Son Jesus Christ," etc.

This fixes the last days precisely at the time Peter fixes them on the day of Pentecost. He said, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel," mark you, "this is *that*," "saying it shall come to pass in *the last days*." John says, 1 John 2:18:

"Little children, it is the *last time*. * * * Whereby we know that it is the *last time*."

But he calls our attention to the fact, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust. This I believe. Then he spoke something about the Pharisees, and about the belief of the Pharisees and Sadducees. I have something to say in regard to this matter now, more by and by. I know the Sadducees not only rejected the Pharisees' view of the resurrection; but also contended that all of man dies at the death of the body. The Sadducees' view,

Josephus declares, expressed the doctrine of souls dying with the body. Again he tells us they take away the belief in the immortality of the soul, and prove the soul not to be immortal. We read the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both. The Sadducees' denial of the resurrection was equivalent to a denial of life after death. Their denial of spirits was the denial of the existence of spirits, or souls of earthly bodies. They seemed to believe that the old body died, and the spirit died with it, and man had no further existence. The Pharisees thought the spirit continued to exist. I do not know but it would be well enough to read the definition of the word spirit. Angels the brother seems to think are different from spirits. But they can not be, my brother, according to your own speech. Do you not believe with me that spirits may be messengers? And that that is the meaning of the word angel? Then, if you do, there is no necessity of keeping up the division, and trying to create the impression here that there is a difference. Being as the word angel means messenger, it may not be, or it may be a man. It may be a spirit sent from God. It may be a person here in mortality.

But my brother calls my attention to Luke 20 : 35-38. I think this was it:

"But they which 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."

Mark that, my brother, "Neither can they die any more," when they have reached the resurrection state :

"For they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Now that the dead *are* raised; "now that the dead *are raised*;"—is it not a little remarkable, that my brother should appeal to this passage of scripture in favor of their bodies being raised in the future? What does he believe in regard to this matter? That the bodies *are* already raised? "Now that the dead *are raised*," not that they shall be some time in the future. I wish he would be plain in regard to this matter. I believe in a progressive resurrection. We can not proceed properly, unless we do understand each other. I took a position squarely yesterday. I believe in a progressive resurrection. I believe that this was evidenced by the testimony here given by Moses :

"Now that the dead *are* raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; *for all live unto him.*"

And the time I believe to be now; that is, the day of the dead living unto him, but not the dead bodies.

The brother calls my attention to the fact, that our future state will be on this earth, after it has been renewed and changed. I expect to take a great many grand lessons on this earth, in a future state or condition. But I am inclined to think I will not remain here always. I do not know how long God will permit me to remain upon this earth and view its beauties and wonders. I have not been able to ascertain that. I expect to remain here for some time, but I do not expect to be confined here throughout all eternity.

The brother refers us to Job, and makes a point strong as he can. Now for Job, nineteenth chapter, "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever!" I now leave out the italics. Look at your Bible. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth."

You will never be able to prove that the Redeemer named is Jesus Christ, or that Job had anything of the kind in his mind. You must prove your position as you go along. Remember you are on the affirmative now. It requires something more than mere denial.

I know my Redeemer liveth, and he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. "And after my skin destroy this;" the word "worms" is not here, my brother, only in italics. I am not mistaken. "After my skin destroy this; (the word "body" is not here, my brother, only in italics.)

Job had a disease, perhaps the small pox; some very sore disease. He was covered with sores, and very probably seriously afflicted. "Yet in my flesh;" though his skin be destroyed with this disease, "yet in my flesh shall I see God." The brother predicates his argument on the fact that Job was to see God in his flesh. Turn to Job 42:5, and I think the laugh will be turned the other way. Job says to God, here at the last of his work, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee." It was fulfilled. All about carrying Job into a future existence, with his old body lugged up, has failed of its point. I leave that for the present.

Now, my brother, if I have misunderstood you in any way, I have not aimed to misrepresent you. I have some counter arguments to throw in, something to present, by way of opposition to my brother's views of the literal resurrection of the body.

My first argument is, "Man is created in the image of God;" therefore the true man is a spirit entity.

John 4:24.—"God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Gen. 1:27.—"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

Gen. 5:1, 2.—"This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them."

Now if God is Spirit, and man is created in his image and likeness, the true man is a spirit entity. It makes no difference what kind of a body he may be clothed upon by, or clothed with. I have something here from, would it do for me to call him Brother Smith, or Joseph; for really I do not entertain that hatred towards him that a great many do:

"And every man whose spirit receiveth not the light, is under condemnation; for man is spirit."—Book of Doctrine and Covenants.

Well, now, I believe that. This being the case, the first argument being the true man is a spirit entity, it matters but little how he is to be clothed upon with a body. He may be clothed upon with an earthly body. At present I believe man is a spirit, clothed upon with an earthly body, but he has in heaven a spiritual body; not the same old body. You can see our view by this.

Now in regard to the record of man's being formed, etc.:

Gen. 2:19.—"And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them."

Gen. 2:7.—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

Job says something about this matter. Job 10:11:

"Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast formed me with bones and sinews."

"Thou hast clothed me." Job, the independent spirit man stands out as clear as can be, "with skin and flesh, and hast formed me with bones and sinews." Again, Psalm 103:

"For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth we are but dust."

That is the frame, not the spirit entity, the true man; but the form, the frame, the house that man lives in. Now Paul's understanding. We call your attention to 2 Corinthians 12:2, 3:

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), such a one caught up to the third heaven."

Now mark you, Paul makes the point very distinct, between the man and the body; showing that the true Paul, man, himself, may be in the body, or out of the body, showing conclusively, that the true man is the spirit man. "I knew such a man, (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth); how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."

"Time," called the Moderator.

Elder Shinn asked, "Let me just read one passage."

Elder Forscutt. "Certainly; go on."

Peter's view, 2 Peter 1:14:

"Knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me."

Elder Forscutt's second argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I rise with a great deal of pleasure this time, as I see my friend is disposed to help me in this debate. He has been doing his very best to sustain the argument put forth in my first speech. He has spelled well, and I thank him for his assistance. I hope that the arguments by me, sustained by him, will have their due weight with you all.

The brother claims, however, that I am not sufficiently clear in stating my views on the question of the resurrection. The gentleman himself wrote the proposition for me to affirm, and if he did not write it sufficiently plain, you must blame Brother Shinn, not Brother Forscutt. I am speaking to the proposition as he wrote it. It is this, "The Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave." It is for me to lead this time, as I happen to have the front harness on, and the brother must not kick out of the breeching.

The brother wishes to know, however, whether I believe in a progressive resurrection, or a resurrection at some stated time. I will be equally as frank as he in stating my views. I do *not* believe in what is ordinarily called a "progressive resurrection," but I do believe in the very opposite to what my brother does; I believe in a resurrection at stated *times*, instead of at *a time*, making the word time plural.

The brother introduces, as supportive of his view of this subject, the Greek word *anastasis*, and quotes from Mr. Lewis' work on the resurrection, his definition of that word.

(*To Mr. Shinn.*) Did not you quote from Lewis on the resurrection?

No reply.

Mr. Forscutt. I think you did, Sir.

Mr. Shinn. I quoted from several learned authors.

Mr. Forscutt. I think you quoted from Mr. Lewis. That is the book there, is it not? (putting his finger on the book.)

Mr. Shinn. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Forscutt. Yes, Sir; I thought so. I have Lewis' work, and am acquainted with its arguments. Mr. Lewis is a Universalist writer. We are not arguing the question on the basis of Mr. Lewis' views as to the meaning or application of the word *anastasis*, from which, he tells us, we have the word resurrection wherever this word is presented to us in the English translation of the Bible; but from the Bible. Of course, if I wished, I might run to other authority, and quote other Greek writers if it were wished; but that would not determine the question; as when we agreed upon this debate, it was stipulated that King James' translation of the Bible should be the standard reference

on all doctrinal matters. Therefore, though we may quote other authors, and may use those authors as supportive of our arguments; yet King James' translation of the Bible, whatever value my friend may attach to that translation, becomes the reference to us.

He tells that the word *anastasis* signifies to rise, or a state of rising. Very true. I believe that; but it also signifies *resurrection*. There never will be any resurrection, unless there be a rising. The resurrection state is that state into which the rising introduces, whether it be a rising of the body or of something else. I have argued that it has reference to the rising of the body. Our friend quotes for us from Greenfield, and gives as one of his definitions of *anastasis*, the word resurrection. I thank Mr. Greenfield for this, and our brother for quoting him, as I have just as good a right to use his quotation as he has. Webster tells us, it signifies a rising again; chiefly, or specially the rising again from the dead,—the rising of the human race. I thank the brother for quoting Webster also. His definition describes exactly what I understand the resurrection to be, in the proposition now presented and affirmed by me.

In reply to my friend's criticism on tombs or graves, it may perhaps startle some of you, because he tells you that if I understand the statement of Jesus correctly, "All who are in their graves shall hear his voice," it will be but a partial resurrection after all, because there are many who are not in their graves. There are some who are burned, who are reduced to ashes; there are others drowned in the depths of the ocean. True; but with the great majority, the generality of mankind of all nations, christian and heathen, civilized and uncivilized, the general plan is to bury their dead. The Savior chose a word expressive of a principal condition, to represent a general idea. The word graves or tombs represents the place to which the dead are generally consigned; either word is a general term; and if there be exceptions, they do not affect the rule. To meet these exceptions, as though such objections as this would be urged, though I consider them very superficial, and the using of them nothing but mere quibbling, we have the testimony given to us, that not only those who are *in their graves* shall come forth, but likewise those that are *in the sea, death and hell* also; in fact, John saw, as it were, every place deliver up its dead. "I saw the dead, small and great stand before God."—Rev. 20:12. The question, then, as to whether people are in their graves of earth, or graves of water in the seas, is not the important question. If the Savior gave the general idea, and used the word which expressed this general idea, he used the proper word, even if it did not express every condition in which men would be found in death. There is no necessity for this puerile kind of presentation, which arraigns Jesus for his use of language.

Then the brother says of me, Let him prove it a resurrection to immortality. When I say it will be a resurrection to immortality, I will try and do so. I have not yet said it was; nor does the proposition require it.

The brother now introduces what seems to me the veriest quibbling. He tells you that I base my argument upon the statement *last day*, "I will raise him up at the last day,"—the words of Jesus,—and then to overthrow that argument, he turns and quotes from Hebrews, "Hath *in these* last days," and from John's testimony concerning "*these* last days." Now I would like to submit this point to any intelligent child, who should read these three testimonies. The testimony of Jesus, when he spoke of the resurrection, was "Marvel not that I said unto you, all that are in their graves shall hear his voice;" when Martha came to Jesus he said of her brother, "Thy brother shall rise again." Martha said, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection, at the last day." Martha did not express any other idea, in the using of these words "last day," than that

of their pointing out a time future from them, afar off, the time of the resurrection, whenever that may be, nor did Jesus correct her. Several others used the phrase Paul does, or a similar one, "in these last days," and I repeat what I said before, they were the last days to them, the same as these are the last days to us. Should this earth stand a thousand years longer, people living then would, from friend Shinn's standpoint, look back to our speeches, should we be so fortunate, or unfortunate, as to have our words and thoughts recorded and preserved, and would ask of these men of a thousand years ago, they thought they were in the last days; for here is a brother who used the phrase in the time that he was living "in these last days," and that a thousand years ago. Yet Sir, such a use of this phrase *now* would be a correct use, on the same principle on which the apostle Paul used the phrase, "*these last days*" *then*; those days then were "these last days" to him. *These days*, will not be *the last days* a thousand years hence; but they are *now* "these last days."

The brother gives the definition of angel and spirit, and wants to know if I try to make an argument upon that. If he has a mind to find fault with Brother Paul, the time may come when Paul will answer him. An angel is spirit, or a spirit; man also is spirit, or a spirit; but neither man as such, nor spirit as such, is necessarily an angel. Angel is in the Latin *angelus*, Greek *aggelos*, signifying primarily a messenger, and changes neither its form nor its signification materially in either the Anglo-Saxon, German, Danish, Italian, or French languages. The use of it in connection with Paul's appeal, is true to that definition. An angel is sometimes a messenger, spoken of particularly as such. We, at least I, speak of all beings that have life in themselves, and say of them that they are spirit. I am glad our friend read from Brother Joseph on that point. You might have read a little farther, Sir, and you would have learned just what we do believe on this question. You would not only have learned that "*man is spirit*," but you would have also learned that the elements are eternal, and that spirit and element inseparably united, receive a fullness of joy; and that, when separated, they can not receive a fullness of joy. We do not believe, that he who created our bodies, and placed the spirit within them, created them to live but a few years, or perhaps a few months, days, hours, minutes, or seconds, if even to live till birth at all, and then or afterward to die, and be done with. We believe that *God* does no such imperfect work. We believe that He is too good, and too wise, and his workmanship too perfect for such undeveloped or imperfect results.

The brother quotes for you the twentieth chapter of Luke, from the thirty-fourth to the thirty-eighth verse, and expresses surprise that I quoted that or introduced it, and well he may do, for I never quoted it. Which has the argument upon it, I do not know. I will leave that for him to say; for I made no reference to it, and did not intend to do so for the present, nor shall I now do so. I may save it as return fire for some of the big guns the brother has reserved, which he has hinted about.

The brother quotes for us the testimony of Job, nineteenth chapter, and leaves out the words printed in italics, "For I know (that) my Redeemer liveth, and (that) he shall stand at the latter (day) upon the earth; and (though) after my skin, (worms) destroy this (body), yet in my flesh shall I see God." I would like the gentleman to open his Bible, and read that again, and see if there is not a mistake somewhere, either in his reading or interpretation. There certainly is a mistake somewhere on that question, Sir. I read it before just as it is in our standard authority in this debate, as it stands in King James' translation. He reads it, "For I know—my Redeemer liveth, and he shall stand at the latter—upon the earth: and—after my skin—destroy this—yet in my flesh

shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another," and thinks thereby to overthrow Job's testimony for the resurrection. But we see that, even leaving out all the italicised words, Job yet declares he will see God IN HIS FLESH. If he sees God in his flesh, is there any possibility of gathering from this statement, the argument that he will not have his body? Talk about the body not being involved in the resurrection of Job, and yet in his flesh he is to see God! Who cannot see that the flesh spoken of here is the flesh of his body? What do we understand was the reason why the translators placed the word "body" after the word "this?" Was it not simply because that was the plain and evident sense of the passage? "This" what? What should be destroyed? Evidently, *this* body; hence the translators have supplied the proper ellipses.

The brother tells us the true man is a spirit entity. Of course he is; but is he not also something more? He is not spirit entity only. I claim to be a true man, Sir; and I am sure there is something more solid about me than mere spirit. There is something besides spirit here. There are flesh and bones here, and these, Sir, are mine, and part of me.

Quoting for us the testimony, that God created man in his own image, and that in his own likeness created he him, he says that man is therefore a spirit entity. He might also have quoted for us the testimony that God made man out of the dust of the ground. *What, Sir, did he make out of the dust of the ground? Man.* What; the "true man" of our brother? the spirit entity? This creation, Sir, was the body. That same body, Sir, shall die, that which was made out of the dust of the ground, What then shall be resurrected. We read here, "Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return." The same that was made from the dust, will return to the dust; the same that returns to the dust, will be called forth from the dust; that is, on general principles.

The brother tells you, after quoting Job, the Psalms, and Paul, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, that the body is but the house, or the frame the spirit dwells in. In one sense only is this true. God placed the spirit of man within him. The ancients sometimes spoke of their bodies as being a part of themselves. Their bodies being of the earth, earthy, had to die; but they will come forth again and have new life infused into them, when the earth and all things therein reach their higher positions, and are perfected according to the wisdom of God; that is, all that is good.

I pass on now to the consideration of the theory I was presenting. I had read for you the testimony of Job, and I will now read for you the testimony of David, concerning the resurrection or restitution.

Psalm 49:15.—"But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he will receive me."

There are some who have argued from this, "God will redeem *my soul* from the power of the grave," that it does not refer to the resurrection. "Does the grave hold any power over the soul?" they inquire. We read in King James' translation that God, after he had created man, "breathed into his nostrils the *breath of life*; and man became a living soul." Before this "breath of life" was infused into it, the body was called "MAN;" but when the breath of life was received into the body, *the man* BECAME a living soul. The body, then, Sir, was at least a part of the "living soul." The "breath of life" was not the atmosphere, for that, before this breathing process took place, necessarily occupied the interminable avenues, ducts, and pores of its organism, or it would have been crushed by atmospheric pressure. The "breath of life" was not then merely the aerial particles of the atmosphere; but something distinct, giving life, which the atmospheric breath could not do, and that something is necessary to life, some-

thing without which the body is dead. The apostle James says the body without the spirit is dead; I conclude then, as another translation renders it, that when God breathed into man the "breath of life," he put a spirit within him. The spirit within him, "Man," *spirit and body*, "BECAME A LIVING SOUL." Then, at death, the soul is in the power of the grave, because the body, a part of this once living soul, is confined there. Hence the statement of David, "God will redeem *my soul* from the *power of the grave*; for he shall receive me." Not my spirit, nor my body, but "ME," the perfect, living soul; body and spirit.

Again, Isaiah in his twenty-sixth chapter, beginning with the nineteenth verse, writes:

"Thy *dead men* shall live, together with *my dead body* shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the *earth shall cast out the dead.*"

What is it that is spoken of here, that shall be cast from the earth? Is it not that which shall live hereafter? "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise." Certainly, then, it is the body that shall be literally restored. I do not say that the literal body shall be restored, but that the body shall be literally restored; and I urge the argument and the claim, that the Scriptures, in all these points I have presented, bear me out in taking this position. We notice again that⁸ statement, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise," as I am aware that by some it is argued, and it may be argued here that this has reference to a restoration of Israel to a condition of blessedness; but I do not see how the dead body of a man can have any representative fitness at all in this case, or how, if it was merely thought or intention, the thought personified as "my dead body," can be properly employed with reference to the restoration of a people to conditions of life from death, before their death takes place.

I now call your attention to the statement of Jesus to Martha, John 11: 23, 24:

"Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection, at the last day."

Now, Sir, what was the understanding among the people at that time when Jesus addressed Martha? You have heard from the commencement of this discussion, that we should be governed in the interpretation of Scripture, by the understanding of the language had by those to whom it was addressed at the time the language was spoken. It is a correct rule, and we must be governed, in respect to the understanding which Martha and others would have of the Savior's words, by this rule.

Josephus writes concerning the resurrection, and connects with it the very same judgment day spoken of in this discussion, and advocated by me. In his Discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades, Josephus says:

"We have therefore believed that the body will be raised again; for although it be dissolved, it is not perished. * * * For all men, the just as well as the unjust, shall be brought before God. * * * Minos and Rhadamanthus are not the judges, as you Greeks do suppose, but he whom God even the Father hath glorified. * * * This person, exercising the righteous judgment of the Father towards all men, hath prepared a just sentence for every one according to his works; at whose judgment-seat when all men, and angels, and demons shall stand, they shall send forth one voice, and say JUST IS THY JUDGMENT."

In introducing this subject, Josephus informs the Greeks that God hath determined to "make a resurrection of all men from the dead, not procuring a transmigration of souls from one body to another, but raising again those very bodies, which you Greeks, seeing [them] to be dissolved, do not believe."

Josephus is described by Scaliger, in the prologue to his *De Emendatione Temporum*, as "the greatest lover of truth of all writers," as one whom we may

safely believe "because his fidelity and his compass of learning are everywhere conspicuous." It was then a settled principle of the faith of the Pharisees, and of those who believed in the resurrection, that the resurrection would consist in the bringing back the body, and uniting together body and spirit once more as "a living soul," and Josephus in this discourse but expresses their settled conviction, when he says:

"We have not rashly believed [in] the resurrection of the body; for although it be dissolved for a time on account of the original transgression, it exists still, * * * and to every body shall its own soul [spirit] be restored."

Let us then, Sir, be governed by the "rule of interpretation," and with Josephus as expositor of the manner in which the resurrection was understood, what did Martha mean by the expression, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day?" We understand from this quotation from Josephus, that he believed there would be a restoration of all men to the body; that they would then, in the body, be brought before the judgment seat, and be judged. Martha, in common with others of the Jews, believed this, and Jesus said to her, "Thy brother *shall rise again*." In answer to him she said, Yes, "I know that he shall * * * at the last day,"—at the the resurrection of all men we believe he will rise. This was the thought expressed by the reply made to him. Jesus did not correct that thought; nor did he tell her it was then the last day, and that the recall to life Lazarus was then to receive would be that resurrection; nor that that resurrection, instead of being at a future day, *always had been, and then was* a progressive resurrection. He might have corrected her, had the thought she expressed been wrong. He might have told her the using of that phrase "last day," was improper; but he did not.

I will now quote Acts 24:15. Paul declares that he had "hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there *shall be* a resurrection," *not* there is now being, *not* there has already been, *not* after this there is to be going continually on, *not* the progressive future tense, but entirely, absolutely, the future, there *shall be* a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.

And again, in the twenty-sixth chapter, fifth and sixth verses, speaking of the acquaintance with the Jews with his former manner of life, he says:

"Which knew me from the beginning, (if they would testify), that after the most straightest sect of our religion, I lived a *Pharisee*. And now I stand, and am *judged for the hope of the promise*, made of God unto our fathers."

In 24:15, he states this "hope" was touching the resurrection; and he said also, twenty-first verse, "Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." Consider this in connection with fifteenth verse, "Now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers," and the conclusion must be that Paul then believed that there was ground for hope in the promise made, because there should be a resurrection of the dead.

The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the dead, did not believe that there were either angels or spirits, or life hereafter. With our friends, some of the materialists of the present age, they seemed to delight in the theory of unconsciousness after death; and did not accept the doctrine of the resurrection. They claimed that the body dies, and that then we are done with. No further life, no further existence for us. Paul was reasoning with them, after being called in question by them. Reasoning on—what? The subject of a progressive resurrection? Or on the subject of a resurrection at some future, some especial time or times? The answer does not come from the statement made by Paul in this place; but it certainly does come from what we before read. Paul did not change or explain away the testimony of the prophets and

the Psalmist David, as friend Shinn tries to do; but all the way through his statement, the argument is made in their favor. Hear his declaration:

"This I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets*: and have hope toward God, *which they themselves also allow*, that there *shall be* a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

And again in the seventh and eighth verses of the twenty-sixth chapter, the apostle further says, "Unto which promise,"—what promise was that? The promise of God made unto the fathers, that the dead should be raised; "unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come, for which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead."

Again, Hebrews 11:19, as illustrating the ground of this hope, Abraham "accounting that God was able to raise him [Isaac] up, *even from the dead*; from whence also he received him in a figure," offered his son Isaac, and thus exemplified his confidence in God, and in the promise of God, prefiguring the hope of Israel in the resurrection, as I just quoted concerning that hope from Paul.

The evidence from the testimony presented to us is this:

Firstly.—That the fathers *believed* in a resurrection.

Secondly.—That God had *promised* to them that resurrection.

Thirdly.—That Paul and the brethren had *hope in that promise*.

Fourthly.—That he was called in question *because he had hope* in this promise.

Fifthly.—That the assurance of the *fulfillment* of that promise had been given by the raising up of Jesus from the dead.

And *Sixthly*.—He closes this connected series of thought by an *argumentum ad judicium*, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" If God has made the promise that he would raise all men from the dead; if the fathers believed that promise; if in fulfillment of that promise he raised Jesus from the dead, *why should you doubt?* "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" A very pertinent argument!

In Hebrews 11:35, Paul testifies:

"Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a *better resurrection*."

What was this better resurrection? I hope we shall learn what the views of our brother are in relation to this matter. I will give you mine frankly. The resurrection in which those received their dead to life again, was a resurrection to mortality. Lazarus was raised from the dead; but only in the sense of his being raised to receive temporarily a fresh lease of life. In the same sense one of old, who was on his sick bed and expected to die, prayed to the Lord, and the Lord gave him a fresh lease of life, to continue only however for a certain number of years. Just in this sense were these spoken of by Paul received to life again, being received through faith. The apostle Paul tells us that others exercised their faith, and endured their trials, that they might obtain a better resurrection.

What follows this thought, "a better resurrection?" It seems as though something hinges upon that which ought to be considered. In the thirty-ninth verse of this same eleventh chapter of Hebrews, Paul informs them that:

"These all, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not* the promise: God having provided some better thing for us."

Why better? Because a promise of a resurrection to continuity of life had been made, not a resurrection to mortality, nor a progressive one; but one to take place at the great day, at the "last day" of their bondage to death; at the time when the great power of God shall be exercised,—his miracle-working, wondrous power,—when he shall call forth the righteous dead to their inheritance; at the time when the grave shall cast forth its dead. *Then* those who are raised will not be raised to mortality; but to immortality. Those were still mortal of whose being raised Paul speaks; their resurrection had been only to mortality; but in the *better* resurrection, those who are raised will be raised to immortality, will have become immortal beings. This will be the resurrection unto immortality and eternal life reserved for those who shall be found worthy; for those who shall have waited patiently for it; for those who shall have trusted in God and have had hope in his promise, and who having this hope in them shall have purified themselves. They looked for the *better* resurrection; and when the dead shall be cast forth, their bodies, being raised, shall no more be subject to decay; they shall no more have pain and suffering, neither shall they die any more; but they shall rest forever-more with the angels, in the presence of God.

"Time."

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's second argument is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It certainly does appear to me, that our brother has introduced a great deal of matter here that is not definite, so far as the proposition is concerned; but we shall endeavor to review briefly, of course, all that he has said. He first starts out by telling us, that he does not believe in a progressive resurrection, but believes in a resurrection at stated times. He does not believe in a resurrection day.

I presume then according to this view, that the dead may all have been resurrected up to the present, by having been resurrected at different times. I assert in this connection, that I believe in a progressive resurrection. I think we will come to understand each other by and by. I have something more I wish to say upon this subject of a progressive resurrection, but not just yet. My brother affirmed in his first speech, that resurrection meant a bringing back to life of that which was dead.

He grumbles because I quoted Brother Lewis' testimony. He is certainly a very scholarly man, and his testimony is worth something. I gave Greenfield's definition which is a rising up, a resurrection. You will see he uses it in the sense of rising, not being brought back to life from the dead, or a resurrection of the dead. Other evidence I gave in this connection you will remember. I gave from Bishop Newton, that it never signified the resurrection of the same body.

"Anastasis usually denotes an existence beyond the grave."—Dr. Dwight.

"Anastasis denotes, properly, no more than a renewal of life to them, (the dead), in whatever manner this happens."—Dr. Campbell.

Then I gave Webster:

"A rising again; chiefly, the revival of the dead of the human race."

Not their dead bodies. John 5:28. The brother quotes this passage very triumphantly. There is one little matter I wish to call his attention to now, in connection with this:

"Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in *their* graves—"

The brother quoted it both times. Let me call attention to the fact, it is

not *their* graves, but the graves. The brother so quoted it, and read it from the book. I call his attention to the fact now, that it is not *their* graves, but the graves. Something will depend upon this by and by, in the bringing out of these questions. But he says it is not a resurrection to immortality; he has taken no such position. Why then introduce it? It might as well have never been introduced, if it has no reference to a resurrection to immortality. I expect him to prove his proposition in this debate, that they are raised to immortality. Mark it now, my brother must not take any other position upon this passage of Scripture during this discussion. He says it has no reference to immortality.

He does not like my view upon the meaning of "last day." I read from the Scripture in regard to it, saying:

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son Jesus Christ."

Does that mean the last days to come for a thousand or ten thousand years off? The word of the Lord does not take that position. My brother takes it because he has to, to sustain his doctrine. I say now, "in these last days," does it mean that which is to take place ten thousand years in the future? No, you all say, it means now.

"Micah 4: 1.—"But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountain."

This alludes to the government of the world by the Messiah. To the Messiah's reign. Isaiah 2: 2, gives the same testimony. Now "no man can come unto me, except the Father draw him." Again, "at the last day," during my gospel reign, during the gospel age, you shall have this moral resurrection. I will raise him up when he comes to the knowledge of the truth, which brings life to the believer therein.

It seems to me very singular indeed, that the brother should try to make it appear, that Peter would say as he did, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, saying, in the last days;" that phrase, "last days," used by Peter, had any other meaning than what it evidently has. It would certainly have the same meaning, the same as the other apostles mean; and is that a thousand or ten thousand years yet in the future. No, Sir, it can not be. It meant the days in which they lived, not days to come. The age and generation then, not the age and generation to come ten thousand years in the future. So, my brother, you will bear in mind, that there is a little difference between this and that. "*These* last days" were the days in which the apostle spake. Away back there when this thing was spoken of.

The difference between us on angels and spirits. Why, my brother, are not spirits angels. Then, I maintain they may be messengers. The meaning I gave of angel you will remember. I told him it simply meant messenger. A spirit may be a messenger. Was not there an angel sent to Joseph Smith? Was not that Nephi? Therefore, according to my brother's last speech, he is not a believer in Joseph Smith. I believe there are distinct classes of beings, but because I believe spirits are angels, do not think that I believe all spirits are angels. A spirit may become an angel. All men may be messengers. All that are sons of God, certainly will become angels, messengers.

The true man is a spirit man. He believes that in a certain sense, but thinks we must have this old body to have the true man there. I am glad we are a unit upon that. It is only a little matter, that stands in connection with that, that makes the point of difference between us, which we will notice by and by. Luke 20. The brother says I read too much. True; for it proves the resurrection is progressive, as I understand it:

"For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him."

How plain this view seems when we read the passage before this, "I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob." The force of this is seen when we remember, that he was then the God of Abraham, and of Isaac and of Jacob. They were alive unto him, although they had been dead nearly twenty centuries. Notwithstanding this, Jesus speaks of them as being alive, and he was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Away back there in the days of Jesus Christ, this view of a progressive resurrection was presented. When the Lord appeared unto Moses in the burning bush, he said, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." They were then alive unto God in the Spirit world, the spirit state. We shall show you that they have a spiritual body, by and by. I am glad this truth was reiterated by Jesus himself in Luke 20. I do not blame my brother for grumbling at this. It does not suit him very much. I can not help it. It does not suit his theory. I can not help that.

Job 19, he calls our attention to again, and says there must be some mistake. Let us read it again. It may be I have not read it just right. I want to be fair and candid in regard to this matter:

"For I know my Redeemer liveth, and he shall stand at the latter upon the earth. And after my skin worms destroy this, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me."

The idea is, that there was some disease preying upon Job. Now the argument is, Job should see God in his flesh, "Yet in my flesh shall I see God." I turned to the last chapter of Job, and showed my brother that he did see him in his flesh. Job was still alive. But he predicates the idea of the resurrection of Job's material body, upon the fact that he was to see God in his flesh. You have lost it, my brother. He did see him, my brother. He saw him in the flesh before he died.

Job 42:5.—"I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine *eye seeth thee.*"

We think there is no mistake about it. We may look in vain for the fulfillment of this prediction in the future world, for it was fulfilled while Job lived. Psalm 49:15. I do not know that I ought to notice that. I do not see that it is very much to the point, or has much to do in this matter:

"But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me."

I believe that as much as my brother does. What is meant by the soul? Is it the body? Why did he quote that passage if it is not the body? I believe that the soul will be raised from the power of the grave.

Isaiah 26. I expected my brother would notice it. How much time have I?

MODERATOR. Fifteen minutes.

ELDER SHINN. I will review as long as I have time. I want to notice my brothers's views, candidly and fairly, in this discussion; for I desire to be fair and honest, if any one does. I hope that we shall be frank and candid with each other to the close of this discussion.

Isaiah 26:19.—"Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

Now it will be necessary for me to go back to the twelfth verse, and I expect it will be necessary for me to leave out the italics. The Lord is spoken to by his own people:

"Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us. O Lord our God, Lords besides thee have had dominion over us; by thee only will we make

mention of thy name. Dead, [the God's, you know, who had dominion over them, he here declares have been dead], they shall not live; deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them; [that is, the Gods who have had dominion over them], and made all their memory to perish. Thou hast increased the nation, O Lord, thou hast increased the nation; [mark it now, this is a national matter, he is speaking of the nation]; thou art glorified; thou hadst removed far all the ends of the earth. Lord, in trouble have they visited thee; they poured out a prayer thy chastening upon them. Like as a woman with child, draweth near the time of her delivery, is in pain, crieth out in her pangs; so have we been in thy sight, O Lord. [We. Who? The people here the prophet spoke of, the Jews. They have been in pain.] Thy dead shall live, my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew, the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."

A national event, clear and plain as can be. It has not one particle of reference to the resurrection of the dead to immortality. It is strictly a national matter, as any one can see who will read it candidly and carefully over.

John 11:24. Martha said she knew her brother should rise again in the resurrection, at the last day. Then the brother reads Josephus to introduce the idea here that was among the people then. Not among those who strictly read and understood the Bible; however, it did not mean that; but to those who did not strictly understand that. It is an argument against himself. He does not believe in a progressive resurrection, but one that takes place at stages along. I wonder which will be raised first? He does not believe the popular idea noticed by Josephus, not a bit more than I believe it will be at stages; so he discards his own author.

I call your attention to the twenty-fifth verse of the chapter referred to. What does Jesus say in reply to Martha?

"I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?"

The resurrection was clearly different, from what my brother had presented, as I understand him to present it. Paul says, however, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead. Grant it, my brother. And at the time of the resurrection, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. The brother urges, that it was to be a resurrection future from the time that Paul lived. Paul's resurrection is progressive. It will continue to be a resurrection of mankind, the same as it has been. The brother's view is, that all mankind shall be resurrected; but the time he says is future from the apostles' day. A part of them had been raised, however, when the words upon which the brother places his point, were uttered. The brother places his point upon *shall be*. We readily grant it. It is all right enough. It was future from that time. But mark the difference between "of the dead," and "from among the dead ones." See Emphatic Diaglott. Does it mean dead bodies? That is the point in view. Does it mean dead bodies? I maintain it does not.

Hebrews 11:19. He speaks there of a resurrection to mortality. "Women received their dead brought to life again," etc. The brother talks about not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain the better resurrection; that is, become immortal. The better resurrection he believes to be a resurrection to immortality. We are perfectly agreed in regard to that passage of Scripture. I believe I have reviewed as candidly and carefully as I have time to, at present, my brother's arguments. I will now continue my counter argument.

Third argument. The true man is the inner man.

2 Corinthians 4:16. We want to find the teachings of the apostle Paul, what they were truly.

"For which cause we faint not; but though our *outward* man perish; yet the *inner* man is renewed day by day."

Mark you here, the apostle speaks of an outward and an inner man.

Ephesians 3:14-16.—"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the *inner man*."

The strengthening of the spirit is to take place in the inner man.

2 Corinthians 5:6-8.—"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."

See how clearly that "*we*" stands out from the body, "(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." The true man, the inner man, the spirit entity, which is in the image and likeness of God, which will live forever.

2 Corinthians 5:1-4.—"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this [that is, the fleshly house, the body] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

Is it the same house? The house we will be clothed upon with, is this earthly house? No, no, it can not be; for "in this earthly house we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked." See how independent that is from the inner man, the true man. Brother Smith calls the man, the true man, spirit. The apostle Paul says:

"For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not that we would be unclothed but clothed upon; that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

This mortal body is to be put off, and we are to have a spiritual body. That we will talk about in due time. This inner man, this spirit entity, will be clothed upon with a spiritual body, and this arising, *anastasis*, resurrection, is the passing from mortality to immortality; the being clothed upon with that house which is from heaven. This house which is from heaven is eternal, and is to be the spiritual body in which the true man, spirit entity, is to dwell.

2 Corinthians 4:18.—"While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

Hebrews 11:3.—"Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen, are not made of things which do appear."

Now I can not help but believe here, the apostle speaks so plainly of that which is eternal, that it is the inner man, this spirit man, this spirit entity, which is eternal. "That which is seen is temporal," says the apostle; but "that which is not seen is eternal." Therefore I must believe that the spirit man which is invisible, is eternal. The true man is invisible. Repulsion is invisible. We find the powers and forces in the universe, electricity is invisible, but it is a known law, and for aught I know, the world's material was drawn out of that. The elements that composed this earth, and all the planets, for aught I know.

Time.

Elder Forscutt's third argument was as follows :

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the prosecution of the debate now pending, I shall first call your attention, this afternoon, to some of the remarks of Brother Shinn, when last addressing us. The brother rightly states my position, in that I do not believe in what is called a progressive resurrection; but he does not correctly give the idea that I would have you receive, in relation to this belief of mine.

While I discard the idea of what is called "a progressive resurrection," which he has hinted at to-day as being believed in by himself, and which is believed in generally by the people whom I suppose him to represent, I yet do believe in a progressive state hereafter, as respects the spirit, while separated from the body, and as respects the united soul-man, after that which we call the resurrection shall have taken place, when the body and spirit shall again be united, and become one grand whole, what the Scriptures call "a living soul."

He again refers to Greenfield's interpretation of the Greek word *anastasis*; also to Webster's definition of the word resurrection. I do not see that he makes anything for his view, however, by this "review;" for Greenfield interprets *anastasis* as signifying a resurrection. If *anastasis* be a rising up, a resurrection, whatever may be the gentleman's view in regard to the meaning of the word resurrection, the subject of this debate being the literal resurrection, I shall certainly avail myself of the word *Resurrection*, according to the Websterian definition, as well as the true interpretation of *anastasis*. Webster defines the resurrection, as being "A rising again, especially the rising again from the dead; from *re*, again, and *surgere*, to rise." As we use the word, it signifies, the rising again of the human race. The gentleman adds a word to Webster's definition, and says these are *not* the literally dead, but the *morally* dead. Now I am desirous of knowing, by what right, my brother, scripturally or philologically, you make this change, and instead of saying simply, "from the dead," say from the *morally* dead.

The brother wants to know why I quoted some testimonies of Scripture, to prove a resurrection, when they had no reference to a resurrection to immortality. I quoted them, Sir, for two purposes; first for the purpose of showing the power by which a resurrection was effected to a mortal state; and secondly to base thereon the proposition that the very same power which called life back into the mortal frame, though it was still mortal,—that that same power could call forth the body from the power of death, and infuse therein the power of life in perpetuity, or eternal life. Whether I make the point or not, relative to it, this is the chief object I had in view.

The brother still harps upon the term "these last days." He has several times spoken about presenting arguments "before *this intelligent congregation*." I have never yet spoken about the intelligence of the audience, and perhaps you may think I do not appreciate you as much as he does; but I think he pays a very poor compliment to your "intelligence," and proves that he does not think you are quite so intelligent as he would flatter you that he does, when he will try to make you believe that the "these last days" of the apostles' age have reference to the same period as "the last day" of prophecy; to try to make you believe this is, I think, a very poor compliment indeed to your intelligence.

In reference to Luke twentieth chapter, I reminded the gentleman that I

had not yet quoted that, and corrected his reference to my quoting it by urging that I had not referred to it at all. He calls attention to it in his last speech, and says that I said he had read too much. Now I would be willing to submit it to our reporters, to see if they can find any such words, or any such idea having been uttered by me, or to you as having been so understood by you, as that I charged the gentleman with having read too much. I would like to have had him read a little more. I said this—I had not yet named it, but indicated that I expected to do so; and was reserving it against some of the "big guns" my brother hinted about in his speech previous. I think you will all remember it now.

The brother calls our attention again to Job. I must look at it once more, for he argues that he has in fact cleared all my argument away. Job, chapters nineteenth and forty-second. The nineteenth chapter we will notice first, and as the standard of reference is King James' translation, I submit that these words supplied by the translators, even though they may not be a part of the original text, *and yet a part of the text in evidence*, seeing they are found in that translation; and I therefore submit them in their entirety.

Yet—we will notice how the gentleman's claim that they are answered by the testimony quoted from the last chapter of Job is sustained, "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book!"—I will pay a compliment to the "intelligence" of the congregation just for once. I suppose this congregation is sufficiently intelligent to know, in these intelligent times especially, that it was customary to write or make indentures upon the rocks with iron tools, such as is called here an iron pen; also that into this incision, or writing, molten lead was then poured, and that thus testimony was preserved from destruction in the engravings made in the rock. I have heard the brethren of different churches quote this as though Job had said "*laid* in the rocks forever;" but his words are, "That they were graven with an iron pen and LEAD in the rock forever." He had a desire that his words should be recorded in a firm and *lasting* manner.

The brother told us in his last and first speech that Job was sick; had some disease, and that the event of which he spoke was to have its fulfillment in a few months from the time he spoke. What, he was to take the iron pen and engrave in the rock, and then take lead, melt it and pour into the engraving, to tell the people that he had been sick six months before that time!! Our friend does not pay very much of a compliment to Job's "intelligence," surely.

Job, Sir, had reference to something that was afar off in the future; to something a long period in the future; to something not to receive its fulfillment while he should live in the flesh; to something in reference to that period of which himself refers, when he says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand AT THE LATTER DAY upon the earth."

Job was a believer in the God of Abraham. Job was one of those who lived contemporaneously with Abram, or at most was removed only a short period from him. For a note to the Greek version of the Seventy, he is considered a son of Zave, a son of Esau, and named as Jobab, king of Edom, an Arab prince or emir, who had learned the plan of salvation sufficiently to look for and expect a Redeemer; who had been taught of the Lord, and whose knowledge of the planetary system, of the government of the universe, was so accurately conveyed to him by Deity, that expressions of scientific value and import are found in his book which are in advance of the utterances of the proud scientists of to-day. Job's descent from heaven-instructed patriarchs, and his perfect life before God, as well as his exalted rank and heavenly communions, had given him such reliable evidences, as that with all his soul he believed in a God, and in a Redeemer.

When we take these facts into consideration, we understand the reason

why he uttered the words, "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! *For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.*"

Having the faith of the servants of God, and realizing the grand truth that his Redeemer lived,—that though his body should die, it should be called forth again from the tomb, and, made alive, be permitted to stand in the presence of God;—realizing this grand truth of the far distant future, how reasonable that he should desire that the rocks should be engraved, and the lead melted and poured into them, to show to future generations that he knew whereof he affirmed.

The gentleman tells us, however, that in this last chapter of Job, we read that Job *did* see the Lord. If he will notice the chronology of the book, he will find that, according to Ussher, it was written fifteen hundred and twenty years before Christ. Remember that no man, unless inspired with the Holy Ghost, knoweth God or Christ; in other words, no man, without revelation, knoweth him. It is strange then if Job should receive a revelation imparting to him a knowledge that he should see God, that he should desire that information "graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock *forever*," and yet that it should only refer to six months hence, that we should read the fulfillment of it in the same book! But God inspired Job with the power of his Spirit, and by it gave to him a revelation of the knowledge and existence of his Redeemer; a knowledge of the power of the resurrection; a knowledge of his restoration from the tomb; and these things he reasonably desired preserved. Why should he desire them preserved, if in the same book we read them, we were to read their fulfillment? Let us see, however, what Job says. The gentleman reads with a great deal of emphasis, "I have heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee," and then tells us that as we have here the evidence that he saw God, therefore this old body of ours need not be taken up again from the earth. I think we had better turn back to the thirty-eighth chapter and first verse, and we will then see whether Job did *see* God or not; that is, whether he saw him personally and *stood with him*, or not, "Then the Lord answered Job"—how? By personal appearance? No; "*out of the WHIRLWIND.*" When Job saw this wonderful display of God's power in nature, in the whirlwind circling around him; and when the voice came out of the whirlwind, and he realized that the voice was the voice of God, and that he was in the presence of God while in the presence of this wonderful manifestation of power, he exclaimed, "Now mine eye seeth Thee." There is not one word of evidence that either Christ, his Redeemer, or God, personally appeared to him. God then speaks to him by his majesty out of the whirlwind; but *does not stand with him on the earth.*

Let us look at his former testimony again, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body." The gentleman leaves out the words in italics because they are supplied by the translators, though they were evidently needed to make the sense complete. Let us read it without them, therefore, once more; "And after my skin—destroy this—, yet in my flesh shall I see God." "Destroy *this*"—What? The gentleman claims that Job had "*the small pox.*" Wonderful thing for a revelation in God's book to be preserved in lead in the rocks, that Brother Job had the small pox! The gentleman nervously leaves out the words in italics; so we will supply them according to his explanation instead of the translators, "And though after my skin destroy this *small pox*; yet in my flesh shall I see God." Wonderful argument! Wonderful definition, this!

Our attention is now called to Isaiah, which was before quoted for you. We will look at it again :

"Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

The gentleman tells us that it has reference to this, that this was to be a national restoration. Now I want to know, wherein either the word national, or the idea of a national restoration is found in connection with this prophecy.

Let us turn to the twenty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, beginning with the sixth verse, and see *what is the subject* of this prophecy. He is speaking of the mountain of the house of the Lord.

"And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto *all people* a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over ALL people, and the veil that is spread over ALL nations. He will swallow up *death* in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off *all faces*; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it."

Is this, Sir, a *national* restoration? Or is it the time referred to, when Israel shall no longer be scattered among the nations? Then, Sir, the veil of darkness shall be taken from *all* the earth, and they shall see God face to face; then they shall be brought before him, into his great and august presence; then death shall be swallowed up in victory; then God shall wipe away tears from off all faces. Sir; can you call this a national restoration, a restoration of Israel? No, Sir; it is a much grander and nobler event of which the prophet speaks.

And, Sir, lest you should say we are still wrong, the prophet continues, 26:1, "In *that day*,"—WHAT day? The day when God wipes tears from off ALL faces; when death is swallowed up in victory,—"*In that day shall this song be sung, in the land of Judah, We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks.*" This was never sung in Jesus' time. It never has been sung since that time by Israel. Jerusalem has been trodden under the feet of the Gentiles, and must be till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. But in that time when Judah will have a strong city, when God will have appointed salvation for walls and bulwarks, the mandate shall be, "Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation *which keepeth the truth* may enter in." And then, addressing first the Son, and secondly Israel, the prophet exclaims: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in Thee." "Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord JEHOVAH is everlasting strength." The triumph of the righteous and of Israel.

In the verses following we have a description given of judgment that shall come upon them that dwell on high. The eighth and ninth verses of this chapter read :

"Yea, in the way of thy judgment, O Lord, have we waited for Thee; the desire of our soul is to thy name, and to the remembrance of Thee. With my soul have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit will I seek thee early: for when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness."

The *time* of the judgment on Israel's foes, the enemy who had lifted up his hand against Israel unjustly, and the *time of their punishment* then will have come, as well as the *appointed time* of rewards for those who shall have kept the truth. Hence in the fourteenth verse we read of those "other lords" who had ruled Israel, "Therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memories to perish." *That time* will be the *time* of the overthrow of the other lords who had had dominion over them, under whose rules their sufferings are graphically described in the eighteenth verse, thus, "We have been with child; we have been in pain; we have as it were brought forth wind;

we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth; neither have the inhabitants of the earth fallen." This is to be their lamentation; but the encouraging response is, "Thy dead men shall live." Notwithstanding all this trouble, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise." Inspired with the hope of redemption from the grave to inherit the promises, Isaiah could make this declaration, "Together with my dead body shall they arise;" and anticipating the mandate of restitution to life, exclaim, "Wake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.

Leaving this, we turn again to the testimony our brother tried to answer in the fifth chapter of Job, twenty-eighth verse; and as this is a favorite quotation of his, we call his attention again to it:

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all who are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Jesus introduces this statement by saying, "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Because his Father, God, hath given unto him to have life in himself, he is enabled to make the promise that the dead shall be brought forth by his power.

The brother tells us that this is a moral death. He does not accept this as referring to the literally dead. He thinks these morally dead were in their moral graves, and that the Savior's idea was, and that the Scriptures furnish the proof that they were to be raised therefrom, and that this is the resurrection here spoken of. It is not a new theory that our friend thus puts forth; but it is certainly a peculiar one. The scripture in question contains neither the adjective, *literal* nor *moral*; but by supplying the word *moral* we make it inconsistent, while by supplying the word *literal*, the sense and harmony are both preserved. A doctrinal and prophetic declaration ought always to receive a literal interpretation when consistent; never a private one, and a metaphorical one *only* when it is clear that a metaphor is employed. Let us read it as friend Shinn explains it for us. "The hour is coming, and now is, when the *morally* dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall *morally* live. * * Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that in their *moral* graves shall hear his voice, and shall *morally* come forth; they that have done good, unto the *moral* resurrection of *moral* life; and they that have done evil, unto the *moral* resurrection of *moral* damnation." We can all see that a *moral* death and a *moral* resurrection are inadequate here, and equally so elsewhere, where death and the resurrection are taught and prefigured. We *die literally*; we must be *raised literally*; or the power of death will be greater than the power of life. What is the reason Jesus speaks of two resurrections, if resurrection be *moral* only? What kind of a resurrection is a *resurrection to moral* damnation, or condemnation? If condemnation is a state of death, how can one be *raised* by the power of the resurrection, the power of life, *from moral death* in sins, *to moral death*, the resurrection of damnation?

The terms life and condemnation are expressive of conditions which are to affect us in the life-state, or in the death state hereafter. There are no such conditions in this moral resurrection, as applying to all. But, Sir, what is moral death? I have yet to find the first word spoken of it in the Bible. I do not know anything about this theory from the Bible; I never read the words moral death, or anything intimating such a death in the Bible, otherwise than metaphorically. There is a spiritual death, and a natural death referred to; but I do not know anything about this moral death. Of course, the brother's idea of a moral death, is the idea of such a condition as that in which the moral facul-

ties are lifeless; but I do not know of any such a general condition in the human race. Some will say I suppose, as others have done, that moral death is the soul in a *state of death*, soul-death, therefore; yet I do not perceive the force, though I do the fallacy of the term.

But does the quotation in question teach, in any sense, a moral death? Hear it again:

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which *all who are in THEIR GRAVES* shall hear his voice, and *shall come forth*; they that have done good unto the *resurrection of life*; and they that have done evil, unto the *resurrection of damnation*."

I would like the dividing line drawn just here by my brother; I would like to have it drawn very closely; I would like it to be a very nice and clear line, running between these two resurrections, characterizing and classifying those who receive a resurrection unto life from this moral death, and those who, though they receive a resurrection, receive it unto *moral damnation*, who are resurrected unto moral death. If it be a moral resurrection; I declare, brother, I would like to have this explained and cleared up in your next speech. Perhaps when I hear the explanation by my brother I will understand it myself.

The brother tells us that I speak about this earth being the place where man shall dwell; but says he does not think he will wish to stay here always. My brother and I differ in this. This is the very place where I would like to live. I want no other spot in the universe. I will be satisfied here. The Scriptures tell us that the Lord hath created the earth for the children of men, and I am satisfied with what God has done for me. If the children of men would only be good and upright, and do their duty one to the other, this little earth would soon be a very paradise, as at the beginning. I would not want a better heaven, if every creature on this earth was good. When the curse pronounced upon it in consequence of sin and transgression shall be taken off; when the laws of God shall be honored here, and his Son and his people reign upon it, as we read they will do, in the word of God, when the glorious change to be wrought upon it by the power of God shall have taken place, I want to be here. I have no idea of, and no wish to go far away "beyond the bounds of time and space" for my home,—that is too far away, too long a journey for me, it would take too long a time to reach there. There are stars which have been faintly discovered far within the bounds of space, yet so far within the "milky way," that it takes more than ten thousand years for light to reach us from them, and if I traveled as fast as light does, I should then be more than ten thousand years on my journey home. Too long a journey, brother, to undertake in going home. No; God has made the earth for me, and I am satisfied with what my Father has done.

The brother tells me that he expects me to prove *my proposition*, "raised to immortality." I must remind him once more, that I have not yet made such a proposition. Respecting the righteous being raised to immortality, I believe that for them there will be such a life; but I have not yet made my argument in relation to it; nor am I under any necessity to do so. I have grown into the habit of reserve by following Elder Shinn. It is a good idea, sometimes and often, to remind the brother of the subject of debate, which is "the literal resurrection of the body."

He tells you that I do not believe in a *day* for the resurrection. Well, well; but I do. He is wrong again. I believe that there is a "day appointed, in the which God will judge the world." My view of this term *day*, is like that I expressed of eternity, exactly. The term is a period of time, as here used; not a period of twenty-four hours; it is like the days of creation. I do not believe that God created this earth in six times twenty-four hours of our time. These

days, to me, represent ages, periods of time. God's judgment day is also like his gospel day; it is a period of time. The gospel period is metaphorically called a day; the judgment period is called a day, but I do not understand it to be merely twenty-four hours. How long it will last God has not told us. I dare not venture a guess upon it. The Elder tells you that I discard my author Josephus on this point. I do not believe I discard him. Josephus does not confine it to anything like a period of twenty-four hours. He simply leaves the question open, by using the broad general term, "day aforesaid determined," "a future judgment." We think in the same broad, general terms, there will be a "day of judgment."

On consciousness beyond death, I really ought not allow myself to be led. But that there is a conscious existence of the spirit after death, we fully believe, as well as the evidence brought forward from God's word in support of it. 2: Corinthians 4:16; 2 Corinthians 5:1-3, and Hebrews 11th chapter, where the visible and invisible powers are spoken of.

Elder Forscutt closed at the call of "Time."

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's third argument is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to have accomplished thus much in a right direction so far in this discussion. My brother refers you to Luke 20. I understand him clearly to have admitted, this morning, of a conscious state of existence for spirits beyond this life. Having admitted that fact in his last speech, you will therefore remember, that we are agreed in regard to the fact that there is a conscious state of existence for spirits, human spirits after death. That is all I wish to say upon that subject just now. I have no further reference to make to Luke 20 now. I will wait for the brother to call that up, which he has promised us to do in good time.

I call your attention at once to Job 19. The brother is determined to hold me to King James' translation. He even wants to go so far as to bring all the italics, when he knows as well as I do, that in many instances they have no place there. But if he is determined to have the King James' translation, italics and all, we still have the argument. For the marginal reading of this translation makes quite a difference in the sense, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Now look at the margin, my brother, and you will see it makes quite a difference in the sense, "Though this body be destroyed, yet out of my flesh shall I see God." There is King James' translation, marginal notes, italics and all. Though his body be destroyed, yet out of the body he should see God. He might just as well have left out the italics in the first place. It is against him, I do not care which way he takes it. You remember I called your attention to the fact here, that Job did see God in his flesh, "I have heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee." This is Job's own language addressed to God. If Job has not told us a straight story I am not responsible for it. He goes back to the thirty-eighth chapter, and talks about God speaking to Job out of the whirlwind, "Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind." We do not know but what he might have spoken to him again. Turn to the end of the book, the last chapter, and there we find Job declares, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee." Square and clean as can be. You see this removes the necessity of Job's literal body being raised up in a future world, in order that he may see God. The brother tells about the use of the iron pen; about cutting holes in the rocks and pouring

lead into them. I wonder if Job had reference to the resurrection of the literal body, when talking about that. No, Sir. Job was ascribing his punishments to the Lord. His enemies did not believe in the existence of a true God, and Job is trying to enforce the argument in favor of his existence, and that he rendereth judgment. Let us go back and see how he commences his nineteenth chapter. We will commence with the 13th verse, "He hath put my brethren far from me, and mine acquaintances are verily estranged from me." Job's wife died not believing. God rendereth judgment. Job thought that he did. 17v. "My breath is strange to my wife." 19. "All my inward friends abhorred me, and they whom I loved are turned against me." Let the brother blame me for it, Job was suffering under some disease from the crown of the head to the soles of his feet. Now we know what he had been talking about, that there was power with the God of heaven. "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever!" What did he wish preserved? Namely, the grand truth that God rendereth judgment. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth," I would like to read this as I understand it, if my brother will not be put aside, "And he shall stand at the latter upon the earth: and after my skin destroy this, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Then Job testifies over here, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee." How plain and clear it is then, "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." I presume this is all that is necessary; however, I will put in the close of the chapter, "But ye should say, Why persecute we him, seeing the root of the matter is found in me? Be ye afraid of the sword; for wrath bringeth the punishments of the sword, that ye may know there is a judgment," or a retribution.

Isaiah 26; he refers to 25: 6-8, "And in this mountain will the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering," under the reign of the Messiah, under the gospel reign, "cast over all people, and the vail that is cast," that is spread "over all nations." Paul describes this vail to be a vail of unbelief. "He will swallow death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it." This has reference to the grand and glorious consummation of the gospel reign; when Jesus shall have accomplished the object of his mission, to seek and to save that which was lost, and save it forever. This points to the grand consummation, my brother. "And it shall be said in that day," in the day of the gospel reign; in the day of the Messiah's reign, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation," under the great Messiah's reign. There were to be judgments upon the Jews, in fact upon all mankind; but these were to be before this grand prophecy from the sixth to the ninth was to have its fulfillment, or be realized. "In that day," the day of the Messiah's reign, the day that Jesus was to judge mankind by his kingdom, by his truth, mark it, *that* is the day spoken of, "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: we have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in." So we might read on, until we come to the passage the brother refers to, "Thy dead men shall live," etc. Let us go back to the twelfth verse, "Lord thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us. O Lord, our God, other lords besides Thee have had dominion over us; but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy

name. They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, and they shall not rise." These lords that have had dominion over them, they shall not rise, as the brother says, therefore he has taken the position that all mankind will not be raised from the dead, "Therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish. Thou hast increased the nation." Now you see he speaks of the nation, "O Lord, thou hast increased the nation; thou art glorified; thou hast removed it far unto all the ends of the earth;" that is, the nation. "Lord, in trouble have they visited thee; they poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them." Now we read the verse the brother speaks of, "Thy dead men shall live;" the nation that the old prophet speaks of here shall live, "Together with my dead body shall they arise." If we take the literal sense, that the nation is to arise, the dead body of Isaiah will never do so anywhere. The nation was to do this, "Awake and sing ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people;" my people here, is used in a national point of view, so it is still a national affair, "Enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were for a little moment until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth shall also disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." The same subject is continued in the next chapter, "In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword," etc.

In the twelfth verse of the next chapter we read, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall beat off from the channel of the river into the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children."

Thus we might read sketches from different chapters, referring to the gathering of the Jews under Messiah's reign, and what I conceive to be a moral resurrection of them under Messiah's reign. It has nothing to do with the resurrection of this old body. That has nothing to do with the resurrection of mankind from the state of the dead, according to the teachings of the holy Scriptures. But let us see. I hold here in my hand a work by a very eminent and scholarly man, Brother Goodwin, a presiding Elder of the Methodist denomination. You see my views are sustained by good authority. I have noted scholarly men on my side. In support of the view I have given you, I will read you his view:

"We have yet to find a commentator of respectability, who assumes that the doctrine of a future resurrection can be proven by this passage. They uniformly apply it to some deliverance of the children of Israel, but generally follow Bishop Lowth in saying, "The deliverance of the people of God from the lowest depression is explained by images plainly taken from the resurrection of the dead." Indeed! But that is assuming the very thing which needs proof. The Bible nowhere teaches such a resurrection; why should prophets represent temporal deliverances by the creatures of uninspired imagination? Identical in import is the prophecy of Hosea, written a few years after the prophecy of Isaiah. Hosea 13:12-16."—*Mode of Man's Immortality*, page 65. T. A. Goodwin.

Then he understands these passages of Scripture as I understand them.

The brother speaks about the earth as a future heaven; and he seems glad, and becomes quite eloquent at the thought of its becoming renewed and purified, and made a fit dwelling for the redeemed human spirits. Well, brother, I hope to be with you in that heaven, or another like it, here upon this earth so far as that is concerned. But I do not suppose I shall be confined here, if it should take a thousand or ten thousand years, with the speed of light to reach some other planet. I might stop at a nearer place, and learn of the beauties and glories of it first. I might take the solar system to begin with, as far as that is concerned, and drink in of its beauties and glories as they were unfolded to me from one stage of progression to another, drawing nearer and still nearer to God

throughout the endless cycles of eternity. This looks like a heaven to me. Drinking in new beauties, and viewing the grandeur of God, manifested in his goodness and excellent works. I agree with you, brother. All the heaven we can have upon this earth, we must make. Then let us try to make, help to make it as much like heaven as we can. Let us work on, hoping for better things.

Day of judgment. He explains it to be an age or a period. We are agreed. That is my first view and my last view, all the time. The word day, the day of judgment, is an age or a period. It does not fix a day to judge the world by Jesus Christ, a day of twenty-four hours. Whoever advocates such a view as this, I must forever differ with.

My brother speaks of his quotation from Josephus. I will simply remark, my brother, that your quotation you have referred to in your last speech, is a spurious quotation.

Once more I want to make a correction, my friendly hearers. Because I do not believe the same old body will be re-animated, after being scattered to the four winds of heaven, will be brought up again in the future and made the home for the spirit to dwell in again, some have the impression that I do not believe in a resurrection. All the resurrection that I suppose is taught in the Bible I do believe in. I believe that the spirit man is the true man. That when death comes, this spirit man is clothed upon with "the house which is from heaven," that the apostle Paul speaks of; a grand, glorious, spiritual body.

This is the word you know we have some difficulty with; had some little contradiction in our views, a question at any rate, about the meaning of the word translated resurrection. *Anastasis*, my brother would define as a reanimation of the dead body. I claim that to this word no such meaning as being brought to life belongs. It means rising; that is what it means. How beautiful the word when we understand it. When delivered from the mortal body, the spirit will rise, and will be clothed upon with a spiritual body, a house that is from heaven. We simply move out of this old body, and move into that spiritual body, that house which is from heaven, which is not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. This is my view of the matter. There is no sleep of the spirit. The spirit man lives right on. I will show you by and by, that there is no such thing as death, when we reach it. I should have attended to this before I commenced reviewing my brother's speech. I left off speaking on the subject of the inner man being clothed upon by the house from heaven. You remember I had just quoted Hebrews 11:3. I had only just time to make a remark or two about it. I want to read it again, to refresh your minds, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." I took the position here, that that which is seen is temporal; but that which is not seen is eternal. I want to conclude my argument. Attraction and repulsion are mighty forces in the universe. They are invisible, but real. Electricity is a mighty force in the universe. It is material, something, though invisible. It is real, and I believe it is eternal, as well as all the other forces in this earth. Man, I believe, represents in himself all these forces and elements. I believe electricity, that invisible power, that agent of God, is spirit, because it is invisible. And now my argument is, that that which is invisible, is alone eternal. The invisible man, the invisible spirit man, the inner man, the true man, must be the eternal man. All of man is in that germ folded up there, and though separated from the body it lives on, it is himself. All of man is in that spiritual germ; it is the power, it is the principle, this image that corresponds with the inner man, the spiritual entity that the apostle speaks of in the fifteenth

chapter of first Corinthians. This old body will die, and return to its primitive elements, dust; but the inner man, the germ, the soul, we read of, the invisible man will live on. Here is the clothing. Here is the body from heaven, the spiritual body. Our Lord Jesus Christ brought arguments from the Old Testament in support of this view, "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." What does he mean here if it is not true that Abraham and Isaac and Jacob were then living, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;" "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living. This proves that the resurrection is progressive. That when this body is laid off, we are clothed upon with that spiritual body, that house which is from heaven, as I showed you before. It was true then away back there, that Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, although they have been dead for centuries, lived unto God, "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living; *for all live unto him.*" This was truth, glorious truth understood by Moses.

Again; I call your attention to Genesis 37:31-35:

"And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and dipped the coat in the blood; and they sent the coat of many colors, and they brought it to their father; and said, This have we found; know now whether it be thy son's coat or no. And he knew it, and said, It is my son's coat; an evil beast hath devoured him; Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces. And Jacob rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days. And all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted; and he said, For I will go down into the grave *unto my son* mourning."

Now he knew that his son had been sacrificed, had gone to the state of the dead, but he was going to him. He knew his son was there. Mark you, *his son*. Not his literal body, for his literal body did not go there, but the spirit man, the true man was there. And here we have the old Patriarch Jacob, going to his son, whom he thought to be in the state of the dead, I understand to be in the spirit life or world; in that eternal real world. "For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

Again; 2 Samuel 12:23. David says here, "But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." Another example, as I understand it, of the consciousness of the spirit in the spirit land. Whether these have any bodies or not we shall see by and by.

The Moderator's voice calling "Time" closed the reply.

Elder Forscutt's fourth argument:

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the close of my last speech, I was about to review some of the brother's thoughts on conscious existence; but while I have listened to his criticisms upon my last speech, and the new evidences our brother has presented to us, in support of his theory of a conscious state of existence beyond the grave; I have concluded that to nearly all that he has said this time, I can say "Amen." I presume nearly all the Latter Day Saints can; for we have all the same general views.

I gave him credit day before yesterday in this way, and he did not like my criticising him afterwards; and he has said so much in this speech that pleased me, that I will have to be careful this time; but yet there are some things that he presented to us in this last speech, that I must criticise just a little. I will be as tender as I can. I am naturally sympathetic, I am told.

We learn from what the gentleman has said, that he still decides as before in respect to the testimony of God to Job. We will only answer one point in

this reference, namely, that Job saw the Lord at the time he spake to him out of the whirlwind. He says we do not know but what he might have spoken to him again. In the thirty-eighth chapter we first read that God spake to him out of the whirlwind, and then follows the reply of God. In the fortieth chapter we thus read of Job's answering the Lord, after the Lord had spoken, "Once have I spoken; but I will not answer: yea, *twice*; but I will proceed no further." Then we read the answer of the Lord as before, "Then answered the Lord unto Job *out of the whirlwind*, and said, Gird up thy loins now like a man." That speech continues right along down to the end of the forty-first chapter. In the beginning of the forty-second chapter, Job commences his answer to the Lord; and in that answer occurs the words you have quoted. We will dispense with that argument now, and let it pass as sufficiently answered.

The brother quoted the testimony of saiah, and says that it points to the general consummation, when all shall have been brought unto a state of salvation. I give his idea, not his words. This is in relation to the twenty-fifth of Isaiah; I have the same understanding of it; and on the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah, I agree with him partly too. I do not know whether I would say that they would all be raised then, or not. Except they change, they will not then all be raised. I have already said, that there are times, set times, for the resurrection. And at *this* time, when Israel will be restored to his land, the wicked will not be raised.

Illustratively, we find, right here in the next chapter, a distinction marked out plainly between the righteous and the wicked; Israel is to "blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit;" (27:6), "Yet the defenced city shall be desolate, and the habitation forsaken and left like a wilderness;" (10*v*), "for it is [occupied] by a people of no understanding; therefore he that made them will *not* have mercy on them, and he that found them will shew them *no favor*."—11*v*. There is then to be destruction to the foes of Israel; there is then to be pain to the enemies of Judah; but in the land of Judah shall the new song be sung; for God shall have planted on the mountains of Israel his people, in fulfillment of the promises to the fathers. These enemies will *not* then arise. The *time for their resurrection* will not have come. It will not take place for a thousand years at least after that, as we shall bring evidence of in the course of the debate, if time permit.

The brother tells us at the close of his argument, that the old body drops off, and we have no more use for it. I wonder whether it ever "dropped" on. I can not understand the philosophy of the thought, that God should give to us a being in this state, in order that we might enter into the conditions of our earth-life, pass through them in such varied forms, in such unequal stages, and in such unequal circumstances, with such unequal capabilities for good or evil, and all just for the sake of being burdened and grieved for a few days or years here; which is the case if the body serves no other purpose. Truly, Sir, if the body be only for this life, then can we not ascribe to God, its author, wisdom, as we have been accustomed to ascribe to him wisdom. Here is a child that is born and lives but a moment. Where is the wisdom in the creation of that child, if there be no resurrection of the body? Of what use is earth-life to that child, or to its suffering mother, if there is to be no resurrection of the body? If the conditions designed for this life are not to be repeated by an existence in the body in a sublimated form, the body is a worse than a useless creation. It seems to me that the work of a careful man would excel this work of creation, if there is to be no resurrection. Yet, in fact, if there is to be no resurrection, it matters but little whether we are born at all, or how long a time or how short a time we stay here,—that is, according to Scripture, or what he may call "Mor-

mon philosophy;" for as that teaches a pre-existence of spirit, there is no necessity for birth here at all, in order to existence of the spirit. With the philosophy of our friend, that this condition in the body is the only one we shall ever have in the body, and that we are going to leave the body to perish or decay in the grave through eternity, and we exist only as spirits in a spirit condition forevermore, it is another question. We believe that God does nothing in vain, and that as the body is essential to ultimate happiness in a perfect state, so it was created for union with the spirit to form the perfect soul-man. Given, the claim that the body is not essential, and its creation is a work of folly, and a cause of pain and grief. When we consider the two propositions, we are satisfied with our position that the body will be restored.

As touching the question of the restoration of the body, the brother tells us, that these bodies drop off, and are done with; that they shall not be raised again. Let us see. We have just heard from Br. Shinn, and will now hear from Br. Paul, from Jesus, from Br. James, and from a few others of the ancient brethren. There is certainly a very serious disagreement between them and him somewhere.

The apostle Paul says, "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." He is referring here to Jesus Christ. What was the resurrection of Jesus,—a spiritual or moral one? No, Sir. A literal one. Yes, Sir; a literal one; for after he had been raised from the dead, the disciples thought that it was a spirit that had appeared unto them, but Jesus made this demand of them, "Handle me and see;" and afterward explained to them, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Now, Sir, in this resurrection, Jesus had his flesh and his bones with him, and these are certainly a part of the body. There was a little difference in the body of Jesus, I grant you. One of the elements in the body when Jesus was a mortal being, was not in the body in a resurrected state. This that was in the natural condition of Jesus, as a mortal, was not in the condition of Jesus as a resurrected being. In the mortal state he had flesh and bones, and blood circulated through his veins; but we do not read of his saying or intimating that a resurrected being had blood, when discriminating between himself and a spirit, in the phrase, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones," no blood named, but "a spirit hath not *flesh and bones as YE SEE ME HAVE.*" There is a distinction between the mortal or natural body, and the spiritual or resurrected body.

Now, Sir, was this body the same that Jesus had before on earth? Let us go for evidence to the words of Jesus to one of the disciples, who could not believe that Jesus could have a literally resurrected body. Like my brother, he thought that the body was "done with" after this life had been spent in it. He did not believe that the body of Jesus would be raised again; perhaps not that the body of any one else would be; and unless he saw the prints of the nails in the hands and in the feet of Jesus, and saw where the spear had pierced his side, he would not believe that the body of Jesus had been raised from the dead. Jesus appeared, however, and showed him. He saw the prints of the nails; he saw the spot where the spear entered. He saw the marks in his feet and hands, and exclaimed, "My Lord, and my God." Jesus said, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

I believe with all my heart in the literal resurrection of Jesus. I dare to believe the word through Jesus, and the word of the Holy Ghost through Paul, "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of *his resurrection.*"

Now, following out the same thought, this apostle says in the forty-ninth and fiftieth verses of the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians :

"As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood, [*flesh and BLOOD*], can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

What is corruptible in man's nature? What is the corruptible that can not inherit the kingdom? Flesh and bones can; for Jesus had them. What is the life of the mortal flesh, the natural man? Is it not blood? Blood is the element of natural life within the body. Take a person and deprive his body of blood, and supply the more than electric force of spirit, and every purpose of life could be served. Take this body, and fill it with that spiritual electricity which flows from the Spirit of God, and we have, instead of a corruptible body, one like unto the glorious body of Jesus in his resurrected state. The blood was not there. Flesh and blood were not there, but flesh and bones were; the veins were filled with, and the body animated with spirit; just such was the body of the Lord Jesus Christ; just such are we to be. Our mortal bodies while animalized by blood, can not inherit the kingdom of God; but they are to be changed, to be made immortal, and yet they will be in fact the same bodies; but animated by another element.

The apostle says on this subject, commencing at the forty-second verse of the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." What is it that is sown in corruption? Is it the spirit? Is that sown in corruption? There is no reference here to the spirit. You, Sir, have told us that the spirit lives on; and I believe it. The spirit then is not sown in corruption; but the body is. That is "sown in corruption, and raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor." Surely, Sir, it is no dishonor that the spirit is sown in, if your theory be true. You tell us that from this state the spirit rises to a more exalted one, and certainly there is no dishonor attaching to that. The body alone is sown in dishonor, because its death, or sowing, is a sin-penalty for the works of the flesh in this earth; because man has corrupted himself through sin. "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness," yes, in weakness, because subjected; but "it is raised in power,"—in triumph. It is sown a natural body, a body of nature, a body afflicted with the sins of our earth-life;—"It is sown a natural body," a body of the life of the natural flesh; but "it is raised a spiritual body," a body filled with spiritual life, renewed flesh and bones, but filled with the element of spirit, and for that reason "it is raised a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual; but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual." The natural condition of the thing sown, the body, comes first. It came first to our Lord; it comes first to all; and after the natural conditions have been passed through, the spiritual condition follows. If we are sown in dishonor, sown in weakness, we only in so far as our bodies are concerned, we shall be raised in glory, raised in incorruption to endless life, with spiritual bodies, if we be worthy.

The brother tells us something about a spiritual body; about that which is not seen being eternal. The body, the idea is, is seen; so that it is a material substance. Yes, it is a material substance, and there is no such a thing as an "immaterial substance." I know a great many talk about an immaterial substance. I think my brother, however, has too much good sense for that. I do not think he will take this position; but if he does I will "go for him." We discover from the reading of the words of Paul, that not only did his hope centre in the resurrection, not only did his highest and best aspirations point in

that direction; but he seemed to realize that all the sons of God waited for it. I will give you his words, Romans 8:19:

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. 20. For the creature was made subject to vanity, [my brother perhaps will try to turn this aside by saying that he may have travailed in sin], was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

What is the creature? The spirit? No. The body? Yes. The creature, the body was made subject to vanity; not the spirit. "The spirit is willing," one has said, "but the flesh is weak." I do not know but I believe that Jesus made that remark; I am not positive. It is true, whoever made it. We may be willing in spirit to do good; to become more like Christ; but the flesh hinders. It is the flesh that is weak; it is the flesh that deprives the spirit within of the native dignity which it had when it came from its God. Through our parentage, through the associations of life we have here in the body, in the flesh, the body is "made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." What kind of hope? The hope that though now it be made a subject of vanity and weakness, it shall be raised in glory and power. All these idiosyncrasies, all these pre-natal, natal, and associated inharmonies now attaching to it through weakness, through the lack of knowledge, through the poor selection of each other for companions, through the conditions of the past and present, through the circumstances attending our birth, through and in a thousand causes serving to make us what we are; in which, did we but give them a proper consideration, we would discover the source of our present subjection; but it is a subjection in hope that in the hereafter we shall, if worthy, be raised; freed from all these conditions. Hence, though made subject to vanity, the body has been so made in hope of the resurrection of that body, the deliverance of the body; as Paul testifies in Romans 8:22, 23:

"For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit."

What spirit? Evidently, the spirit by which our bodies are to be raised; the spirit by which they are to be governed; with which they are to be surcharged and renewed;—having now the first fruits of that spirit, "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body.*"

Brother, I would like to have Brother Paul here just five minutes to talk with you upon this subject. The brother says this old body drops off, and then we are done with it, we have no more use for it, "let it go." Good Brother Paul thought differently. He was *groaning* for the *adoption* of THE BODY. He was *waiting* in this condition of mortality for the *adoption* of THE BODY. He was true to the work given him while waiting, that he might attain to that redemption. He had hope that his body should be changed, and be fashioned in the likeness of the body of Jesus, and that he should be permitted to live with Jesus and reign with him when he comes.

Now still further, proceeding with this subject, I will call the attention of my brother to the statement made concerning Jesus in Colossians 1:18. The apostle here tells us that Christ was "The *first born* from the dead." The brother has told us that he believes in a "progressive resurrection." He has not defined just what he means by a progressive resurrection; but in his argument he has intimated that it is a successive resurrection. In his last speech he instructed us that when death came the spirit took its flight to a place prepared

for it, and was clothed upon with a spiritual body, and that this is the resurrection. I do not pretend to give his words, but his idea. I think this was the thought expressed. If this be true, then I would like this idea of the resurrection being "progressive," and the statement that Jesus was the "first born from the dead," reconciled. For, Sir, Jesus was not raised from the dead, until the world was over four thousand years old. If Jesus was not raised from the dead, until the world was more than four thousand years old, and the resurrection had been going on from the time of Adam down to his time, I would like you to instruct us how he could be the "first born from the dead." If that be true, there were thousands who had been raised before him. How, Sir, and in what sense was Christ "the first fruits," the "first born from the dead?"

Again; in Acts 26:22, 23, the apostle tells us that the prophets had borne witness that Jesus "should be THE FIRST that should rise from the dead." Were the prophets wrong? Would it not be a very damaging discovery to make that he who "should be the first that should rise from the dead," had been preceded by millions in a progressive resurrection, a resurrection that commenced four thousand years before his birth? The gentleman told me yesterday that he was going to hold me to this thing, and to that thing, and that if I did not make this and that clear, I had lost the whole argument; I now want him to tell me how that "progressive resurrection" had been going on for four thousand years, and yet the scriptures be true that Jesus was "the first born from the dead," "the first that should rise from the dead."

John 6:39-45.—"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

I wish to ask the question here of the gentleman, if this is a promise, this statement made by Jesus Christ, how could Jesus make such a promise, such a statement, provided the resurrection of all men took place in "the last times" that the brother has been telling us about. I would like him to inform us how this testimony could be of any value to the believer; if *all men* are raised in the resurrection as soon as they die, of what benefit is a promise that *they that believe on Christ* should be raised. Where are all the wicked who die? They are raised, I suppose, according to Elder Shinn, as soon as they die; their resurrection to glory is going on "progressively." If then the righteous have to wait until "the last day," I do not know but the wicked will have the finally better chance; decidedly the better now, for they do not have to wait any such a length of time as the righteous do. I can not arrive at such conclusions by the word of God, but by the arguments of my brother.

Again, as regards this progressive resurrection idea. I remember reading of a circumstance that occurred during the lifetime of Jesus. A certain man whom he loved, died, and Jesus, having before learned of his sickness, was made aware of his death by inspiration. He then went over into Bethany, that he might raise him from the dead; and thus show forth his power over death. Arriving at Bethany, he learned that this man had lain in the grave four days already. This man had two sisters who loved him. These sisters wept over him, and one of them came to Jesus, with whom Jesus returned to the other, and thence to the grave. Jesus then raised their brother from the dead. Now, if Jesus raised the body of this man from the dead, and he had also been raised according to the gentleman's theory four days previously; if, I say, four days before Jesus raised him, he had been resurrected in this progressive resurrection which we are told is going on all the time, what was the nature of this double resurrection? If a man is resurrected as soon as he dies, four days before Jesus

raised him, this man had been raised, and had had given unto him the spiritual body our friend talks about, while the natural body was in the grave; then, Sir, at the resurrection of his natural body, this man had two bodies at the same time, his natural and his spiritual body. But if our friend denies the possession of two bodies to Lazarus, what became of the spiritual body when the spirit came back to take the natural body? When Jesus called the dead body forth, I wish to know what then became of the spiritual body. Two bodies in one, a spiritual body and a natural body, and a spirit within the two; how is this, friend Shinn?

In the same chapter quoted from by the brother, verse 44, we read:

"No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day."

It is so very strange that Jesus did not give any kind of an idea of the matter, if it was the intention that the dead should be raised as soon as they die. It is very strange that the Great Teacher did not give some clear idea of this matter, and in speaking to them at this time say, "I will raise him up as soon as he dies," instead of saying, "I will raise him up at the last day," is it not? How is it my brother has become so much wiser than Jesus? How is it that Elder Shinn is able to discriminate so much more closely than Jesus?

How is it that he will be able to get along without the body, while he is to be wandering upward or around from world to world, during this ten thousand year's journey, and for ever; while all the brethren of old looked forward to the adoption or redemption of the body, that they might dwell here? It is because, perhaps, he has made up his mind on this question, as did the Sadducees of old, that there is no resurrection of the body, and therefore, adopting the modern spiritualistic view, he discards the Savior's doctrine of the resurrection. It may be that he has come to that conclusion, and in adopting it, the Bible is laid aside; for it certainly teaches that the bodies of the Saints shall be raised again, as glorified bodies. Jesus too will reign with those who are glorified, for they will be glorified with him, and their bodies be raised in the likeness of his body. His body is the same body he had on earth, there being missing from it only the element of blood. If the Saints have not their bodies, they will not be raised in the likeness of Christ's glorious body, and the promise will fail. There can be no powers to reign with Christ on earth, without the body in its resurrected state. They are to be like Jesus. His body was there, when resurrected; the flesh was there, the bones were there, the spirit was there, and his body, being filled with and quickened by the Spirit, was a spiritual body; yet it had substance and parts, and all the essentials of a body, when Jesus showed himself to his disciples, and made himself known to them; ours must possess all these elements, or we shall not be like him.

"Time" was here called.

Elder Shinn's fourth reply.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to make one more reference to Isaiah 25 : 6-8. My brother certainly does not understand me, or at any rate he does not fairly represent or present my view. I believe that that prophecy of Isaiah, brother, has reference to the reign of the Messiah here in the earth. What I meant by consummation was the time when he shall have wrought out under that potent power, that great power of love, which shall finally rule all men, the salvation of all souls, and shall have brought all souls to God. I believe the grand consummation spoken of there, is to be wrought out, my brother, before his personal coming, before he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father. For the time of this glorious

salvation, I would refer you to 1 Corinthians 15; to Thessalonians, relative to a personal coming of Jesus, to take place at the end of his reign, when he shall have wrought this salvation for all, and delivered up the kingdom to God the Father.

The brother seems to be impressed with the idea that this literal, animal body will be necessary; especially so far as the future life is concerned. Well, I presume that this view of the matter will do until old Babylon falls, and all such speculation with it; but where is the evidence produced that the Bible teaches a resurrection of the animal body? I can not see, so far as I am concerned, that the same body will be necessary there.

Brother, is the same body necessary here for identity? Do you have the same body to-day, that you had seven years ago? Not one particle do you have to-day, that you had seven years ago, according to scientific reasoning upon this matter, perhaps. I will give that matter due notice, however, before the discussion closes. I shall speak of it again. I will state, however, that the characteristics of the body, which we dwell in now, are not necessary for our identity, and will not be hereafter, in the future, spirit world.

Paul's teaching, "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

I maintain that this is a moral resurrection plainly, in which we are to be raised in the likeness of Jesus. The apostle's view upon it. The apostle Paul's teaching upon the subject of the resurrection, brother, I will introduce in due time in this discussion. We will see fully what they are. He admits, however, that Jesus, in his resurrected body, lacked one of the elements that the animal body has. Well if it lacked one of the elements, it was not the same body, literal body.

ELDER FORSCUTT. "It does not require all the parts to constitute a body."

ELDER SHINN. I am frank to say, so far as I am concerned, that I believe the literal body of Jesus was raised from the grave. I believe it was necessary it should have been done, to convince mankind at that age of the world, of the truth of a resurrection to immortality.

First Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, the brother refers us to. I want to notice some of the things he has said. He called especial attention, I notice, to the 49th and 50th verses; also the 42-48th; 49th verse first, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy," the independent spirit man stands out again, "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." The brother understands the phrase, "kingdom of God," to apply to the future immortal state. "Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." I do not wish to read any farther. I believe that is as far as the brother read. Then he called attention again to Corinthians, forty-second verse of the same chapter, "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." What is sown in corruption, the brother asks, and answers, the body, the literal body, is to be raised in incorruption. I deny its being the literal body that is sown here. The forty-first verse reads:

"There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead."

That which is denominated dead, is the same that is sown. I believe it is the same. There is not anything in the original answering to the pronoun it, that I am aware of. I believe it would be better to say sown, than "it is sown." But the construction of the sentence requires something right at the beginning,

and would it not be right to say, "we are sown," or something answering to that which is the subject of raised is "sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body. Sown in dishonor, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power." One criticism here, my brother. I want it distinctly understood now, that the sowing here is not death. We are sown now. We are in the natural body, sown a natural body now. It answers to that which is to be raised. Now is the time we are sown; sown a natural body; by and by, we will be raised a spiritual body. We read further, "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up?" This is a question in the very same chapter, thirty-fifth verse, "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou foolish man." I will read it this way, it sounds better in speaking to an opponent, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Then this body must be dropped off; it must die. Then that which is within, answering to that which is to be raised, this germ that grows, that is to be clothed upon with a spiritual body, "For thou sowest not that body that shall be." For all the brother thinks it is the same body that shall be. There is the apostle Paul's teaching, here is the subject of the resurrection defined at last, and Paul declares positively, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain: but God giveth it," answering to that which is within, represented by the germ in the grain, "a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Then he read the fiftieth verse, "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." How clearly then the same animal body can not inherit the kingdom of God. This body is corruptible; the heavenly body will be spiritual and incorruptible.

He says he does not charge me with teaching the idea of an immaterial body, but if I do, then he will go for me. Thinks I have more sense than to teach any such a body. I am very thankful, brother, I do happen to know better than that. I do not believe in an immaterial body, neither do I believe, Sir, in going beyond the bounds of time and space. Neither do I believe that the same body we have now will be a material body in the resurrection. I speak of this, so that we may be distinctly understood in regard to this matter.

Roman 8:19, calls my attention to. I want to notice that closely:

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope."

The brother spends considerable time on the word "creature," and claims that it means body. If you will allow me that it means the whole body of humanity, I will agree with you. What body is it? I believe it is the whole body of mankind, but not the literal body. "For the earnest expectation of the creature," that which was made subject to vanity, "waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity," the same creature which the apostle Paul was commanded to preach the gospel to. Mark you, the same word in the original is found in both these places. What! to the dead bodies of mankind? The literal bodies? "For the creature was made subject to vanity." These bodies? "Not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." Can the literal body hope? "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. Had it been here the whole literal body of mankind I might submit to my brother's criticism! "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption

of our body." It is the whole body of mankind; all men; mankind is the body. It is "our body," the whole body of mankind. The same body the apostle refers to when he says, "Sown in corruption, raised in incorruption." I did think I would read something from the Diaglott in reference to that, but I will not do so. You can see what the Diaglott says yourself, when you refer to it again.

He referred us to Colossians 1:18. I merely wish to read the passage, that is all, "Who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." I do not believe that Jesus was the first born from the dead, in the sense that he was the first who was raised from the dead; but it is by way of pre-eminence. This is the sense I take it. Jesus is the Mediator, the chief one among those that have died. The one having the pre-eminence over all creatures. Not the first fruits, only in the sense of pre-eminence, that is all. There is not the first reason for believing it in any other sense. Thousands had been raised before him, if your theory be true. If your Book of Mormon does not teach that all mankind from Adam up to the year before Christ had been resurrected—

Elder Forscutt interrupting, "Some of them after Christ, not before."

Elder Shinn resuming. Well, it teaches it before. I have it marked and paged. It certainly does teach it. Those who live in glass houses ought to be careful how they throw stones, or they will get their windows broken. The brother seems disposed to throw odium upon me because I am a Universalist. I do not think that is altogether right, my brother. If I was disposed to, I could throw a good deal of odium upon you before this congregation. He tries to make it out, that the wicked, according to my theory, are better off than the righteous. You know that I have been teaching that all mankind are strictly rewarded according to their works. The Universalists believe that all mankind are rewarded according to their works. Do not try to misrepresent me any more.

My friend teaches that the wicked, as well as the righteous, will all be raised. But he says, "If the progressive resurrection be true." The progressive resurrection is true. I have shown you some testimony in regard to that, and will show you more in due time.

Lazarus raised from the dead. The brother supposes he was not raised to a state of immortality. Then, certainly, my brother, he must have been raised to a state of mortality. The brother would find a difficulty in claiming that was a resurrection to immortality. He wants to know of me where his spiritual body was, after having been brought back to his literal body. I reply by asking him another question, Yankee way of doing business. Where do these spirits dwell, after they leave these bodies, and go into the hereafter? I leave it there for the present.

Now do not try to create the impression that I do not want to have any body in the future world, because I do not want this old literal body brought up again. God bless you, I believe in a body, a spiritual body. Do not try to create the impression that I do not want any body, because I do not believe this animal body will be brought up again in the future world. I have asked you several times to prove in this discussion, that a resurrection of the dead, means a resurrection of the dead bodies. Why do you not make your points few and pointed?

In regard to the matter of a progressive resurrection, I continue my argument in that direction by reading 1 Samuel 28:13, 14:

"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."

There was Samuel, the same old man. Not with his old literal body, but his spiritual body. Well it is Bible, whether you receive it or not. I see some of you with a scornful smile upon your faces, and I expect you are thinking about Spiritualism. Well it is the Bible declaration, and shows that Samuel had an existence. He was seen by this woman and by Saul. The Bible says it was Samuel that said to Saul. You see he could hold conversation:

"Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, [says he in answer], and I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Samuel, Wherefore dost 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 us: for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, even to David. * * * 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."

That presents the idea of a progressive resurrection. He is not only the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, but all the dead live unto him; and the truth of the matter, after all, is simply this: at the time of death, "The dust returns unto the dust, and the spirit to the God who gave it," to be clothed upon with that house which is from heaven, which is a spiritual body but not an immaterial body, in my opinion.

I now reach my fourth counter argument. Immortality and a progressive resurrection are eternal truths. Truth of truths. God's truth is eternal. The sun is the center of the solar system, whether the uninformed believe it or not. The best brain, the best read men, the most scholarly men believe it, whether the uninformed understand it or not. Jesus' declarations are true, and because some one happens to not believe them it does not destroy truth. I will read John 18:37.

"Pilate therefore saith unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."

Mark^o you, Jesus came to create no new truth, but he came to bear witness to the truth.

2 Timothy 1:9, 10.—"Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality into the light through the gospel."

Then they are eternal truths of the gospel, and before existed through all the ages. God was the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Jesus did not create the truth of immortality. He brought it into the light, and demonstrated immortality to the world of mankind; therefore it is as true as the sun shining, whether people see it or not.

Matthew 17:1-3.—"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 them."

There Peter, James and John and Jesus from the earth; and Moses and Elias from heaven, constituted this friendly group. Some from heaven, the spirit world, and some having on their earthly bodies; and yet, according to the popular view of the resurrection, it had* taken place. Yet here was Moses and Elias holding converse with the Redeemer and the disciples. I read in this connection Mark 9:14:

* We think that Elder Shinn intended to use the word "not" here; but it was not in the MS.—Ed.

"And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus."

They were clothed upon with that house which is from heaven, with that spiritual body, Moses and Elias. Luke 20 : 37 :

"Now that the dead are raised, [this is the language of Jesus himself], 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 a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."

And the time is now. I read in this connection a parallel :

"Matthew 29-32.—"Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven— :

"Time" was called.

Just let me read this?

Elder Forscutt. "Certainly."

But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

Elder Forscutt's fifth argument:

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*³¹

At the closing part of our investigations on last evening, Mr. Shinn, having the closing speech, presented to us some thoughts which I propose to notice before I proceed with the affirmative of the question before us. And that there may be no mistake respecting the question which is before us, and that it may be known when we are speaking to the question, and when we are not speaking to it; that it also be known to the audience when we are keeping within the line of evidence, and when we are straying from it, I again read the proposition, "The Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave." *King James' translation* the standard of reference.

During the course of the last speech we heard on last evening, the brother contended against the doctrine of a literal resurrection from the dead, on the hypothesis that the body changes once in every seven years. In the first place, I do not grant the hypothesis. Able medical men dispute it, it is therefore not a tenable ground on which to base a theory; yet it is true, as can easily be demonstrated, that the body is undergoing a change. But instead of seven years being the time in which this change is accomplished, it is owing to the degree of activity of the body, and to the expenditure of its force or the reservation of its force; and the period ranges from five to twelve years; that is, according to the testimony of experiences as given in "the observations" of some of our best and ablest medical men who have written on medical jurisprudence.

The brother tells us that the body is not necessary for our identity, and then asked of me, "My brother, have you the same body that you had seven years ago? I answer, relatively speaking, Yes; but I answer, in an absolute sense, No. The gentleman may use the answers as he pleases. When he speaks to us of a person's identity, he uses this argument, that as we change every seven years, therefore the body is not a sufficient guide for our identification. This is the argument; but is it true as borne out by experience? I have lived now forty-one years in this world, and though I have past through six different changes, and have had nearly six different bodies, if his idea be correct, yet my mother would be able to recognize me, to identify me, notwithstanding the six different bodies his theory would make out I have had. But after all this theorizing about the changing of the body, and the argument that we lose our identity *here*, because we do change; yet it does not affect the question that in the

resurrection we shall be able to identify each other, notwithstanding the change we shall have passed through here, when the body, after being raised by the power of God, will not be subject to the changes to which it is subject in this life.

There are many things in philosophy which we do not understand; many things in our every day experience which we can not comprehend. Why then should we take uncertain philosophy to explain or repudiate the statements of the word of God? Why attempt to show that he will not raise us from the dead, because of the absence of philosophical evidence, seeing his word promises it shall be done? That which in nature was supposed to be accounted for a few years ago by philosophical evidences of a certain character, is to-day accounted for by philosophical evidences of a different character, and certified to with equal assurance. Truth is always philosophical, whether the developments of our minds qualify us to understand it philosophically or not; but that which passes current among philosophers, so-called, as philosophy, is not always truth. God, the author of all truth, has inspired his Son and his servants to teach the doctrine of the resurrection; and, though it may seem to be a summary manner of answering "philosophy" on this point, my answer to the objection of philosophy to God's word on this subject is, God has declared it, and he can not lie.

The brother asks of me, "Why do you not make your points few and pointed?" Why, my brother, I can not make them few, because I have so many of them to make; that I do not make them as pointed as you or I would like, must be charged to my inability; not to the doctrine I hold. That I do not make the points you wish me to make, is partly from a consideration for the well-being of the community, to whom I wish to present the truth, rather than what *you suppose to be my views* of the truth; and partly that I may not appear to be too personal in anticipating your views, in the remarks I make. As to the pointedness of the arguments, that I submit to the audience for their decision; Elder Shinn is not the judge. If we should judge each other very particularly, as to the pointedness of remarks made, I think I should have something to say on that; if it were to be investigated, I think I should be entitled to have something to say on that question; neither you nor I are the judges, however, so we will let that remark pass.

The brother calls our attention to first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, and seeks to make out an argument from that, which, at first sight, does seem to have some force. But let us look at it a little closer, and see whether it *really possesses* the force which it seemed to possess when he called our attention to it. He first said it is not the dead body which is sown, which is to be raised; and yet, afterward read for us from the thirty-fifth verse of this chapter, as follows:

35. "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? 36. Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: 37. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be."

In reading this the gentleman was careful to stop at the word "*be,*" and make "his argument" upon it, before he read the rest of the clause. We will read it as he read it, and then read it in connection with what follows, and see whether or not his conclusion can be properly drawn from it. He reads, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be," and then he stops and tells us that the apostle does not say thou sowest the body that shall be, but the opposite, "Thou sowest not." Hence, the gentleman announces, *this* old body is not the one that is to be ours in the resurrection. That would be quite a clinching argument, if, my brother, this did not depend on something else, or if something else was not given for its explanation. "And that which thou sowest,"—What did *they* sow? The body Paul told them of before. Hear him, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, *but* BARE GRAIN, *it may chance of* WHEAT *or* OF SOME

OTHER GRAIN." The apostle here, Sir, was presenting to them the testimony of a fact of their experience; which was known to and borne out by the experience of the farmers then, as now, namely, the sowing and bearing of grain. The grain seed which is sown, bears grain. *It* germinates and springs forth into new life. "But God giveth *it* a body as it hath pleased him, and to *every seed his own body.*" To have the seed sown without producing, would be fruitless, and would be no simile, no likeness of the resurrection truth. God gives *it* the seed, a new body; he will do so to man. Paul here simply refers to a physical fact, an experienced fact, to illustrate a truth by; and when the gentleman draws the conclusion from this that he does, he does that which the Scriptures do not warrant him in doing. I will merely remark that the whole statement made, so far as it involves the comparison of the sowing of a man's body to the sowing of wheat or other grain is concerned, if this be its design, it shows that the body sown is as the seed of the body that will be raised in a body of the same form, as is the grain which we sow the body of in the earth the seed of the future body.

Very strange, very strange, indeed, I admit, is the doctrine of the sowing of this body the sowing the seed of the future body; but still more strange, if indeed the spiritual body we are to have supplied to us is to be no part of the body sown! A very strange kind of sowing, Sir, in the light of Paul's theory. If the body rising be a spiritual body, in the sense in which you use the term "spiritual body," is the body raised any part of the body sown. As the grain sown is to bear grain; so is the body, by some mysterious agency, to generate, spring forth and be filled with spiritual life and power. This is the idea presented in the text.

The apostle tells us what *kind of bodies* we shall have, so far as their different characters, and their personality is concerned, and from his language we can plainly draw an inference in favor of our view of the resurrection of the dead: "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." This all applies to the sowing by man, and God's blessing upon it; inferentially, and partly analogically, to the resurrection.

The brother says we are sown now in corruptible bodies. Yes; but we shall be raised in incorruptible bodies. I do not know what force the brother sees against the resurrection of the body, however, in the consideration of this statement that we are sown now in corruptible bodies. I do not know how he understands the word "sown," and to what it applies in his theory. If by the using of this term he wishes to make us believe or to understand that it refers to the spirit within man, and that it is the spirit which is sown, I can not understand or gather the idea clearly from his argument. The Spirit, it seems to me, is planted in man; and as the gentleman wishes to hold me to the analogy in the words, as well as in the idea, I suppose he uses the correct word analogically; but I can not conceive of the idea, with the little knowledge I have of the process of sowing, that the spirit being planted within us, is our being sown, or that the spirit being planted within man is the spirit being sown within him; I really fail to comprehend the brother's view. The force of the comparison between this, sowing as sowing, and the sowing of grain I can not see. I do not know how much ground the gentleman thinks we will be scattered over in this sowing process, or in the rising in incorruption. If the apostle speaks of the sowing of the spirit of man within man, I must confess that I fail utterly to comprehend either the apostle's argument or meaning.

The gentleman tells us the same body is not to be raised, because of the statement found in the thirty-seventh verse of this fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, "Thou sowest *not* that body that shall be;" but that we receive a new body. Yet, just a little before this, he tried to make us believe that it was the spirit which was sown, and not the body. I trust he will try and make this clear to us.

We are again referred to Romans 8:20:

"For the creature was made subject to vanity,⁶ not willingly,⁵ but by⁷ reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope."

In reply to my argument that the creature here spoken of is the body, he asks, Does the literal body hope? It is *not* the body, if I understand the meaning or the force of the reading of language at all, it is not *the body*, the *thing acted upon* that hopes, but he who, or that which acts; and the actor in this case is God,—the one who had planted us in this condition of life, who gave to the body its life by implanting the spirit within it. If you believe that this being here called "*the creature*," is the spirit, and that it is subjected in hope, it involves both contradiction and absurdity, in my view, at least. Is the spirit "the creature" of the body? If the answer be in the affirmative, then is the body superior to the spirit, *its creature*; and our friend, in denying the resurrection of the body, denies life to the superior, the creator; but concedes it to the inferior, the creature. Granted, our view of the relations of the spirit of the body, and the relations of the spirit and body conjoined to the past, present and future, and we have a reason for our present earth state. "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, (was it the body that subjected the spirit?) but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." It is not the body that subjects the spirit; but it is God who subjects the body, and if you will receive it, the spirit also, in hope of their re-union and glory in a future state.¶

The brother charges me with trying to throw odium upon him, and makes the remark that "those who live in glass houses ought not to throw stones, for they might get their windows broken." The gentleman doubtless thought there was some thing very smart and clever in this; but it seems to me, brother, that *glass houses* do not need to have any *windows*. You might have left the windows out, if you had wanted to say something really smart and clever. The idea that I was trying to throw odium upon him! I would like to have him find any man or woman in this congregation, one of his own friends here, that will say I have in any sense tried to throw odium upon him.

In referring to the twenty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, I endeavored, from the statement of the prophet of the Lord, to show that the righteous should be restored to life, that the grave should give up its dead, that death should be swallowed up in victory, and that following this there should be a restoration of Israel to their own land, and that then the song of the house of Jacob should be sung. I also spoke of the condition in which Israel is to-day, and in which he has been for hundreds of years, comparing their present with the future after their restoration from their graves. I also made the argument that if in this life the people of God are suffering such difficulties, trials and persecutions as are in keeping with the legacy left them by Jesus, and if in the *next* life *all* the wicked, as well as the righteous, attain to the same glorious resurrection, and there is no distinction there, according to the gentleman's theory of the resurrection, between the wicked and the righteous, then is justice a misnomer. And I repeat it, and add that as in this life the righteous are suffering all kinds of ignominy and reproach, as Jesus said they should, if Mr. Shinn's theory be true, then the righteous are not so well off as the wicked are. I do not know

why, and I do not see *how* that *that* is throwing any odium upon the brother, or any reflection upon him. It is merely the answering of his argument by another which he has failed to meet. If we are to take it as casting odium on each other, when we try to answer each other's arguments, we might conclude there has been a great deal of odium thrown upon each other in this debate.

The gentleman tells us, unqualifiedly, that the Book of Mormon teaches that the resurrection of the Saints took place at the crucifixion. Brother, I have brought the Book of Mormon, and I want to hear that statement read from it.

Mr. Forscutt here handed the book to Mr. Shinn. On receiving the book, Elder Shinn turned over its pages, and said, "This is a different edition and I can not find it."

ELDER FORSCUTT. No, Sir, I am *well satisfied of that*; for it is not there.

Mr. Shinn quotes for us the testimony to Saul; let us examine it. Saul went to the "witch of Endor" to enquire concerning what he wished to know of his future,—and the brother brings this circumstance to prove, I suppose, (I do not know that I correctly understand him, but I think this was the idea), that when the spirit departs from the body, it is then en clothed with a spiritual body. Was not this the idea, brother, or do I misrepresent you? Is not that the idea of a future existence you wished to support by this quotation, Brother Shinn?

ELDER SHINN, in reply, "The spirit is en clothed with a spiritual body after death."

ELDER FORSCUTT. Very good. We will take the testimony here quoted by the brother in support of this theory, as found in the chapter the brother referred us to, 1 Samuel 28. We find on examining it that Saul had ceased to serve God, and that God had ceased to answer him by Urim and Thummim, or by dreams, or by prophets. And when he had ceased to receive favor of the Lord, when he could no more learn from him in any manner by which he had learned from him beforetime, Saul *then* went to enquire of the woman. Yes, Sir, God *would not* answer him, so he goes to—the—witch—of—Endor. She is here certified to have called up Samuel. But *was* this Samuel? *Was* this his spiritual body that was seen by the woman? *Did* Saul see Samuel? If he did, then we are not fully advised by the record, and his questions propounded to the woman are, to say the least, very peculiar. Hear them. Saul enquired of the woman, "*What savest THOU?*" And the woman said unto Saul, *I saw GODS ascending out of the earth.*" Saul pressed her a little closer, as she had claimed to see Samuel also, and enquired, "*What form is he of?*" The woman replied, "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." It seems that Saul never saw him at all. When this description of the man or spirit seen, was given by the woman, we merely read of Saul that he "*perceived that it was Samuel.*" Perception does not depend on sight.

Three years ago, I was witness to an illusion of this kind. Another woman, a medium, in whose company I chanced to be, claimed to see a relative of mine, whom she described, and described so accurately, that I perceived *it to resemble*, in all his external features and in every peculiarity of form, the person whom the medium declared it to be. She claimed to *see* him, I did not see him; but I know that the description answered in every respect to one who had gone from earth, and had I been a believer in or a convert to Spiritualism, so-called, I should without any hesitancy have declared the person she described, to be my father, for I should then, doubtless, have *perceived* that it was he. Learning from the word of God that fallen spirits can assume even the character of angels, I could easily believe they would, for the purpose of deception, assume the char-

acter and appearance of mortals; or I might have been deceived as easily as Saul, or Elder Shinn.

It was something like this in the case of Saul, at the appearing of Samuel to the witch of Endor. If the gentleman takes the position that it was Samuel that appeared, because he told Samuel the truth, it does not affect the question. If he wants to know how much truth has been told by the spirits of falsehood, I have a little book which gives samples of a hundred truths told by the spirits, and ten hundred lies told by the same spirits, on the back of them.

The brother quotes from Ecclesiastes, that the spirit returns to God, and the dust whence it came. It is true. The dust does return to the earth whence it came, and the spirit *returns* to God. The spirit does not die; and if it *returns*, it had been there before—it must have been there before, if “returns” be a correct word to use in this connection.

The body then, and only that, was made from the dust of the earth; and *it only* will be resolved into dust. It *is* resolved into its primitive conditions; it, and it only, dies, according to the gentleman's own theory; for he quoted this to prove that the spirit lives on. Therefore *the body is the only* part of man that does die, according to his own showing. If then the body is the only thing that dies, and there is to be a resurrection of the *dead*, I would like to know what there is that can be raised from the dead except the body which dies.

The idea of rising, as presented in the question of the resurrection of the dead, is something more than the mere raising of anything, it is a raising of something from the dead.

The gentleman quoted for us the testimony of some learned men as regards the meaning of the word resurrection. I am not so fortunate as my brother; as I have no books with me except my Bible and two or three other books. But I am happy to say I have one testimony here from a standard author of the Methodist denomination. He quoted “a very able and learned man” of the Methodist Church; I will quote one also on the meaning of this word. I will read from Mr. Buck, who is considered a standard author by all Christians, from Buck's Theological Dictionary:

“*Resurrection.* A rising again from the state of the dead; generally applied to the resurrection of the last day.”

Now, Sir, we will let the one author answer the other on this point, and there leave it.

When the spirit returns to God, the gentleman says it is clothed upon with a spiritual body, I want *the proof* of that statement. *He* wants to know where John is. “If John is alive show him to us,” he says; “I will give all my old boots and shoes to see him.” Now, Sir, as you maintain that there is a spiritual body, let us see it, or the evidence of it; we want to know something about it. Just exactly the same demand as that you made; but no argument. If John lives, his body was changed, and was made after the fashion of the eternal, by the change it passed through; it is no longer mortal. The spiritual body you say, is also eternal, made so by the change. You challenge our faith, I challenge yours; and I ask you for the proof, if it be true that the spirit has a spiritual body when it dies. I do not expect you to furnish any, however, any more than we will show John; they are both questions of *faith*.

The brother quotes for us the testimony of Matthew: “Behold there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with them.” Here he claims we have the evidence that these men had *been raised* from the dead. “We have here two from heaven, and four from earth that constitute this friendly group,” he informs us. Now then, if two from heaven and four from earth met there, supposing that it be so, does it argue conclusively that these two had spiritual

bodies? Certainly the brother knows full well, that the term Elias in the New Testament, is the same as Elijah in the Old Testament. He knows full well that, according to the scriptures, Elijah carried up his body into heaven, took his body with him. If, therefore, Elijah appeared in his body, the brother was arguing on our side in introducing him.

Now as to Moses. If Moses died, it is something strange that he should write the account of his own death. Writers have written histories of their lives, but whoever wrote the account of his own death? It is a good thing Joseph Smith did not write such an account as that; a good thing it is not found in what are specially our books. If we accept this account we must accept it on the hypothesis that it was either written by himself, or introduced by another into the writings bearing his name. The account given to us is this:

"Deut. 34:5, 6.—"So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor: but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

It was no doubt written by Ezra, and not by Moses. Though in one of the books of Moses, it was written *of* him, rather than *by* him. If God had inspired this record of him, he might have revealed the place of his burial, but unto this day no man knoweth of his sepulchre."

"And Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died; his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

Was this *death*, as we use the word, or death only to a mortal state—a change analogous to death?

I want the gentleman to explain to me one peculiar phrase found in the book of Jude; for we certainly have a right to some degree of doubt in reading the account in an unqualified sense. The ministration to which he referred us in Matthew was by one changed from mortality, yet having his earthly body, so changed as to be glorious; why not by *two* instead of *one*? If for some purpose Elijah was sent in a glorified body to minister to one in a mortal state, why not for the same purpose Moses be similarly preserved, and similarly sent, and John too? Let us look at the testimony concerning Moses. Jude, 9v:

"Yet Michael, the Archangel, when contending with the devil he *disputed about* THE BODY OF MOSES."

I would like to know what dispute they could have legitimately had about the body of Moses, if that body died, and was buried, as were the bodies of others. When the sin that visited the earth brought the penalty *death*; the penalty was due from all men, Moses included; if he triumphed over death, there was ground for dispute. Think you not according to this, that he must have received power over death, and that when this condition became due, which we call death, the adversary, being resolute to maintain his claim upon him, disputed against the sacrifice of that claim? If Moses died in the same sense as do other men, the same condition in which all men are involved, came upon him as comes upon all, and there could then be no dispute about his body. If Moses only received the spiritual body at death which friend Shinn says we all receive, what ground for dispute would exist between Michael the Archangel, or chief angel of life, and Satan the chieftain of the powers of death, about THE BODY of Moses? Reason answers, there could be none. Accept my position, that the death of Moses was a death only *to* mortality, instead of a death *in* mortality; a change of the elements of the body from a mortal to a glorious state, instead of a death or dissolution of those elements; and the cause for contention between Michael and Satan is found; the Scriptures are harmonized; the unity of thought in considering the object, supposable though unrevealed, why both who ministered to Jesus on the Mount of transfiguration should be embodied yet glorious beings,

standing in the same relationship to heaven by the spirit, and to earth by the body, that he did, when he was transfigured before them is established; these three formed a grand, triune representation of the glory with which God will crown humanity in its changed or resurrected state.

The brother quotes for us Luke 20:37, "Now that the dead are raised,"—"Time," said the Moderator, and Elder Forscutt ceased speaking.

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's fifth argument :

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a little remarkable this morning, that my brother should place himself on the negative of this question. I want this audience to bear in mind that his place in this discussion to-day, has been to take the lead, take the affirmative. I, not fearing to develop my theory of the resurrection; not fearing that my brother and all the rest of the world might know my position, have frankly presented it, and the result has been to place my brother on the negative side of this question.

It looks a little to me, as though he was afraid to develop his theory, and would rather discuss on the negative, and shows that I had done something in his estimation at any rate.

Well, the body does not change every seven years, he says. It has been recently discovered, that all the particles of the body except the bone, or two or three of the particles which help to make the bone, would be changed in seven years. Suppose it does take from five to twelve years, my argument is the same. If we have a new body every ten years my argument stands unanswered.

The brother has talked something about pointedness. What I meant by that, my brother, was I would be glad for you to develop your theory of the resurrection, that we might all fully understand it. That is all I meant. I do think you have been a little cautious in developing your theory of the resurrection in this discussion. I think this people think so also. He calls my attention to 1 Corinthians 15:35-38:

"But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"

Precisely so. That is the question at issue here between my brother and myself. "How are the dead raised up?" especially, "with what body do they come? Thou foolish man, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be." Here the apostle draws an analogy between the sowing of grain, and the spirit, or resurrection of mankind. The analogy being drawn from the grain he says; "Thou sowest not that body," not that same body of the grain you sow, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." Now, I reason from the analogy thus: Having declared, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." I maintain, here we have evidence, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." Now here is the body sown. What I said about sowing was, we are sown now. That within us answering to the germ in the grain, and the germ of the grain answering to that within us, which is to be raised. It is the spirit entity in man, not the body. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." I want my brother to remember that I make this argument here and emphasize it. I have an argument to present from the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians, as soon as I can get to it. I want to answer what my brother says first. I hope my brother understands me by this time in regard to the sowing. I do not understand my brother, that this sowing can be at death. Is

it common for dead grain to grow? When the germ is dead in the grain when it is sown, you might sow it but it never could sprout anywhere. You destroy the analogy forever in speaking of this sowing. The sowing is now in the living body, in this body. Now is the time we are sown.

Romans 8:20-23 I wish to notice: "For the creature was made subject to frailty, not by its own will." What he says the creature means is the body. Has the body volitional powers? Has the body will powers? The creature has. "But for sin, who subjected it in hope. The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that every creature groaneth, [Does the literal body groan?], in pain together until now. Not only they, but ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit."

The creature is that which has the first fruits of the spirit. Is that the body, the literal body? Does he say that of the literal body? "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body." I do maintain it is the whole body of humanity, not our literal bodies. I want to read in connection Philipians 3:20, 21:

"But our citizenship is in heaven, whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, 21. who will transform our humbled body, and make it like his glorious body, according to that power by which he is able to subdue all things to himself."

I have read from Br. H. T. Anderson's translation. Isaiah 25; I wish to make this explanation in regard to Isaiah 25:6, 7, 8. It represents the government of the world by Jesus Christ. When his government extends over all, he will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God shall "wipe away tears from off all faces." This refers to the establishment of the reign of the Messiah, the gospel reign, here in the world, and also to its final consummation. Now the brother would try to make you believe,—mark it,—the point of difference is as to the time of Jesus coming to be judge of the world. I called his attention to Corinthians, showing the end of his reign, and certainly presented my view of that consummation spoken of in Isaiah 25; at the end of the reign.

In Corinthians it is said, "Then cometh the end," at the end of the reign. At that time he "delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father, that he may be all in all." He then ceases to be judge forever, precisely where my brother says he becomes judge. A little difference between us you see in regard to that point. It might be well enough if he wants to work upon the negative of this question, to take that point of the matter and work upon it.

He tries to make light of Samuel coming up, and tries to get up a laugh if he could. Samuel being presented, he then turns and he blusters some about Spiritualism. My brother says he has a book giving some truths the spirits have told him, and many falsehoods. I believe that Spiritualism teaches some beautiful truths, and some falsehoods. But as it regards this matter, here in first Samuel, twenty-eighth chapter. It shows enough to induce a belief in a present resurrection, or a continuation of the life of the spirit. I do not think he could have been seen unless he had a body, and that passage says he was seen. He was seen, or the account is false. Let him settle the trouble with the Bible. The presentation of this case, indicates that they believed in a continuation of the life of human spirits.

I call my brother's attention in this connection to some other passages of Scripture, showing our view, the view of Moses, of Jesus Christ, and of David; that there was a continued existence. Of that in the case of Jesus Christ and Moses, Moses declared God was "the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." Jesus shows afterward that they were living; for he says that God was "the God

of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob;" and then says, "For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; *for all live unto him.*"

Ecclesiastes 12:7 the brother quotes. I claim that which I presented, that at death the spirit returns to God, and the body to the dust. I claim it is conclusive, it is plain, showing at the time of the death of the body, that the earth claims that which is earthy, and heaven claims its own, the spirit entity. The declaration is, "The dust returns to the dust, and the spirit returns to God who gave it." There the matter rests upon the very same foundation of truth. It was true then, it is true now.

What is meant by the dead. Brother, I would like to have you prove in this discussion, before you go much farther, that the dead means dead bodies. If you do, the point stands against you in this declaration, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be. The brother's body is sown, this is the literal body sown; it is now sown, and the positive declaration is, "Thou sowest *not that body that shall be.*" Now get it in if you can, that same body. But, he talks about John again. Would like to get up a laugh about my saying I would give all my old boots and shoes to see him. Well they are about all I have to spare. I think, however I am liberal still. I think there are others who would like to see John as well as myself, if he is now living. It would end this matter, as far as the first proposition is concerned, if you can only produce John.

He wants me to give proof of the spiritual body. I give proof from the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." I want to introduce second Corinthians in this connection.

"For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."—2 Cor. 5:1. †

What is meant by this house? "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." You can have a body. God will give you a spiritual body, a house which is from heaven. It is of the heavenly, because it is spiritual. This body is of the earth earthy. That which is to come is of heaven, is spiritual, it is heavenly.

I pointed you to the appearance of Moses and Elias. He blusters about that, and tries to make it appear simply because Elias was translated, Moses might have been. Makes light of the idea that Moses could have recorded his own death. Talks something about infidels. Thinks it must have been recorded by Ezra.

We find in the holy record, as the brother read, something recorded about the death of Moses; and if Ezra recorded the fact that Moses did die, that settles the matter, whether he was translated or not, my brother.

Then there was Moses and Elias, Peter, James, John and Jesus, four from earth and two from heaven constituting this friendly group. The disciples saw Moses and Elias there. They were clothed upon, I doubt not, with that body which is from heaven. If not, they could not have known them. They saw them, according to the record.

Let me call my brother's attention to another passage in this connection:

Rev. 22:9.—"Then said he unto me, See that 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."

Did not this angel possess form? Is it not a grand testimony of the Scriptures, that angels possess form? How did Joseph Smith come to know Nephi when he appeared to him, if he had no form. The truth of it is, he had a form, if Joseph Smith ever saw him. The truth of it is, the angel here had a form, a body.

"I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See that thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren, the prophets."

Then he was a person who had lived on the earth. "I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren, the prophets; and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." Work on that a while. That is all we have to introduce on that matter now.

I propose now to finish the development of my theory of the resurrection, to introduce Corinthians, fifteenth chapter. I shall begin with the twelfth verse. Now, remember, that this is in support of my view of a progressive resurrection.

"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen."

Look at that closely, my brother, and mark the language:

"If there be no resurrection of the dead then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.

So were the others that were dead at the time risen, and the fact of their being risen from the dead, was predicated upon the fact of Christ's resurrection. If he be risen from the dead, others are risen from the dead.

"And now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept. For as in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ, the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming."

Some translators say, "being as Christ is the first fruits." Mark you, Christ, in the order that will be here, is the first fruits; afterward "they that are Christ's at his coming." This coming when he will bring the dead with him, I understand this to mean.

I will read this again, and I wish you to notice this point closely, my hearers:

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

All are Christ's at his coming is indicated here. This coming indicated is at the end of the mediatorial reign, when he shall have accomplished the object of his mission, and constituted all souls pure. Then cometh the end of that mediatorial reign, when the kingdom shall be delivered up to God the Father:

"When he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifested that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, [What does the brother think the dead means here? The dead bodies!] if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily."

Now, I wish to be understood in regard to this matter.

Verse 35.—"But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. All flesh is not the same flesh; but there is one kind of flesh of

men, and another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. * * * So^o also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption."

I call my brother's attention to this now. I remark, that there is nothing in the original answering to the pronoun "it." I have no objection, however, of receiving *it*, with the understanding that it relates to the germ which is to be raised. Let me explain. The whole theory of the resurrection rests upon this fact, "thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain." The "it" represents the part of the grain which germinates and springs forth. "It is sown in corruption." The "it" answering to what becomes unfolded in the plant. "Raised in incorruption." The brother can certainly understand this. If the sowing be at death, you would have to have it that matter was raised in glory. Sown in weakness," matter, raised in power; sown animal matter, raised a spiritual body." That is certainly my understanding of that matter.

The body here spoken of, according to my understanding of the matter, is the natural, animal body. "There is a natural body." It is an animal body in fact, which is a better translation. "And there is a spiritual body." I doubt not myself, that Elias was clothed in that spiritual body at the time he was translated. The angels that have come from heaven to earth, have been clothed upon with that house from heaven; that spiritual body. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." I will read in this connection. †

Phil. 1:23, 24.—"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."

You remember the evidence that I introduced in this connection from Corinthians 12, "I knew a man above fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body I can not tell," showing that *the* man, the spirit entity might be in the body or out of the body. "Such an one was caught up to the third heaven." Other testimony I introduced in that connection, and called my brother's attention especially in Corinthians 15:35-38, "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come?" And the declaration, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." One other point I want to notice.

Elder Shinn's half hour had expired; and "Time," from the Moderator prevented further speech.

Elder Forscutt proceeded with his sixth argument.

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother does not seem to feel pleased that I am taking what he calls the negative in this discussion. He does not like my answering and removing his objections; this is the secret. He says I am moving very cautiously. True; I am. I expect to move cautiously in the things of God. I think we ought to be cautious, very cautious in these things. I shall not notice this time but very little of what has been said by him, but proceed to unfold our own theory, as he wishes us to do.

The cases of Moses and Elias I leave. The question about the angel coming to John I leave. The question about angels appearing in ancient times I leave, and simply state, that as much as the brother believes it, so much more do I believe it, and so does the Church I represent. But one thought I would give here, which may be new to the brother, in relation to our faith, and that is this: There is a possibility of spirit existence without a body of any sort. He says the spirit *must* be en clothed in form. We believe the spirit *itself* has a form, and that the spirit within man is of the form of the body of man, in every particular; so far as relates to its individuality, its size, and its general features,

it is in appearance, to those in its sphere, the same as the body is to those on earth.

My third proposition is this: *Unless the doctrine of the resurrection be true, the promises of both the Abrahamic and the Christian covenants will fail.*

In regard to the Abrahamic covenant, I will simply observe, and leave my brother to refute me if he can,—

Firstly; that God made to Abraham certain distinct promises, representing inheritance in the land of Palestine; that he again made to Isaac and Jacob those same promises, and repeated them or renewed them to others in Israel.

Secondly; that those promises never were realized; that Abraham himself was a stranger in the land; that he never did inherit it; though God had said, *"The land whereon thou standest will I give to thee for an inheritance,"* etc., and on this base the argument that if there be no resurrection of the dead, that they may be restored to the land which God promised they should inherit, then will the promise of God fail, so far as the Abrahamic covenant is concerned.

It will not do for our friend to change the location from Palestine to heaven; God did not say that inheritance should be in heaven, but on *"this land,"*—*"the land whereon thou standest."* Unless the children of Israel are restored to the body, so that they can inherit that land, then will this promise have failed.

In relation to the promises of the Christian covenant. God made specific promises to the believers, as a people, through Jesus and the apostles; among the rest of them, is that of Jesus Christ found in the fifth chapter of Matthew, and fifth verse, *"Blessed are the meek: FOR they shall inherit the earth."* This is a promise of Jesus Christ, the highest and "best developed" spiritual being in heaven or on earth, the Father only excepted; and however materialistic it may appear, it is a promise in the Christian covenant. There are also other promises and prophecies which our brother has quoted, which, we believe, never can be realized, unless the body be restored to life.

Proposition 4th. *The righteous will be raised to glory; the wicked, to condemnation.*

The gentleman wants me to state distinctly, *what* will be raised. I have already said it is the body. I repeated it this morning, and now again. *It is the body, and THE BODY ONLY* that shall be restored to life. By the arguments of yesterday, it can be plainly seen where I stand. I said then it was the body; and that as the body is now "quickened" by blood; so then it will be quickened by Spirit. I quoted, I think, first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter.

The brother seems to have gathered the idea himself, and tries to convey that idea to us, that the body in the resurrection will be a spiritual body, and that therefore it shall be, if not immaterial, so nearly so that it may be seen or may be not seen at pleasure, as Samuel was when brought up by the "witch of Endor," when he could be seen only by the woman, while Saul, the man there, could not see him. That is his view.

Our view is that the righteous will have a spiritual body like the body which Jesus had. This body was essentially a spiritual body, yet the body raised from the dead was the same body that he had in mortality. It was a spiritualized body; filled with the Spirit of God. The central governing Spirit who rules in heaven is God. He is a Spirit; yet he has personality. Jesus is the express image of his *person*, and his body, therefore, was a spiritual body. It was governed by spiritual influence; it had spiritual life infused into it; it was purely spiritual in all its aspirations; all its thoughts, all its powers were spiritual; and, therefore, it was a spiritual body. It was, however, none the less a real, tangible body, as evidenced by the testimony, (a testimony never

borne about Samuel, Elder Shinn's prototype), "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. The testimony teaches us, that though it was clearly a spiritual body, it was also a material body, equally as material as when it was in mortality. It was a body of matter still, but it had more power, because the true force was within it.

There are secondary forces in nature which operate upon matter with a wondrous power; electricity for instance. Introduce a little superabundant electricity into this room, and it will be instantly manifest in its effects. Increase the volume, and the room will tremble; augment it still, and its parts will separate; add to it again, and it will crumble to atoms. All forces are governed by the same laws; but the spirit force is higher than all, governs all.

The Spirit of God is the controller of this force; aye, the very essence of power over all substance. This Spirit, when infused into a body, can transport it from realm to realm, though the body be as material and as heavy as now. Nothing in the world can hinder its operations. By that Spirit we are to be raised.

The apostle reasons in the quotation read by my brother, twelfth verse:

"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

He presents here an argument for me. I thank my brother for, part of the time, helping me with my subject.

"13. But if there be no *resurrection of THE DEAD*, [Paul says], then is Christ not risen: 14. And if Christ be not risen, *then* is our preaching vain, and *your faith* is also vain. 15. Yea, and we are found *false witnesses* of God; *because we have testified* of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, *if so be that the dead rise not.*"

If the dead rise not, if the doctrine of the resurrection be not true, these five results are to follow:

FIRST, *Our preaching is vain;*

SECOND, *Your faith is also vain;*

THIRD, *Ye are yet in your sins; i. e., have no spiritual life;*

FOURTH, *We are found false witnesses;*

FIFTH, *All who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*

These five conclusions are inevitable, provided there be no resurrection of the dead, and sad indeed is man's condition. The apostle's method here is the logician's *reductio ad absurdum*, that is, proving a proposition by showing the opposite to lead to irrational conclusions, literally reducing it to an absurdity; and well does he do this.

Provided too, that there is no literal resurrection of the body; provided that the body had on earth is no more to be restored; then, indeed, may we ask the questions, Are our resurrected bodies to be like unto the body of Christ? Are there to be the same conditions attaching to them as to his? If not, the Christian promises fail too.

Turn to the testimony read yesterday evening from Luke 24:36-44, and you will see that the argument can be very clearly drawn from it that I presented last evening:

"And as they then spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. (37) But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. (38) And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? (39) 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. (40) And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet. (41) And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? (42) And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish and of a honey comb. (43) And he took it, and did eat before them."

The body of Jesus was exactly the same that he had in his earthly estate, his mortal state, so far as flesh and bones were concerned. Ours are to be like his.

I think, too, as we gather from other evidence, especially from the testimony of Paul to the Colossians, 1:18, that as Christ "is the *first born* from the dead," he was the first resurrected being. Further, that if he is the *FIRST BORN from the dead*, and we are to be raised in his likeness, we too shall be raised; our bodies will be raised from the dead also, and raised in glory, if we serve him.

But I pause here to ask the gentleman, What was it that was raised? What was it that was dead of Jesus? Was his Spirit dead, Sir? Was there any of the germ principle dead, that you have spoken of, Sir? What was it that was dead? The body only. The only part about him that was dead, was the body. "If Christ be not raised," if the body be not restored, if Christ's natural body be not restored by divine power, "then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain." These sad results are to follow if the natural body of Christ be not raised, if it has not had given unto it new life from God.

The expression, "*first born*," would be a very improper phrase to use, Sir, if there never was to be another one born in like manner. It would seem ridiculous to talk about the first born of a family, if there was but one child born in the family. Yes, Sir, Jesus is "the first born from the dead;" and therefore, instead of your progressive theory being true, which teaches that the resurrection has been going on ever since Abel died, Christ was *the first* that rose from the dead;—instead of the resurrection having been going on from the time of Adam down to Christ, there were none raised before Jesus; no, not even Adam.

You promised, Sir, to prove from the Book of Mormon that some men were raised before Jesus, at his crucifixion; but, Sir, you can not find it in that book, and I expect you, Sir, to take that statement back before this people, or find it.

Again, in Acts 26:22, 23, we find the statement made that "Christ was the *first* that *should rise* from the dead."

How Christ was the *first*, the appointed *first* that *should rise* from the dead,—and this word *first* is properly used here, for the Holy Spirit certainly used correct language, certainly did not aim to deceive,—how then this word should be used in reference to Christ first rising from the dead, and yet there is never to be another that shall rise, is a mystery for Elder Shinn to solve. If Christ is to be the only one that shall rise from the dead; if his body, and *his only* will be restored, why is this statement made that Christ should be *the first* that should rise from the dead? If he is the first, there will be, or has been, a second and a third, and there may be millions, for he is called "the first born among many brethren."

John, in the sixth chapter, thirty-ninth to forty-fifth verses, which were read to you yesterday in my affirmative argument, tells us that Christ speaks of the resurrection as being an event that shall take place at the "last day." In order for the resurrection to be "at the last day;" of course it would be after this word was spoken, after this statement was made, "I *will* raise them up at the last day." It was a day yet future, clearly and distinctly future from that time, and a long time in the future, too; at the great day to be.

The audience will remember how Elder Shinn tried to twist around this last day question; but "*then*," at that time, then shall they see the sign of the Son of man in heaven; *then* they shall see the Son of God coming with power and great glory; *then* shall the dead arise and be brought to judgment. Each event in its order.

We now turn to the quotation that has before been made, from 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17:

"13. But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. 14. For *if* we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so*."

Here the argument can be made the same as in the fifteenth of first Corinthians, where the apostle says that "As in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive." Here we have it, "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so* them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." They which SLEEP in Jesus. Are these the ones you told us about yesterday, Sir, who, as soon as their bodies die, have their spirits clothed upon with a spiritual body, and return to God in this condition, without sleep? If this be their condition directly after death, it surely is not sleep. Enjoying the rich spiritual power and blessings of association with God, surely there is no sleep in that condition! What then is the sleep referred to? It is the sleep of the body. The body dies, it is then asleep. Sleep is a very proper term to represent the unconscious state of their bodies by. The promise of God is that as Jesus rose from the dead, *even so* them also which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him.

"15. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are *alive and remain* unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent *them which are asleep*. 16. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and *the dead in Christ* shall rise first."

Why are these two terms introduced? The first term is, "They which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him." Not bring all the world at that time? Oh! no. Not that Christ as the first fruits and they that are Christ's at his coming constitute all, all mankind? Oh! no. They consist only of *those who sleep in Jesus*. Not those who shall have perished in their wickedness, who shall have been rebellious against the laws of God; not they, but the obedient will Jesus bring with him. Those who "sleep in Jesus," are those who kept the commandments of God, those who glorified God in their bodies and in their spirits which are his; these are the ones whom God shall bring with him; these are the ones whom Jesus shall raise *from the dead* at the time of his coming; these are they who "shall rise first" from their sleep of death.

Now, take the second sentence or term, "And the dead in Christ shall rise first." They are dead in fact, as to the body; but they sleep in Christ, because that Christ who died and rose again according to the Scriptures, has promised to raise them up; they were baptized into Christ; while living, they lived to him, hence they are also said to sleep in him, and their dust, I believe under the promise here made, will be restored to form, new life be given to it, be infused into it, and it, as a living body, be clothed with powers of eternal life when thus brought again into being.

This resurrection, this "*first resurrection*," this "*resurrection to life*," is something to be *attained unto*; something growing out of spiritual conditions; something following the existence of spiritual life which affects us here; it is something to be attained unto by an observance of God-given laws.

I call your attention now to the fifth chapter and twenty-first verse of John, "For as *the Father raiseth up the dead*, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth"—"*all men*?" No, Sir. There are no such words there; but "even so the Son quickeneth whom he will," WHOM HE WILL. Perhaps the brother will tell us that Jesus "wills" the salvation of every creature in the world, and therefore wills that every creature should come with him. We will search and find out whether this is the case or not:

"For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. 22. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: 23. that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. 24. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me,

shall have everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

There are certain conditions presented, upon which we may pass from death unto life; if we honor these conditions, we shall be accounted among the righteous who will be raised to glory; but if we honor them not, among the wicked who will be raised to condemnation. The hearing of the word, not merely *audiently*, but *submissively*; (granted, of course, the opportunity of hearing); the believing on God, not merely assentingly, but practically, faith leading to obedience; the *possessing* already the Spirit, which is the power by which eternal life will come, are the conditions on which the Saints are said to *have* everlasting life; the earnest of it makes it sure, because the promise is, Romans 8: 11, "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwelt* in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead *shall also quicken YOUR MORTAL BODIES*;"—that is, they will be quickened by that same spirit. "Even so, the Son quickeneth whom he will."

I will now read the twenty-eight and twenty-ninth verses of the fifth chapter of John, and see whether we can discover the two resurrections, or resurrections to glory and condemnation."

"28. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which *all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice, (29) and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; [here is *one* kind of a resurrection]; and they that have done evil, unto the *resurrection of damnation*."

Here is another kind; that, Sir, makes two. If I understand the meaning of the English language at all, we have presented to us in this text, the two following resurrections, 1st, a resurrection of the Saints, called a resurrection unto life; and 2d, a resurrection of others, called a resurrection of, or unto damnation. The first is a resurrection of those who are dead in Christ, who shall *attain* unto the resurrection of life. And they who wish to attain to that resurrection, *must be* the children of God, heirs of God, for these only are they who will attain unto this resurrection of life; otherwise they will bear part only in the resurrection to condemnation.

And in support of this, Sir, I turn again to Romans 8:11:

"But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwelt* in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies *by his Spirit* that dwelleth in you."

Now, Sir, if you wish to know what kind of an argument I will make upon this, I will inform you. I am not going to argue that *this* proves that there shall be a resurrection of the dead; but that it shows that only those who receive the Spirit of God in this life, that only those whose bodies are alive to God, but dead to sin because of obedience, of whom Paul speaks in the preceding verse, have the promise that this spirit which raised up Jesus from the dead, should quicken them by that same spirit that resurrected Jesus. If the same spirit that raised up Jesus dwell in us, it will quicken these mortal bodies; and while it does so, it becomes also the *seal* of "the adoption of the body" which Paul waited for, and the *earnest* of our inheritance in a glorified body on a glorified earth.

And in connection with this, I read in the ninth verse of the eighth chapter of Romans, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. I understand that this applies also to those who have the Spirit of Christ in this life, and I draw the inference from it, and quote it for the purpose of making the argument, that those who are "dead in Christ," "asleep in Jesus," have the promise of being also raised in Christ; and that those who have the Spirit of Christ, and those only, are entitled to the blessings of "the *first* resurrection."

The twenty-third verse I also read in this connection, in which the apostle uses some very strange argument if he does not refer to the restoration of the body before referred to:

"And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the *adoption*, to-wit, the *redemption of our body*."

We learn from these evidences, Sir, that those who are dead unto the world, receive the Spirit of God unto life, "They are passed from death unto life," are become as you read from John yesterday, lovers of God and the brethren. But if the apostle be correct here, though they *had* received this testimony of the spirit, and *had* passed from death unto life, in a spiritual sense, *yet* they all groaned within themselves, *waiting for* the redemption of the body.

You tell us, Sir, that our body is in heaven. Will you tell us when that body was lost? Nothing can be *redeemed*, unless it has once been lost. Tell us how that body in heaven was lost. If we have one there, that can not be redeemed, for it never was lost; and it is surely something strange if we are to look for, and wait for the "REDEMPTION" of something which never has been lost. Strange that it should be said, we are "waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body," when that body never needed redemption. And these who waited, were those who had the first fruits of the Spirit that should reveal the things of God.

We also turn to Philippians 3:9-12:

9. "And be found *in him*, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. 10. *That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection*, [mark it, please, very particularly], and the power of his resurrection. [Why distinguish *his* resurrection from any other resurrection?] *That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his suffering, being made conformable unto his death.* 11. *If by any means I might ATTAIN UNTO the resurrection of the dead.*"

I see that one other translator has it, "the resurrection of the just," agreeing with the testimony of John. The apostle certainly had two kinds of resurrection in his mind, and whether this be rendered the resurrection of the dead, or the resurrection of the just, it does not materially affect the question. The apostle seemed to realize that *this* resurrection unto which *he desired to attain*, was a resurrection to the same state and degree as the resurrection of Jesus. And to attain unto this he was willing to sacrifice everything in the world, to give up everything else, *if by any means* he might attain unto *this* resurrection. Surely, Sir, even you will concede that there was present in his mind some special view of the resurrection, some special resurrection to be attained unto, for which he was willing to endure the sufferings of Christ, that he might be found in him, that he might receive this resurrection in Christ, and in Christ only. Certainly you will not argue that Paul had your views of the resurrection, in the light of such testimony as this; he certainly did not believe that the only resurrection attainable was this which all have, according to your theory, at the time of death.

Another statement, as found in the fifteenth of first Corinthians, twenty-second verse, is: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The brother understands that this is "even so;" he believes that all will be made alive in Christ. I understand it a little differently to my brother. When the apostle said that all mankind was to be raised in Christ who died in Adam, he evidently had in his mind the difference between the resurrection *that should come* freely and unsought unto all mankind, and the resurrection *to be attained unto* by obedience to God. This is evident from the twenty-fourth chapter of Acts, and fifteenth verse, where he clearly divides the resurrections,

and speaks of one as the resurrection of the just, and the other as the resurrection of the unjust. Thus by letting the apostle Paul explain himself, we gather his true meaning.

Time.

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's sixth argument:!

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I shall notice as closely as I can, and as lengthily as time will admit, my brother's points in his last speech.

He first calls our attention to the Abrahamic promise, and claims that the Abrahamic promise can not have its fulfillment independent of the resurrection of the literal body. That simply shows to me, that the brother is sadly mistaken in regard to the nature of the Abrahamic promise.

The great and glorious truth standing out in the Abrahamic promise, throughout, was of a spiritual character, as well as of an earthly Canaan, an earthly possession. There was a spiritual possession, or rather this promise spoken of was to be in Christ, as it is explained by the apostle Paul. This argument or talk of my brother's is a new view of the matter, this far, that it is fulfilled at the resurrection of the dead. I believe I understood you to say it would be fulfilled at the resurrection of the dead, or does he mean at the resurrection of the Saints. I do not believe this promise will be fulfilled, the one spiritual promise here made to Abraham, the promise of the blessing that was to come upon all kindreds, tribes and languages, until the grand Messiah's reign, and until all souls be constituted pure and blessed. That reign of righteousness extends into the future world, over the living and the dead, and Jesus will have to reign until all things are subdued unto him, as I showed from the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians. Then death will be swallowed up in victory, according to Isaiah, twenty-fifth chapter: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things," etc. I understand my brother to apply it to the resurrection. I understand the apostle Paul makes the same use of the expression, "Death is swallowed up in victory," that Isaiah does, in reasoning upon the subject of the resurrection of the dead. It seems to be the point all along through my brother's speech, that there may be one, two, or three resurrections of the dead. It may be at stated times, at stages or periods along through the history of the world. Paul speaks of a resurrection of the dead, but he does not seem to know anything about the multiplicity of resurrections my brother has been talking about all along through this discourse.

I will simply refer him to 1 Corinthians 15:51-55:

"Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruption shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Now the victory that is to be gained over death, is its utter destruction. The destruction of death, is the universal resurrection of the dead. After the destruction of death, there is no enemy beyond death. I think it would worry my brother to get in his second death, or fourth death beyond the resurrection.

Remember Paul is pointed upon this matter. He places the resurrection at the end of the reign of the Lord, and when he comes at the end of his reign, those that sleep in Christ will God bring with him. I remark that this is equivalent to saying that the dead shall have been raised. You will see the

force of that, brother. It is said he shall bring them with him. How could he bring them with him, unless they shall have been raised, resurrected?

I want to notice my brother's points as closely as I can, however. The Abrahamic promise. That part of it that is literal, pertaining to temporal things, I maintain has been fulfilled. What has all these dead bodies from the grave to do with it? Not a single thing.

He quotes, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," the language of Jesus. The brother yesterday made a quotation, "Flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God," and thought that that kingdom had reference to a future state.

The brother says it does not say flesh and bones can not inherit the kingdom of heaven. Does it not say flesh can not inherit that kingdom, as much as it says blood, my brother. I repeat it, Does it not say, "Flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God?" Yet, my brother, in order to sustain his theory, would say that flesh can inherit it, and he brings in electricity and puts it to work upon the body, and has it soaring from sphere to sphere. He is making progress. My brother is going up to-day. We may be able to go together yet, brother.

Well, he comes to the body of Christ, and he predicates the resurrection of our material bodies, upon the fact that Christ's material body was raised. I have admitted that the literal body of Jesus was raised from the grave. I believe that, my brother, most heartily. But that he is the exact type of our resurrection, as the brother has tried to make it appear, I do not admit. I showed from the progressive theory that Christ is raised, the dead are raised, it is something that has already taken place. Look here, now. Now as you have introduced this matter in this light, I proceed to say this, that he did not see corruption. That is different from us. We see corruption. Do not our bodies see corruption? Our bodies moulder away and return to their primitive elements, earth. I believe the body, the brother acknowledged yesterday, is something like all matter, changing, and is passing away from one body to another. He did admit it. I called it forth. If he would resurrect that body from the grave, he must bring back all those particles of matter from somewheres. He admitted that it returned to dust every twelve years, and therefore it is being constantly renewed. I remark that it returns to the dust from whence it came, and the spirit returns to God, and is clothed upon with that house which is from heaven. It is for you to judge who has the argument. The resurrection of Christ. Not only he did not see corruption, but he was there such a short time in the grave. Only three days. According to my brother's belief, these spirits are somewheres while the bodies are in the graves. They are somewheres, but where are they? He admitted in his last speech, that he believed in a spiritual existence as far as I believe it. And I believe it as much as you do, so we are agreed in regard to that matter as sure as the world stands. I have shown you here, that this type, Christ, is not an exact type of our resurrection. It cannot be.

He quotes Christ "is the first born from the dead," "Christ was to be the first fruits that should rise from the dead."

There was something said in regard to the Book of Mormon. I took down that. The Book of Mormon, page 553-4, and nearly down to the bottom of the 55th, teaches what I said it did. It was a book nearly the size of this one, but the pages are not the same in that book I notice, as they are on this one. So I have nothing to take back, and he bound himself in his letter to sustain any tenet taught in that book; and if that does not have some effect in regard to this matter, it is a strange thing to me.

The very place there, the very pages in that book I took down; and if it does not teach what I said it did, I am unable to understand the English language. I will never take it back. It tells us that all the Saints, from the time of Adam to the resurrection or crucifixion of Christ. That is the way I understand. I might have misunderstood it.

ELDER FORSCUTT here said, "I presume you did."

ELDER SHINN resuming. Very likely I did, but I have given you my understanding of it. I have no desire to misrepresent. I might have misunderstood it.

Thessalonians 4:13-16.—"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

I believe that all sleep in Jesus, and that God will bring all with him at that time. All the dead. For this, we say, is at the end of his reign, when he comes in person here upon the earth. The mediatorial reign of the gospel is ended. "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep." Mark you, "Them which are asleep." Wants to know if they have not been dead. I believe the word sleep is equivalent to the word death, in this sense; certainly I do. Does it mean bring their dead bodies when he comes, I want to know whether it was these, or the spirits. It has no reference to the dead bodies. All the dead are in Christ; but are not until the accomplishment of his mission, at the end of his reign. When he comes in person all the dead are in Christ; they come with him; with the Lord; God brings them with him. How will he bring them with him, if they are still in their graves, my brother? How in the name of sense is God going to bring them with him, if they are sleeping in their graves? You will have to go back to your Book of Mormon, and acknowledge that there has been a resurrection to get out of this dilemma. The truth of it is, all mankind will have been raised up at that time, except those who live upon the earth, and they will be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, as is spoken of by the apostle in the fifteenth of first Corinthians.

All the dead bodies shall have been raised up to that time, otherwise they could not be brought with him, and those alive upon the earth are to undergo a change, equivalent to death, and are to be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. Let him get in another resurrection if he can. The last enemy, death, has been destroyed by the universal resurrection of the dead.

John 5:21. Romans 8. There are some points here I wish to notice. I wish to notice John 5:21, "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." I told you this was a moral resurrection, and had its fulfillment in this life during the time of Messiah's reign. The coming forth to condemnation or damnation, spoken of in this chapter, had its fulfillment, according to the doctrine of the book of Daniel, in this life, "And many that slept in the dust awoke, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt. According to Daniel it was to have its fulfillment at the scattering of the holy people. Daniel, twelfth chapter. It has reference to a moral awakening in the resurrection. They that have done good come forth in the resurrection to life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. Same thought is presented in Matthew 25, beginning with the 31st verse. They that have done good have the welcome words presented to them, "Come ye blessed of my Father," etc.; those that were willing to receive truth, light and knowledge, went into the gospel kingdom.

Those who were wicked and rebellious, hardened in heart, and unbelieving, come forth to a resurrection of condemnation. Christ judges during his mediatorial reign, as I have shown all along in this debate. This is what I understand in regard to this moral resurrection.

He refers to Philippians 3:10, 11:

"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

Do you think Paul had reference to the obtaining of the resurrection of the literal body? Is it a fact that we have to work in that direction? I thought this eternal life, this future life, was a gift of God. I did not know that we could earn it.

But when is this to be? Under the gospel reign; under the Messiah's reign. This is what the apostle has reference to; for he says, "Not as though I had already attained, either am already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus."

This was the moral resurrection, my brother. The resurrection under the gospel reign:

"Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead and Christ shall give thee light."—Eph. 5:14.

Ephesians 2:5.—"Even when we were dead in sins, hath he quickened us together in Christ."

Mark you, "He hath quickened us together in Christ." All that the brother has tried to prove in regard to the future state of mankind, is useless. Now, right now, we are risen with the Lord. Now having been quickened together with him. This takes the force out of his text in Romans 8:11.

He admitted he did not take that to prove a general resurrection of mankind. He knows it would not do to apply that to mankind universally. It has reference to a moral resurrection. That is what it has reference to. Not a particle of proof in that in regard to immortality. But he has admitted this, so I don't know as it is necessary for me to notice that any farther.

Thessalonians 4 I have noticed.

Romans 8:20. The redemption of our body. I maintain it has reference to the body of humanity.

Colossians 1:18. Christ the "first born from the dead." I want to notice that a little. I do not think the brother fully understands me. I take the position that Jesus was not the first raised from the literal dead. If the brother can convince me, let him. I present a passage of scripture to prove my position now.

2 Timothy 1:9, 10.—"But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior, Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

He has illustrated immortality; brought it into the light. It is true, no matter whether men believe it or disbelieve. But that does not make Jesus create any new truth, as I told you yesterday. Immortality was a truth before Jesus came and entered the world. For God declared he was the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. They were living unto him. Immortality was a truth, and Jesus is only represented as being raised from the dead, that he might have the pre-eminence in all things. Not because he was the first that was raised from the literal dead. There are instances in the Old Testament of men being raised from the literal dead; but I do say to immortality. You can take that for what it is worth, I do not stake much on it. This other truth I do. I remark here. Immortality must have been a truth,

although it might not have been illustrated, brought into the light, as Jesus did bring it.

Acts 24:15, "Shall be a resurrection of the dead." Places his argument upon the tense. Now, my brother, at that time it was future; that is, according to my view. It does not destroy my view. It can not. The resurrection was not all past away back there. There shall be a resurrection of the dead, for it continues. That "shall be" did not confine the entire resurrection to the future, because Elias and others away back before Paul had rose from the dead. On the subject, too, of the resurrection of the literal dead, I would like to know how many resurrections you do believe in. At least two? I do not think you can sustain the proposition from the Bible of two resurrections of the dead. The literal dead I mean; those moral resurrections I do not refer to. I want him now, when he speaks this afternoon, to prove from the Bible, the doctrine of two resurrections of the literal dead. But I affirm here from the Holy Scriptures he can not do it. Jesus in his conversations with the Sadducees about the resurrection, Luke 20:30, makes no mention of two resurrections. Thess. 4:16, Romans, Corinthians 15 presented by the apostle Paul, do not give the idea of two resurrections of the literal dead.

Acts 24, I want to notice in this connection. Two resurrections he claims are presented here. That these that shall be raised, shall be raised in two different resurrections.

I claim it is not two resurrections, one of the just, and the other of the unjust. It is distinctly a resurrection of the dead. The just and the unjust are to have part in it.

The brother may read all that in Romans, and Corinthians; the ground of the testimony of the Scriptures I introduce here. I do not attempt to forestall my opponent, however.

I call your attention to Daniel 12:

"And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt.

Mark you, "*many*."

John 5:28, 29.—"Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Rev. 20.—"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again, until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

Now, my brother, I want you to take a position, and in the name of reason and common sense plant your stake and stand there. Take up Daniel 12, John 5, Revelations 20, and plant your stake there, you can take all of them.

One says, "*many*;" the other says, "*All in the tombs*." It says "*many*" in Daniel, and "*all in the tombs*" in John. He has taken Paul to prove the resurrection of the literal dead. I want him to take one of these proof texts, and plant himself down, and stand there, if he can.

"The first resurrection, the second resurrection," etc. As to the language of that matter I will look at that by and by. I know my brother plants himself in regard to this second death.

Jude 12.—"These are spots in your feasts of Charity, *twice dead*."

How much difference is there between twice and second. I read that the Revelator speaks of second death. Jude speaks of twice dead. Does not that

affect us in this life? He can not find any other testimony bearing upon that matter in the book.

The apostle Paul, who had shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, had preached the whole truth, said not a single word about the resurrection of the literal dead. If my brother's theory be true, the apostle Paul testifies falsely; for he says he shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, yet said not a single word about the literal resurrection of the dead. Let him bring forth his evidence from the book of metaphors, and see how much they are worth.

(Time.)

Elder Forscutt's seventh argument.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am somewhat sorry that I have to announce this, and the speech of my brother following it, as the last speeches in which arguments of a new, or un-presented nature can be presented by either of us without mutual consent, as there is yet a vast array of evidence, to the point, that I should like to introduce, and which I shall have to introduce very rapidly, which I must crowd a little just now.

I must, however, just notice one or two objections of my brother that he presented to-day. He has contended in respect to some expressions in regard to the resurrection, that they show that the dead are *being* raised, and that these expressions are in the present tense instead of in the future. Especially does he refer to the twentieth chapter of Luke, and the thirty-seventh verse. The words are these:

"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 a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."

All I have to say now about this being in the present tense is, that it does not convey to my mind anything like the idea it does to my brother's mind; because the evidences in other scriptures prove to me clearly, that the *time* of the resurrection was then considered to be in the far distant future. Beside this, if we are to be governed by the tense in this particular verse, we ought to bear in mind the testimony of Paul to Romans in the fourth chapter and seventeenth verse, where he says:

"Before him whom he believed, even God, who *quickeneth the dead*, and *calleth those things which BE NOT, AS THOUGH THEY WERE.*"

This is right to the point, right on the subject. God, who raiseth the dead, or who has purposed to raise them, or in whose mind the raising of the dead is present, speaks of raising the dead, although it be a thing not yet in being, as though it really was. He speaks of these things not yet in being, as though they really exist.

One more objection I wish to notice. The brother has referred to it some two or three different times. John 5:28, 29. He has repeated, two or three times, that it has reference to the *moral death* and *moral resurrection*. When he first made the statement yesterday, I thought surely he was making a mistake. I thought I would not answer then fully, as the brother would surely correct himself in time; but instead of correcting himself, he has again repeated it. I am forced, therefore, to again notice it; and in doing so, we will look at it in the light which it would present if we were to supply the word "moral" according to the theory of the brother and see whether or not it will read as in reason we understand it should read. While listening to this reading we must remember that there is a judgment connected with this resurrection; that Jesus is to

be the Judge; and that he is raising *the dead* and bringing them to judgment.

"28. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all who are in the *moral* graves shall hear his voice, (29) and shall *morally* come forth; they that have done good, *morally*, unto the *moral* resurrection of *moral* life; and they that have done evil, *morally*, unto the *moral* resurrection of *moral* damnation."

Can we understand the view thus presented as representing the thought of the one who uttered it? "Those who have *done good*," in a moral grave? The good, *morally dead*, needing a *moral* resurrection! All who have died and are in their graves, to come literally forth is not unreasonable; but the other view is decidedly so. If we supply the word literal there, it would not destroy the sense. Let us try it:

"28. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the *literal* graves, shall hear his voice, (29) and shall *literally* come forth; they that have done good, *literally*, unto the *literal* resurrection of *literal* life; and they that have done evil, *literally*, unto the *literal* resurrection of *literal* damnation."

You perceive the difference in the rendering, when you supply the word which makes it a moral death and resurrection, and the one which makes it a literal death and resurrection, supplying the words in the same places.

I submit whether the reading of it which gives with the supplied word the view of my brother, that with the word moral supplied; or the reading which is given without any supply, or with the supplied word, our view, that with the word literal supplied, gives most accurately the view intended to be conveyed by the Savior of a resurrection and a following judgment. After a moral resurrection there could be no judgment; after a literal resurrection there may properly be one.

The brother made an argument from first Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, which I wish to notice also. I leave out the italics to suit my brother's taste, as he does not like them when they oppose his views. "But some will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come?"

Here we notice two distinct questions. Question number one, "How are the dead raised up?" The answer to this question must relate to manner, answering to the adverb "how." The next question is, "With what body do they come?" The answer to this must pertain to the nature of the body with which they are resurrected, and not to the manner of their resurrection. I think the brother will submit to this as being correct.

"But some will say, How are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain; it may chance of wheat or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body."

The next verse I will not read, as the brother I am sure would not wish me to do so. 42v.—So also is the resurrection of the dead," answers to manner.

The resurrection will be by the power of Christ; some being raised *in* him, will be raised in glory, in honor; others raised *by* him, but not *in* him, will be raised to condemnation, *in* dishonor; for Peter informs us, 2 Epistle 2 : 9, that the Lord "reserves the unjust unto the day of judgment, to be punished," and they will be raised to "the resurrection of damnation," or as rendered in the Emphatic Diaglott, to *judgment*. It was to this first resurrection Paul desired, in his letter to the Philippians, to attain, the *exanastasin* of the dead, literally out of the dead ones, to which he had not attained, but which he was pursuing that he might lay hold of it. Those who attain unto this will be raised in the glory of Christ, and the bodies with which they shall come, will be fashioned like unto his glorious, risen body. How are they raised up? is the question, and the answer is, in incorruption. With what bodies do they come? is answer-

ed very beautifully in the forty to the forty-second verses, where we are told of the three distinct glories in which they are raised. The glory of the sun, the moon, and the stars. These questions, "How and with what body do they come?" are still further illustrated by the statement concerning the body, that it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." Yes, Sir, it is the body, I repeat, and only the body that "is sown in corruption, and raised in incorruption; *it* is sown in weakness, *it* is raised in power; *it* is sown a natural body, *it* is raised a spiritual body." We think this answers really and truly the questions how and with what body do they come?

One thought more. The brother has given us this, that, and the other rendering, and quotes for us considerable from the Greek. I have avoided quoting from the Greek all through the course of this discussion until this speech, except in reply to him; but just for the purpose of seeing whether the Greek sustains his view better than it does mine, I will quote from it for the rendering of the answers to these questions, and give the translation as it is furnished in the English interlineary translation of the Diaglott. "But will say some one, How are raised up the dead ones?" Question one. "O foolish one, thou what sowest not is made alive, if not it should die." "*All erei tis; Pos egeirontai oi nekroi; poio de somati erehontai; Aphron su o speireis, ou zoopoieitai, ean me apothane.*" "Some one will say, how are THE DEAD ONES raised up?" is the precise language, the words placed in such relations are as consonant with the English, and the answer is, "O foolish one; what thou sowest, if it should not die, is not made alive"—the exact language being preserved. How now about Elder Shinn's *anastasis*, rising out from the old body the elements of the new one, formed during life, as he interprets the word arbitrarily; that is a rising out of the *living* to prepare a body against death; but the apostle's view is, a rising of *the dead ones*. His *anastasis* signifies the same as his *exanastasis* in Philippians 3:11, rendered properly not merely a rising, but a resurrection out of, or from among the dead ones. This *exanastasis* was the same *anastasis* he had hope of before Felix, as recorded in Acts, twenty-fourth chapter, which was to be a rising or resurrection of the dead ones, both of the just and also of the unjust.

I wish to notice once more, but briefly, Elder Shinn's argument on the present tense about the resurrection, by furnishing him a few passages in the present tense to occupy his thoughts with. In Isaiah 25:8 we read, "Death is swallowed up in victory"—perhaps he will tell you the tense is prophetic; but I hold him to his tense argument. In 2 Corinthians 6:2, we read, "Now is the day of salvation." I hardly expect to hear that the day of salvation ended 1815 years ago; but he ought to state so, with his theory." In Hebrews 4:3 we read of Paul writing, "We which have believed do enter into rest." Will the Elder tell us that the present tense here indicates that Paul and the believers *then* entered into rest, and that there then was no future rest, as he tells us there will be no future resurrection? Even his favorite, "Now is the judgment of this world," will not stand the test of his own logic on the *tense* of the verb, even with his own church writer's explanation, that the judgment referred to was the destruction of Jerusalem, for *that* did not take place *then*, nor until about thirty-nine years afterwards. He had better abandon that position as soon as possible.

When the brethren advised me that my time was out this morning, I was quoting, or about to quote, from Acts 24:14, 15. The brother, I think, in answering that, made some very strange admissions. He says, "my brother is right. When Paul made that declaration, the term 'shall be' was a proper phrase to use." Yes, Sir, and if right *then*, why not *now* also? Jesus had been raised

up to glory, or had brought life and immortality into the light," as he quotes it. Jesus then had been raised seven years when this was written.

Now if all who had died had received their spiritual bodies then, in Paul's day, instead of writing they "shall be," Paul should have written, "They are being raised now as they die; and have been raised from the time of Adam down till now; for from the first the brother has urged the thought, at least he did so yesterday, strongly, and I do not know but he repeated it this morning, that the resurrection had been progressing from the beginning.

But, Sir, if the resurrection had been progressing from the beginning, and Christ was the first fruits only in the sense of his having the pre-eminence, what a pity that you were not there to prevent him from making such a mistake then! Or if Christ was not the "*first fruits*," "*the first born*," what a pity you were not there to correct the mistake when made, right at that time. Paul tells us that he was "*the first born of every creature*," "*the first born from the dead*," and that of him the prophets bore witness that he should be the *first* that should rise from the dead." If you are disposed to believe the inspired apostle Paul, this is strong testimony indeed. The fact that some were raised from the dead temporarily, or raised into the life that now is, does not affect the subject of the resurrection to the life that shall be.

I will now present the testimony found in the twentieth chapter of Luke, thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth verses, the testimony of Jesus:

"35 But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: (36) neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

"They are the children of God." What do you understand by this? First, these are certainly the ones that shall attain unto the *first* resurrection. The brother tells us about a general rising; and gives the idea of a universal resurrection in Christ. If his position be correct, I wish to know of what value a sentence like this one in the Bible is, "They which shall be *accounted worthy*," contradistinguishing this class from all other classes as "they which shall be *accounted worthy*?"—"accounted worthy!" Why such a phrase as this, if, as he tells us, all are accounted worthy. It is a useless one if there be no distinction, the one from the other. Paul desired *this* resurrection; all the apostles and holy men of old valued this statement, "They that shall be accounted worthy." It was a talisman, encouraging them to attain to that resurrection, to that world where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, where they can die no more.

The brother said something about the second death. There is no second death nor first death in our proposition. That relates to the resurrection of the body, but I will tell you what I think about it as here indicated. Jesus here describes a class who shall be accounted worthy to obtain a resurrection, and who shall not die any more; and I think it not unreasonable from this to infer that there will be some who are not worthy to obtain this resurrection, who *may* die again.

The brother, in speaking of the fact that I had produced the example of one who was raised to a resurrection into this mortal state, was very anxious to have me prove that it was a resurrection to immortality. I replied that I had not said that *that* was a resurrection to immortality; yet I believed there was to be such a resurrection, but had not yet made my argument upon it.

Here the statement is made by Jesus, that "they that are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection [that resurrection] from the dead, * * * shall not die any more." Does not this expression justify the idea that

some will not attain to this resurrection, who will die again, and *these* will not be raised to immortality. If this be true, how will the brother sustain the point, that the second death has reference only to this life?

I now call your attention, in connection with this, to Matthew 22:30:

"For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven."

In connection with these two quotations, I call your attention to Mark 12:25:

"For when they shall *rise from the dead*, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven."

The same thought presented, and in almost the same words. I have heard the argument adduced, that of all these three testimonies in regard to the resurrection of the dead, Luke is the only one who says anything about there being *worthiness* attached to a promise concerning the resurrection. I do not know what view my brother takes. Were there any one of the evangelists that wrote all the words of Jesus? I think not. But if it be my brother's *moral resurrection*, or *spiritual conversion*, here referred to, I would like him to tell us whether the morally resurrected do not marry.

The brother asks whether or not eternal life can be earned. "I always thought it was a gift of God," says he. So I, too, had always thought. It is a gift, brother, but it is one which, with the blessings belonging to it, are to be obtained by an observance of the terms and conditions upon which they are promised, and in this way only. God has placed these blessings before us, and promised to give them upon certain conditions; and we, in order to obtain them, must observe those conditions, or in other words keep the commandments of God. It is a gift *offered* unto us; but we are expected to reach out our hands and take it when it is offered, by an observance of God's law.

I think I will again notice the "Emphatic Diaglott." This time just to see whether the idea of the brother's, that the Greek is stronger testimony against us than the common version of the Bible on Luke, twentieth chapter, is correct. The "improved" rendering is, "But those deemed worthy to obtain that age, and that resurrection from the dead." Why distinguish by the word *that*?—"that age;" "that resurrection?" Are not these contradistinctive from another resurrection, from another age? If not, what mean the words here, "Those who are deemed worthy to obtain *that* age and *that* resurrection from the dead?"

"Οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῦχεῖν, καὶ τὰς ἀναστάσεως τὰς ἐκ' αὐτῆς ἐκγμισκόνται οὐτὲ γὰρ ἀποθάνειν ἐτι δυνάμει ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσὶ καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὰς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες."

The translation literally is, placed according to our manner of speech:

"But those having been accounted worthy of the age that is to obtain, and of *that* resurrection out of (or from among) *the dead ones*, neither marry nor are given in marriage: nor are able to die any more, for they are like angels, and *they are* THE SONS OF GOD, *being sons of* THE RESURRECTION."

It is true that all will be resurrected; but, as the apostle Paul tells us, every man in his own order;"—only the sons of God will attain to the glory of *that* age, *that* resurrection.

The brother referred to what I said about electricity. My object in speaking about that was simply this. I regard it not as a primal force *of* nature; but as a force *in* nature, as one of the secondary forces through which the controlling force, the Spirit of God, operates on matter. Our resurrection bodies will be material, and the world they occupy a material world. In that world all the "forces of nature" will exist as now, but in different, though not dissimilar, forms. The most powerful agent of this controlling force man has yet discover-

ed, is electricity; and in bringing it to your notice, my design was to indicate that however great its powers, those of the Spirit of God are so immeasurably greater, that it is but one of the agents of this Spirit. And as the brother doubts the *possibility* of a resurrection, I wished him to think it possible, as the resultant of this Spirit power, so immeasurably greater than the greatest power known in nature.

One argument that I heard urged by one speaker concerning the testimony we have read this morning from Luke is, that had it been of a very important character, then either Matthew or Mark would have presented it to us. The brother has presented the same kind and quality of an argument, in the statement which he has made to us concerning the testimony of the apostle Paul. Because Paul said to the Ephesian brethren who visited him at Miletus, "For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God," Acts 20:27, the brother argues to the effect, that if a thing can not be proven by the apostle Paul, it can not be proven at all.

Now we know that there are many things presented by some of the other apostles, that are not mentioned by the apostle Paul. *If he did* declare all that needs to be declared; *if* not one word more of the Bible needs to be declared except the verbal testimony of the apostle Paul to the Ephesians, for he did not write his epistle to them even till four years afterwards, *if that* contains all wisdom, all knowledge, all truth, all that is ever to be learned of God, some other questions ought to be asked and answered by the brother, such as,—Are his epistles to be rejected? Are even all his words, all his writings combined, and all his instructions by writing and by word of mouth to others to be rejected? The apostle Paul went among the Ephesians, and preached to them; but, unfortunately for our friend's position, notwithstanding he *declared* to them all the counsel of God, there is not one word of those verbally-given counsels that is left to us. Paul did declare everything that was necessary to be known by them as the counsel of God to them, no doubt; but there are many things which he must have presented to them and in his two years' preaching elsewhere, and all during his thirty-one years of preaching, that are not to be found in his writings. Paul did teach all that was necessary to be taught by him. He did declare all the counsel of God, the brother is right about this, that is all that they needed *then* to know of the counsel of God, all he had then to say to them; but to *confine* ourselves to what he has said to the Ephesians, or to any one, or all the churches, is quite unwarranted.

The brother in his last speech says he wants me to state definitely my position. I really wonder what he wants me to say. That I have, in a great many respects, stated whether or not I believe the body will be raised, which is the topic now under consideration, I believe you will all bear witness. That the dead are to be raised, I have proven; and I submit whether I have not, by the explanation which I gave of the proposition, and the evidences I gave, in stating my position, of its truth, substantiated clearly the proposition itself, "Resolved that the Bible teaches the literal resurrection of the body from the grave."

The brother wishes me to be definite still farther, and tell him how many resurrections there are to be. Well, brother, I can not tell you. God has not told us; and I dare not be so positive upon things which are not revealed as I would have to be to tell you that. What God has said I subscribe to; but that which he has not taught I can not teach to you.

The Bible teaches very distinctly, Matthew 27:52 and 53, that after Jesus arose from the dead, the graves were opened; it does not call it a resurrection, —but that which amounts to the same thing,—the graves were opened, and

many of the Saints who slept awoke, and came out of their graves. This does not teach the idea of a spiritual resurrection, the theory of the resurrection you advocate, but it declares that *the graves* were opened, and they came out of them. What came out, my brother, their real or spiritual body?

When Jesus ascended on high it was with *his real body*, raised from the dead, and quickened by the power of God. He left on record exhortations and entreaties, we have them on record now, to his followers, promising them that if they would heed them, that they should dwell with him. I do not want a resurrection any grander than being raised to immortality and eternal life, one in the likeness of the resurrection of Jesus, and this is promised. There is no other I wish but that; that and that only will satisfy me.

John 5 : 28, 29, was read in connection with Daniel 12 : 2. Before I quote these I wish to say that Luke 20 : 35 and 36, Matthew 22 : 30, and Mark 12 : 25 are parallel passages, or texts. Mr. Horne lays down the rule, "Where parallel passages present themselves, the clearer and more copious place must be selected to illustrate one that is more briefly and obscurely expressed." Luke alone has the clause making worth a condition to the obtaining of this resurrection; hence I use Luke's statement to explain the others by. Had not Jesus intended to teach that only those who are accounted worthy shall attain to that resurrection, called elsewhere "the resurrection of the just," "the first resurrection," the "resurrection unto life," he would not have designated them as testified to by Luke. To accept any other view, is to make Jesus a trifler, and Luke an unfaithful, an untruthful historian. These are the first fruits unto Christ, and they only who are followers of Jesus, will attain to that resurrection, and the glory thereof.

We will now quote the passage referred to. John, fifth chapter :

"28. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which *all* that are in *the graves* shall hear his voice, (29) and shall *come forth*; they that have done good, unto the *resurrection of life*; and they that have done evil, unto the *resurrection of damnation*."

Two distinct resurrections are here pointed out, whatever my brother may say to the contrary. A resurrection to life, and a resurrection to condemnation. I repeat it, "They that have done good, unto *the* resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto *the* resurrection of damnation." The definite article "the" goes before one resurrection the same as the other. Two distinct positions are occupied; two distinct affairs are to transpire; two distinct effects are to result therefrom.

I now quote Daniel 12 : 2 :

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Perhaps the brother will ask me to locate this resurrection; but God has not told me. I think there is nothing in the word of God that would justify anything more than an opinion in regard to this passage. There is a part of the testimony of Daniel, that would seem to justify the thought, that it might have taken place when Jesus arose; but the other part does not, so I can merely give my opinion; my view, and as that view is not the doctrine or view of the Church I am now representing, I do not wish it reported as such; you will recollect that this is only my view, that this resurrection *will* take place when Jesus comes again to reign personally. This view I present at my own expense.

The brother read again from 1 Thessalonians 4 : 16 :

"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ* shall rise *first*."

It is wonderful that the apostle should say, "The dead in Christ *shall rise first*," if there be none to rise first. Why should he declare that there is to be

a *first* rising or resurrection, if there is to be no second one? We might as well boldly strike this word "first" out, and have nothing to do with it.

"The dead in Christ" are those who have followed Christ in the regeneration; and these are to have the preference, a special blessing. These,—when ever they die,—these fall asleep in Jesus, and they will be raised, Sir, when he comes to reign, and they will reign with him too.

Elder Forscutt yielded at the call of "Time."

Elder Shinn's reply to Elder Forscutt's seventh argument is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to notice first, my brother's criticism on John, fifth chapter. He read it, putting in the word moral for me, because, I presume, I believe it to teach a moral resurrection. "For the Father judgeth no man." I affirm again, it is a moral resurrection. Now we will prove it from the word itself: "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."—John 5:22. There was a time when the Father judged the world himself; judged the nations "in the land of their nativity, in the place where they were created." By and by all power is given to Jesus "in heaven and on earth." He declares that he judgeth in the earth. When he is first established in his kingdom he comes to be judge of the living and of the dead. Now, under this reign, at the beginning of this reign, eighteen hundred years ago, when Jesus is judge of the world, in his reign he says:

"For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Is that literal? Is it not moral? Keep this in your minds. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, *and now is,*" at the establishment of Jesus' reign, over eighteen hundred years ago, "when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." That glorious work has been going on ever since Jesus became judge in his kingdom. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Remember all power in heaven and in earth is given unto the Son, "And hath given him authority to execute judgment," retribution also, because he is the Son of man. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves," *the* graves, graves of moral pollution, "shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation," or damnation. This is all to take place under the mediatorial reign of the Messiah, remember that. It is to have its fulfillment under the reign of the Messiah, who is to reign until all things are subdued, till all mankind are filled full of this moral life; and when all have received this moral life, then he is to come personally at the end of his reign, when he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father, and ceases to be judge, ceases to reign. He has accomplished the object of his mission. It is therefore a moral resurrection, because it is under the reign of the Messiah. My brother never will be able to show it has its fulfillment at any other time. He cannot drive me from the position I have taken upon this proposition, and which I have taken all along, that Jesus was to reign until he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father, and that then he ceases to be judge.

He refers to Acts 24:15. The argument is upon the tense, I believe. Paul says there shall be a resurrection. The resurrection was future at that

time. It was to be future. It was not all past. A portion of it was to be in the future. This is the understanding I have of the argument on "shall be."

Luke 20:35-38. I see he claims the dead will be raised at the coming of Christ. My brother misunderstands here. He thinks the dead will all be raised at that special time. I showed you this morning, that the true sense of it was that they should all have been raised. The declaration is, "All that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." How could he bring them with him, unless they had been raised from the dead. I proved to a demonstration that the dead shall have been raised, when the Messiah comes personally at the end of his mediatorial reign. Luke 20:35.

The brother has called your attention to the reading of the Greek translation, "Those who are deemed worthy to obtain that age," mark you, my brother, the resurrection is denominated an age, the future life of men, that period beyond this life is denominated an age. "Those who are deemed worthy to obtain that age," future life. How many will be permitted to obtain that age? My brother being judge, all will be. Paul being the judge, all mankind will be permitted to come in to the future spiritual world; "and that resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage." They do not marry nor are given in marriage, in the spiritual world, the resurrection age, "for they can die no more, because they are like angels, sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.

"Now that the dead *are* raised," mark you, the resurrection is in the present tense, "even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for to him all *are* alive." Stronger, brother, if possible, from the Greek than from King James' translation.

"*All are alive.*" This proves positively that all the dead *are* alive. To die is to only shuffle off this old mortal body, and be clothed upon with a spiritual body, with that house which is from heaven. But he speaks of Paul, about the tense, and the resurrection from the dead. That was not a resurrection to immortality. Philippians 3:10-12. My friends I will read it to you. I claim it is a moral resurrection. Now we will see: "That I may know him and the fellowship of his sufferings," he is speaking of Christ, "being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not^s as though I had already attained, neither were already perfect," showing positively it is a moral resurrection he is speaking of here, "but I follow after, that I may apprehend that for which I am apprehended." I shall present this in my recapitulation, and some other passages with it.

Matthew 20, and Mark, bearing upon the subject which he has read from the Diaglott. We will let that pass. Matthew 27:52, 53. I wish to look at that. It is new scripture, as far as this discussion is concerned. At the time of the crucifixion of the Savior, "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the Saints arose," mark you, "many *bodies* of the Saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." Now, my brother, you notice here, that it is but a partial resurrection after all, for the graves here is tombs. You do not know how many bodies of the Saints arose. If it is a partial resurrection, how can you prove it a resurrection to immortality? How do you know but what they died again? You will never be able to prove it a resurrection to immortality.

If it was a literal resurrection at all, then they may have died again. If it was a resurrection of the literal bodies, it was only a partial one. But you must prove it a resurrection of the literal body. This may have reference to a great many, to bodies, as the passage I have read. It may be divided and sub-divided, into bodies of that kind. It may not be literal bodies after all. "And came

out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." I notice the opinions of a good many learned men upon that passage of Scripture, and they do not place very much confidence in its being right genuine,—

Elder Forscutt to Elder Shinn. "Will you give the names of some of those learned men?"

Elder Shinn to Elder Forscutt. "I do not care to do so just now."

Elder Forscutt again. "I ask if you could, by courtesy."

Elder Shinn in reply. Yes, Sir, I will."

Argument resumed. John 5 I shall not notice again at this time; perhaps it may not be as well to. I want to notice something in regard to that in Daniel, that the brother called your attention to again. Daniel 12:

"And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt."

John 5 says, all that are in their graves or tombs. My brother has acknowledged that the graves here means tombs, at least so I understood him. Then I consider this is a partial resurrection. Daniel says, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt."

This is parallel with John 5, where it is said, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall come forth, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."

In one instance it is the "dust of the earth," and in the other it is "the graves." Graves of moral pollution, it does not mean literal graves. I have no idea it does. It means moral graves, and a moral resurrection therefrom.

Daniel 12:1-6. We pass on after it speaks of this resurrection, to the sixth verse, where a question is asked, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" Mark you, it is a parallel to John 5, whether my brother believes it or not. This fixes it forever as a matter of the past.

Well, my brother, I have just one question to ask in conclusion. In your last speech you have claimed that there was a resurrection of many of the Saints to immortality, in connection with the crucifixion of Christ. Now, if these were resurrected in their bodies, and the earth is heaven, where are those bodies now?

I have tried to follow my brother so closely in this discussion, and I have been as honorable and fair as I know how to be, that I have failed to get in many of my counter arguments. I present now, as my fifth counter argument, the resurrection of the literal body, is positively contradicted. First Corinthians, fifteenth chapter. The resurrection is compared to the sowing of grain. Man's spirit represents the germ, and the body represents the body of the grain that dies. "And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be." There is the point I want to notice. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, God giveth it a body as it hath pleaseth him, and to every seed its own body." 50v.—"Flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." These bodies are earthy, they are corruptible. They are flesh and bones and blood and muscle, etc., they are corruptible, and the declaration is, "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." This pertains to the life beyond this life, the brother says. He talks about the body being raised, and having electricity infused into it or something else, but here we learn that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Flesh and blood, mark you, brother. And again, 12:19, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Mark it, now. "But if there be no resurrection of

the dead, then is Christ not raised." See how strong it is here. The resurrection of the dead up to that time, predicated upon the fact that Christ himself had been raised. All the dead *are* raised. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Mark it, now. If there is no resurrection of Christ, there is no future life. If there is no future life, Christ is not raised, and all mankind will have no resurrection. But the argument is clear and conclusive, that all are raised, and proves progressive resurrection. "For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." Now, my argument has been all along that "there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The point is this. There is a spiritual body, and we will be clothed upon with that spiritual body. When we lay off this body, that spiritual body, represented by Paul as being a body from heaven, which is incorruptible, will clothe us. That we are correct in this, is seen from Ecclesiastes 12:7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was;" that is, this body, this corruptible. "And the spirit," the true man, the living entity, "shall return to God who gave it," clothed upon with a spiritual body, not the animal body. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be," but it is a spiritual body.

In this connection Luke 20:37:

"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 a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."

I will remark here, that the analogy used by Paul in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, is against my brother's theory of the resurrection of the literal body. He demonstrates the true theory clearly and conclusively, from the sowing of the grain. Grain is sown when it is alive. We are in the sown state now. That within the grain, answers to that within us which is raised in the resurrection. The old body, the body sown drops off, and returns to its primitive elements; the same as my brother said, this earthly body dies, referring to Ecclesiastes 12. It passes off, and helps to form other bodies. Let him bring back all these particles if he can, from all parts of the world. The body is changing, and once in seven years we have a new body. My brother says from five to twelve years. Then if he lived to be ninety-six years of age, he would have at least eight bodies; and all the time you have been living here, effete matter has been passing off continually from this body, and going unto other bodies, and finally at death the body is dropped off. The question is, my brother, if the literal animal body is to be raised, now in the name of heaven tell us which of these bodies you will take up again. Will it be the last one? or will it be the first one? I want to know which it will be. Will it be the first, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, or the eighth?

If you are going to have this animal body raised, it must be one of these. I remark that we must have some other body in the resurrection. Science and reason are against the resurrection of the literal body.

The old body returns to the dust, to its primitive elements, but the living, spirit entity, the immortal part of man, is the only part that returns to God, who gave it. It is the spiritual man, and that, only, that returns to God; but this earthly body goes down to the earth where it belongs.

Many, many, have been made to stumble, because they could not believe in a resurrection of the literal body; because it was contrary to reason. Why, then, try to provoke the world into infidelity? The days have come, Sir, when the Bible is supposed to be at least by some men, in harmony with reason. God would certainly never give an unreasonable revelation. Men are borne from one

place to another. Some are eaten by cannibals; the particles of their bodies scattered to the four winds of heaven. One body is passing into another body. The fishes eat a portion of the bodies, and they in turn are eaten up by other bodies, etc. So one hundred different bodies may have the same particles of matter in their composition. It is unreasonable to suppose, that all these will be gathered together again. There is no necessity for it. Identity does not require it, although my brother's mother would know him, who knew him several years ago. Perhaps she would recognize his voice, and would not have to look at his body. Something in regard to this matter. I know that for identity, this body is not required. My brother told you that we wear out the body in from five to twelve years. The theory is the same, whether twelve or seven. If our identity can be preserved in this life, when we may have from ten to twelve different bodies, it will not be required for our identity in the future world. "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. I want it understood that my objections are to the resurrection of the literal animal body.

This kind of a resurrection is positively contradicted by the Bible, by analogy, by science, by reason, and finally I object to it because it is utterly impossible. But the brother may say, that which is impossible with men is possible with God. I admit, that that which is impossible with men may be possible with God. That does not destroy the argument I presented in this connection. I do not believe that God has ever promised that he will bring up this old body. I suppose if a person should be lame, without a limb, that he would be raised up in this condition in the resurrection.

My brother has got to prove that the Bible teaches that the literal animal body will be resurrected from the grave.

Elder Forscutt interposed. "I beg to correct you, brother. That is not the proposition; please read the proposition."

Elder Shinn reading. "The Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave."

Elder Forscutt. "Do you find 'animal body' there?"

Elder Shinn. "It is just the same thing."

Elder Forscutt. "That is your interpretation."

Elder Shinn. "It is Webster's interpretation. He says the word literal means real, that which is not figurative. In that case it means animal, of course."

The moderator here called "Time."

It was announced to the audience that Elders Forscutt and Shinn had agreed that either speaker should be allowed to introduce new matter in his last speech on the proposition now under consideration; when Mr. Forscutt arose and entered upon his eighth and closing argument upon the second proposition:

Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have been both pleased and amused at the efforts made by our brother during his last speech. It does seem to me, that so far as his mediatorial reign theory is concerned, it is the one insisted on from first to last, notwithstanding it has been answered several times during the discussion; but I purpose to say nothing about this, further, now.

On the question of moral pollution, as the grave, I wish you to notice the brother's argument. He tells us, these graves are graves of sin and moral pollution. In that case it does, in the light of the Savior's argument on the death and resurrection of the body, it does seem strange that a man is accounted dead

and buried, while still alive; true, we are to understand it hypothetically; but the difficulty is this, and our brother must remove this difficulty out of the way before we can consistently give to these utterances a metaphorical meaning, "All who are in the graves are to come forth," *some shall come forth to life, and others to condemnation.* What! brother, come forth *from* moral impurity to damnation? To remain *in* pollution and be condemned, would be reasonable; but to come from it, and yet be condemned, is monstrous. And again, "they that have done good" to come forth from moral pollution! It is too absurd a proposition to come from a heathen, and shall I consent that the Son of God be charged with such folly? God forbid!

As to the question which I have answered once, that the body changes once in seven years, I merely again deny the proposition, and again repeat that the latest discoveries of science do not justify it. Infidels, philosophers, first announced it; and then others took it up, and adopted it. It is not an established principle in physiology; it is rather a doctrine than a demonstrated scientific fact, that the body ever changes in its entirety. Those who have argued on that point, have done so in opposition to christianity. It was first adopted in the French school of infidels, and was by them propagated, until it has come to be received even by some ministers, who are infidels on the doctrine of the resurrection. There is nothing in the history of man that justifies the idea. That the incorporation of all the material which has formed a part of the earthly body, is impracticable, I do not deny. That the renewal of the body in some respects, every few years, or of a portion of it, would, if all this material had to be restored in the resurrection, render the resurrected body a cumbrous vehicle for the spirit to occupy and use, I am fully aware. That the receiving back all that has ever existed in the corporeal body, and that only forming the resurrected body, would involve great and fearful-to-contemplate differences in size and volume, in the resurrected body, I willingly concede. But does the doctrine of the resurrection of the body necessarily involve the restoration of every particle that has ever entered into its combination? I see no necessity for it whatever, either in the statements of Scripture, or in the philosophy of the church I represent in respect to those statements on this subject. I have already intimated that the inheritance of the Saints will be this earth in a purified, and if you will allow me the term, a rarified state; if then the new earth shall part with its grosser forms, and only the primal elements and their chemical properties, such as carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, etc., be incorporated in the new form of the renewed earth, why not this be the case also with the new body, the renewed or resurrected body of man, as well as of the earth; and yet his new body partake of the elements of the old one, as does the grain of its seed? Man is now assimilated with the earth, his present home; in his resurrected state, he will also be assimilated with the redeemed earth, his new home. Harmony and adaptability are everywhere apparent in the appointments of the All-wise God. We may not know the *modus operandi* by which the resurrection will be accomplished; but the doctrine is taught in the word of God, and exemplified there sufficiently to justify our faith, and unbelievers only, infidels only, will disbelieve that word, and they are only infidels who try to throw away and destroy the word of God, which plainly and positively teaches that there shall be a resurrection of the body. Jesus declared, positively declared, that there would be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust; and though the self-wise and vain philosopher be an infidel to his theory, yet, notwithstanding this, God will be proven right yet, and the resurrection will take place.

The brother asks the question whether, if the Saints were raised to immortality in the day when Jesus was raised, and this earth is to be heaven, where

did they go to? All, Sir, that I read in the word of God on this subject, I believe; it does not matter what is there said about it, I believe it; and I read in that word that others were translated in the body, taken up to the place where God dwells. I believe, Sir, that the same God who could provide a resting place for those translated, could also provide one for those who were resurrected when Jesus his Son was raised, and yet believe too, the promise of Jesus, that "The meek shall inherit the earth."

The brother repeats to us that the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians teaches a progressive resurrection. I find nothing in it that justifies the idea that the resurrection is progressive; nothing at all. If the brother's theory be true, there would be no necessity for the raising of Christ at all. For he tells us that all are raised and clothed upon with a spiritual body, immediately after death. If that be true, Sir, Paul is wrong where he says, "*If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.*"

But it does not matter whether Christ was raised or not, if your theory be true; it is immaterial about Christ, altogether immaterial. If men are raised, and have been ever since the creation, as soon as they die, the resurrection does not depend on his power; Christ was only a partaker in the resurrection, and not its author and first fruits. The brother gives to us as the reason why we are raised and clothed upon with a spiritual body as soon as we die, that this is in accordance with a spiritual law in existence long before Christ. Will the brother point us to that law, or quote it for us.

I believe that our all depends upon Christ. I do not want any other resurrection than the one God's word promises to me. God's word tells us that if Christ be not raised, we are dead, lost, perished, and I believe *all his* word. The resurrection of the dead depended upon him, and he holds the keys thereof, as the first-born from the dead.

I now notice as briefly as I can, a number of scriptural evidences, by which I prove that the righteous will be raised first to glory; the wicked afterward to condemnation.

I. THE RESURRECTION OF THE SAINTS WILL BE THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

1 Thess. 4: 16.—"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ* shall rise first."

Rev. 20: 4-6.—"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they *lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years*. 5. But THE REST OF THE DEAD *lived not again until* the thousand years were finished. *This is THE FIRST RESURRECTION.*"

The brother asks me to make an argument upon my view in regard to the times of the resurrection. Here is the testimony, that the Saints shall rise first, and that they shall live and reign with Jesus, and I "dare to believe" it, Sir. I "dare to believe" anything I find given by inspiration in God's word. I "dare to do," yes, Sir, I "dare to do" anything God tells me to do;—anything. Here we have the testimony of God's word, that the dead in Christ shall rise first, and that the rest of the dead shall not live again, (you make out that they are living all the time), "till the thousand years are finished. This is the first resurrection. 6v. BLESSED and HOLY is he that hath part in the *first resurrection*: ON SUCH the *second death* hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

II. THEY SHALL BE RAISED TO THE GLORY OF THE SON.

Phil. 3: 20, 21.—"For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ who shall *change OUR VILE BODY, that IT may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.*"

Rom. 6: 5.—“For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in* THE LIKENESS of his resurrection.”

Psalms 17: 15.—“As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.”

1 Peter 5: 4.—“And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a *crown of glory* that fadeth not away.”

They are *crowned* to reign.

1 John 3: 2.—“Beloved, NOW *are we the sons of God*, [so by adoption], and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, *we shall BE LIKE HIM*; for we shall see him as he is.”

John says we shall be *like him*. He already has a body of flesh and bones; we then will have bodies of flesh and bones also. We will not have the kind of spiritual bodies our friend contends for, if we are “like him.” Jesus himself said he had flesh and bones, as we read to you before. Yes, it is the testimony of God’s word, not only that he had a body of “flesh and bones,” but that he ascended, and will descend with it too, and that “we shall be like him,” and it does not matter who opposes it.

2 Tim. 4: 7, 8.—“I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a *crown* of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”

Paul is to reign with Jesus, and a *crown* was laid up for him.

III. ALL WILL BE RESURRECTED; BUT IN THEIR OWN ORDER.

We might introduce on this an argument from the testimony of Ezekiel, 37: 1-12; but for the purpose of saving time, will omit reading it; and pass to 1 Corinthians 15: 22, 23, “For *as* in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive.” As we die in Adam a physical death,—a physical death, I repeat,—“*even so* in Christ shall all be made alive. 23. But *every man in his own order*: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.” Not all, *then*; but they that are Christ’s. Hosea 13: 14, “I will ransom them from the power of the grave.” Moral grave? No. “I will redeem them from death; O *death*, I will be thy plague; O GRAVE, I will be *thy destruction*; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.” Repentance in that resurrection shall be hid from the eyes of the Lord, therefore it will not be a restoration from moral graves; from which even our brother will tell us, repentance is a prerequisite.

IV. THERE WILL BE NO MORE DEATH TO THE RIGHTEOUS.

“And Jesus answering, said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which 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: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.”—Luke 20: 34-36.

V. THE RESURRECTION WAS THE HOPE OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

“O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me.”—Job 19: 23-27.

Ps. 49: 15.—“But God will redeem my soul from the *power of the grave*: for he shall receive me.”

Acts 24: 15.—“And *have hope* toward God, which they themselves also allow, *that there shall be a resurrection of the dead*, both of the just and the unjust.”

Talk about the just being in graves of moral pollution! Is this, Sir, a moral resurrection? A resurrection of those who are morally polluted? No, no! The just and the unjust alike will be raised. Those who have polluted

themselves, and those who are free from pollution, all will be raised, and brought to judgment; as in Romans 8:23:

"And not only they, but OURSELVES ALSO, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body.*"

VI. THOSE OBTAINING THE FIRST RESURRECTION SHALL REIGN WITH CHRIST ON THE EARTH.

Romans 5:17.—"For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall *reign* in life by one Jesus Christ."

2 Tim. 2:12.—"If we suffer, we shall also *reign* with him: if we *deny him*, [let all take this home], he also will deny us."

Rev. 20:6.—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall *reign with him* a thousand years."

Rev. 5:10.—"And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: *and we shall reign on the earth.*"

VII. IN ORDER THAT THESE MAY REIGN; THE DOMINION OF THE WORLD WILL BE GIVEN TO THEM, WHEN CHRIST COMES, AND AFTER THE THOUSAND YEARS' REIGN, AND THE LITTLE SEASON, THE NATIONS WHO ARE DEAD WILL BE RAISED, AND THEY WILL REIGN OVER THEM FOR EVERMORE.

Rev. 11:15.—"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever."

The wicked will rise to judgment, and to subjection. The brother wanted to know about this second resurrection; and notwithstanding his apparent dislike to evidences adduced from the book of Revelations, yet we notice, though recorded there, that death and hell delivered up their dead; the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and they were all judged according to their works.

By way of conclusion, I wish to call your attention, by way of review, to a few things. Firstly, Mr. Shinn has been very personal in his manner. First, I was the giant Goliath, and he was the little David with his sling and stone. David was to come out with his stone, and Mark was to go down. He started out with this; but it really seems that he was the one panoplied in the giant's coat of mail, with weapons and ammunition forged and made in the workshops of Greenfield, Griesbach, Wilson, Whittemore, Cobb, Goodwin, Clark, Campbell, Lewis and others, while I came armed only with the sling of faith, and the stone of truth, as found in history and revelation. You will all remember his boasting expressions, "I will show you," "I have before proven," "I have shown," "I am going to show," "I will let you see," "I am going to prove it again," "Let him prove it *if he dare*," "Let him show me *if he can*," "I will teach you," "I will *dare* you," time after time, speech after speech, all the way through; fret, boast, threaten, until I should have sunk beneath him, had I happened to be scary.

At the closing up of these arguments presented by us, I have not the time I wish to review the arguments; but I hope you will read the Scripture, and learn what the word of God teaches upon the questions we have discussed; for our position must stand or fall in this debate according as the word of God sustains or does not sustain them.

The proposition is, "Resolved that the Bible teaches a literal resurrection of the body from the grave." The Bible was to be the standard of evidence, King James' translation. But instead of following this, the gentleman has

quoted as much as possible from the "Emphatic Diaglott," as though it were the standard. I quoted from it in my last speech this afternoon, in reply to him, or I should not have even referred to it; but he has given us so much Greek, so many translations from the Greek, that if we did not know any better, we would suppose he was himself half Greek. He has brought forward the arguments of infidels against the word of God, to sustain his position. The representation of this writer is presented when favorable to his views, and of that writer as though they were infallible. Mr. Campbell is quoted, and thus is a bid given for the good will of the Campbellites; Dr. Adam Clarke's and Mr. Goodwin's are quoted, and thus there is a bid made for the Methodists and other orthodox churches; Mr. Whittemore, a Universalist, and Mr. Lewis also a Universalist, are quoted as learned men, and their views are given without informing you that they are his own church expositors; and these he intersperses with scriptural quotations, and strained arguments thereon, finally closing with an infidel argument to wind up on.

With myself, the resurrection of the dead is clearly established by the word of God. God has declared that the dead shall rise, and I believe him. I dare not deny it, since he has declared it.

The gentleman talks about a spiritual rising, a rising of something that never has had an existence, before it has the one he claims for it in the death state; there is no resurrection about it. It is impossible to recover that which never has been lost; to resuscitate that which never has been dead. The body only has died; the body only can be restored. This will be done; God will be glorified, and his word be established in the fulfillment of his promises made by the apostles and by Jesus his Son.

The brother presents for us the phrase, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," as conclusive evidence against the resurrection of the body. The brother doubtless knows the difference between a conjunctive conjunction, and a disjunctive conjunction; and yet presents to us the wonderful argument, that because flesh *and* blood can not inherit the kingdom of God, therefore flesh can not inherit it. Because the Scriptures teach that "flesh and blood" can not, does that prove that "flesh *and* bones" can not? Why, Sir, if flesh and bones can *not* inherit the kingdom of God, Jesus is lost; for he took with him his body when he went to heaven; the angels saw him; the disciples saw him; and those angels declared, that *this same Jesus*, Jesus with his body of flesh and bones, who had ascended into heaven, should in like manner descend.

If flesh and bones can not inherit the kingdom of God, Elijah, too, is lost; for he was taken up with his body. Enoch is lost also; for he was translated with his body to heaven. That flesh and bones can not inherit the kingdom of heaven, the Scriptures nowhere declare; flesh *and* blood, only.

One of our brother's strong arguments is presented to us in relation to the testimony of Job. I do not call it up again for the purpose of making a counter argument upon it; but I will read the testimony, leave out the italicized words to which Elder Shinn objects, and supply the one suggested by the gentleman's remark, that you may see the force of his argument: "And (—) after my skin (—) destroy this *small pox*,"—grand argument! "Destroy the small pox?" Yes, Sir, this is the rendering, with the Bible word omitted, and your wonderful delineative word "small-pox" supplied in the place of the word "*body*." Wonderful interpretation of Job's words! Job had the small pox, the brother said. Job's true words evidently were, "And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." And a grand utterance it was, Sir, too. Does your rendering improve it, think you? This small pox? Not a word about small-pox there. It is a shameful perversion. I do not know

that I wish to make any further particular argument in reference to this now; and I need not attempt to review so flagrant a violation of truth.

The brother wasted a great deal of time in the discussion, to show that we have an existence beyond the grave; and he presented his arguments to you upon this theory as though his opponent did not believe in it. He did likewise concerning the doctrine of angels and spirits. We also believe in them, and the brother knows we believe in them; aye, too strongly for him. The promises of God are yea and Amen; and the time will come when the angels can come to us personally, as they did to others in ancient times.

We believe all the word of God from the beginning to the end. There is not a principle, not an ordinance, not a doctrine, not a teaching, not a commandment, there is nothing in the word of God, nothing that the Saints believed in in ancient days, but we receive it. Whatever God has spoken, we believe it is our duty, as a people, to receive, and it is a part of our faith to accept it.

The brother argues that the body can not be restored, because there are some who are lame on earth, and they would come up cripples in heaven. God never made any cripples at the beginning. These conditions came from unnatural causes. These came not by the keeping of God's law, but by the breaking of it. When Jesus comes, the first law that he gave to man will be in force, and everything will be restored as it was at the beginning, and everything will be good. The present conditions affecting this body in mortality will be removed, and new conditions will obtain with the new life which will be infused into it. Yet every essential part of the body now, will be a part of the body then. There will therefore be no more cripples, no more lame ones then. It is a *lame* argument, Elder Shinn. The brother asks, if the body is scattered here and there, how can it be gathered up again. Almighty power can do many things which finite power can not do. The chemist can reduce precious metal to powder, scatter it among earth and refuse matter, and gather it again. God diffuses the waters from the clouds throughout the earth; but he gathers them again. Nothing is lost; nothing, elementarily, is annihilated; all therefore can be recovered. The wisdom of the Infinite is sufficient for both the preservation and restoration of the essential particles of the elementary substances of this body, and the embodiment of them in a form suited to the higher and better expression of the powers of the spirit which shall then inhabit it.

I see no difficulty in the way at all, only the difficulty of unbelief. An exercise of that principle which is commanded by Jesus, in his words to Peter, "Have faith in God," would keep us from doubting the promises of the word of God; and would enable us to know that he who hath promised, is able to prepare the way for the fulfillment of his promises. Will my brother hold, that because it is impossible with men, that it is impossible with God? With men many things are impossible, with God all things are possible.

He who preserves this vast creation around us, and the laws by which it exists; he who causes the sun, the moon and the stars to move in their proper orbits; he who preserves a perfect balance between the forces in nature; he who created man with all his wondrous endowments; he who has done this, and who preserves all things by the one through whom they were created, has also given unto that one other powers, power to perform other things, even to call the dead to life again, to refashion them, to renew the earth, and to make a new earth and a new heaven. The Holy Ghost, in the word of God, has promised that all these things shall be done.

Away then with the infidel theory of impossibility. Such a negative argument might be made on every subject. A thousand things transpire around us unseen in nature, that we might consider as impossible, did we rely on our un-

derstanding of them. Even some things that are familiar now, would once have been deemed impossible. The time was, and but a few years ago, when our fathers would have thought it a thing impossible, to have carriages go without horses or some beast of draught. That the elements of fire and water would ever generate steam that could be so applied as to furnish the power of transit round the world, would once have been disbelieved in, and laughed at. The idea of fire and water drawing thousands of tons of weight over land and sea, would have been disbelieved, and that such results could obtain from the use of these elements, would have been thought impossible. If it had been said some years ago, that iron would swim in water, the speaker would have met the same incredulity that Mother Shipton did, yet the effectiveness of the iron clads of advanced nations leaves us no room to doubt. This, though an age of advanced and advancing thought in scientific and philosophical matters, is far behind the earlier ages in matters of faith; but when those who now "contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints" shall have secured what they seek after; when angels shall again visit and companioniate with man as in days of yore, we may learn sufficient of the operations of the power by which the dead will be raised, to leave no more room for doubt on that subject, than we now have to doubt what our fathers deemed impossible. That which is presented by me, as taught in the word of God, may now seem impossible, yet in the great future, my brother, even you will believe the word of God; for it will be realized in the resurrection of the dead, by calling forth the particles essential for restoring the body, and either making it glorious for immortality, or bringing it forth to condemnation. The power of God, however impossible it may seem to you now, will be sufficient, and will accomplish this.

In presenting the arguments which I have presented, I have done so, as I doubt not my brother has, in perfect honesty. Whatever his mannerisms or errors may be that I have referred to, I have no doubt of his entire honesty in the matter. In coming to present these things, it was not of my own seeking; it was not of my own desiring. I have come only in the defense of the truth as I believe it to exist in Christ Jesus. I have come, because I felt that duty demanded I should come, and do the best I might be able. Under a sense of duty, I have done the best I could to present *the truth*, and to do it in that way that would harm nothing but error. If I have offended any one, in all sincerity, I ask for forgiveness; for I have desired to hurt the feelings of no one. My object has been to present the truth in the true spirit of truth. My ruling desire is to save souls for Jesus, and I know, as I know that I live, that in presenting the doctrine of the church I represent, I present the doctrines of Jesus; hence I call your earnest attention to the consideration of them. I am very anxious that you should read on the subject of the resurrection, and you will find that without it, the race perishes, and our hope is *lost*. If there be no resurrection of the dead, "All who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," is the apostle Paul's argument. The Greek word here, is *Apothumi*, rendered some thirty times in the New Testament *lose* and *lost*.

There is one statement made by Elder Shinn which I unintentionally passed, viz., that if Saul and his sons went to Samuel, the Elder wonders whether they were not like him, having a body. He predicates the theory of Samuel having a body, on the appearance of the one claiming to be Samuel, who appeared to the witch of Endor. I reject the theory, and deny the predicate. The "small-pox" of Job," the "witch's" representation of Samuel, the offer of "old boots and shoes" to see John, are poor arguments, Elder.

Remember that the doctrine of the resurrection is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, one of the six principles, one of the essentials of the

doctrine of Christ. Destroy one of the essentials of any system, and it is damaged; this is worthless. It is because I believe in the gospel system in its entirety; it is because I believe in the Bible, and accept all the promises in the gospel, that I have defended this doctrine of the resurrection.

I tell my brother I have seen the time when I thought very much as he now does. I tried to reason myself into the mysteries of the doctrine of the resurrection; but I failed. I then went on my knees humbly before my God, and asked him for help, and praised be his name, he did not withhold it from me. I am now as satisfied of the truth of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, as of that of faith, or of the son-ship of Jesus. Light shed its influence upon me, in answer to earnest prayer, to such a degree, that I am changed very much in my views on this subject, so much that in submitting the question of the resurrection to you, I am established in the doctrine; and like Paul, my hope is vain, if the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead be not true.

The resurrection of the dead! I have already sufficiently explained myself. It is a "resurrection of the dead ones," of that which is dead, and that is the body; if that be not raised, my hope is vain. With Paul, with the ancients, I feel that I am *lost, perished*, should there be no deliverance from the grasp of that monster, death.

We are told that Jesus preached to the dead, and the Bible gives the reason why he preached to them. This, brother, Jesus did say, as you have quoted, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." The very same year as that in which he uttered that saying, the Jews put him to death, and Peter tells us that in the spirit he preached to the spirits in prison, (1 Peter 3:18-20), to those whose bodies were dead, who died here; yes, in that very "hour," in that very year, the dead did hear the voice of the Son of God, and Peter says he preached the gospel to them, not only that they might receive the gospel, but that they might live to God in the spirit, and be judged as men are judged in the flesh.

May God bless his truth to your enlightenment and salvation, is my prayer for you in the name of Jesus, our risen Savior. Amen.

Elder Forscutt closed, as the "Time" of the Moderator warned him that his half hour had passed.

Elder Shinn's closing reply is as follows:

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I really do not understand my brother. I thought he manifested a little ill feeling; I think he was a little out of humor during his last speech.

Elder Forscutt. "Not at all."

Elder Shinn. He says he was not. I am glad to hear he was not very much out of humor. I thought from the stress he placed upon his accusations of me standing before you and teaching infidel doctrines, that he was out of humor. I tell you, Sir, that the doctrines presented here are not infidel doctrines. The doctrine of a moral resurrection, is the doctrine that was taught by Jesus Christ. If it is infidel to teach that the body changes, brother Goodwin was a tremendous old infidel. He must have been. A noted scholarly Methodist. What a noted infidel Dr. Hitchcock must have been, Edward Hitchcock, D. D., late president of the Amherst College. I will read an extract from him:

"The chemist can demonstrate that the body laid in the grave is decomposed into its ultimate elements, and that these, by almost endless transmutations, pass through, or rather constitute a part of other bodies; so that the successiveness of men that appear on the globe consist at least in part, of the same particles which entered into the composition of their progenitors. This makes it physically impossible, that the identical particles or atoms which constitute the body laid in the grave, should belong to the resurrection body as a whole."—Phenomena of Four Seasons, page 29.

So much for that infidel in the brother's estimation. Because we do not believe; because we can not believe, that this animal body will be resurrected from the grave, we are all infidels. How do you like to have that rung in your ears by my friend at the close of this discussion? The most sensible, and the most scientific men of the religious world to-day, have all gone over to the infidels. The brother is welcome to all that.

He talks about buncomb and represents that I took a great deal of pains to manifest buncomb during this debate. I do not think that looks very well after all that he has said about pinning me down. "O consistency, thou art a jewel." If you are dissatisfied with this debate, you can have the chance of debating it to your heart's content.

Elder Forscutt, in reply. "I accept it. Let it be understood that I accept it."

Elder Shinn. He says in this connection, that our religion does away with Christ. What a discovery! All these noted and learned men who agree with us, have no use for Christ any longer. Why? Because we discard the idea of the old body being brought up again. That is the reason of it. I will say to my brother, for a wonder, we believe in Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world, of all mankind. We dare to say it, and he does not. How does that sound, in comparison with his buncomb?

"A thousand years." I would like to present my view in regard to that entire revelation; but I will just read a commentary on the thousand years:

"There is some difficulty in determining what particular time is intended by the thousand years. The only aid furnished by the other sacred books in coming to a right understanding of this matter is, they seem to show that the number, a thousand, was used proverbially for *many*. Hence we read of a thousand generations for *many* generations; and one chasing a thousand, for chasing *many*. Again God says, 'The cattle upon a thousand hills are mine,' where no one will pretend that the exact number of a thousand is intended. We read also, 'A day in thy courts is better than a thousand,' to which the same remarks will apply. Lightfoot says, 'The Jews counted the days of the Messiah a thousand years.' And Auruch speaks of it as a thing of undeniable knowledge and entertainment. And so speaks R. Eliezer, 'The days of the Messiah are a thousand years.'—Thomas Whittemore, Commentary on Revelation, 20:3.

The thousand years, then, does not refer to an exact time, but only means some, or many. That is all there is about it. In regard to the exact time, I have my opinion that it refers to the reign of the Messiah here on this earth; to his kingdom here on this earth, and I believe I am correct about it.

He says because all mankind die a physical death in Adam, therefore the literal body must be brought up from the grave. I cannot see the analogy in regard to that. To be made alive is a new creature. The old creature is gone, and there is a new creation. The spirit lives on in the spiritual body, that house which is from heaven.

The brother finds fault with me because I furnish authorities for what I say. Did you not read from twenty authors?

Elder Eorscutt. "No, Sir; I deny it. I gave you what I said was the definition of twenty authors, and said I could furnish them if it was desired. I did not present the twenty."

Elder Shinn. "Did not you give those authors?"

Elder Forscutt. "I will leave it to the Moderators."

Elder Shinn. "Besides that, you have submitted other authority besides King James' translation."

Elder Forscutt. "Not until to-day."

Elder Shinn. "Well, that shows you have done just what you abused me for doing, and that is all I want to prove in regard to that matter." Resuming his argument—Finally, my brother tries to throw an analogy between the railroad traveling, and so on and so forth, and the resurrection of the literal animal body. In relation to this analogy, I can not see the point. He says this debate was not of his seeking. In relation to this matter, I have but little to say. The matter of the debate was stirred up, and we have had the debate, and that is enough. He has stood, however, nearly where I stand. What if he did stand nearly where I stand. Tried to remain there, he says, or rather tried to gain a knowledge of the truth.

Elder Forscutt. "That is it."

Elder Shinn. "I presume that was in Canton, about a year ago. I have some testimony here, from a lady in Canton. I do not know—perhaps it would not be very respectable to read it."

Elder Forscutt. "Perhaps you would better read it, or the people may think it is worse than it is."

Elder Shinn. "I do not do this out of any ill will or ill feeling, but just to show you why he stood so nearly where I stand now."

"One year ago,—the evidence is from a lady friend of yours, and from a gentleman also, both friends of yours, told me that Br. Forscutt, in preaching in regard to this matter, said that men died and were buried, and the grass grew upon their graves, from the material of their bodies, that this was nipped off by the sheep, and the sheep eaten by men, and finally confessed himself to be afloat. This was only about a year ago."

Elder Forscutt. "I believe that now."

Elder Shinn. "Perhaps he was not very thoroughly converted, was the reason he stood so nearly where I stand now."

Resuming his argument. Now I must commence my review. I have not time to get through, however. I will not be able to review all my brother's arguments.

The word *anastasis*, I showed, did not mean a revival of that which was dead; but simply signified a rising. I believe my brother has admitted, all along through the discussion, that the word *anastasis*, translated resurrection, did not mean a bringing to life of that which was dead. You know the meaning I gave, and the authors which I presented. It means rising, standing up, and so forth. Acts 24:15. He places his argument here upon the tense being future. I showed that the resurrection was future at that time, and that this did not destroy the theory of a progressive resurrection. Neither does it to-day. The resurrection is still future. Job 19:22-27. The brother argues that Job was to see God in his flesh. I showed you that he did see God in his flesh, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee." The brother did not want me to leave out the italics, and to strictly adhere to King James' translation. I told him that it would be against him still; for the

marginal reading is, "Out of my flesh." Isaiah 26; I showed you conclusively that this pertains to the nation.

Romans 8:20. The word creature there spoken of, that is made subject to vanity, is that which is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption. I think I showed conclusively, that it was the whole body of humanity; and not the physical, literal animal body we live in.

1 Corinthians 15:35-38. I called his attention to the fact, that "Thou sowest not that body that shall be," showing conclusively, that this old body would not be raised; that it corresponded with the part of the grain that died and mouldered away, and the spirit corresponded with the germ of the grain, and that that arose in accordance with the meaning of the word "*anastasis*," therefore, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be," but "God gives it a body as it pleases him, and to every seed his own body." That the spirit will be clothed upon with a spiritual body, "for there is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body." That spiritual body, I told my brother, was the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. It is of heaven, heavenly.

Ecclesiastes 12:7. My brother referred to this, and I also referred to it. The point upon that was, I believe, about this body returning to the dust as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it.

Then my brother quotes, "Flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God," and says that it means blood, but does not mean flesh. He says, it nowhere is said, that flesh and bones can not inherit the kingdom of God. I tell you, my brother, flesh can not inherit the kingdom of heaven. Blood can not inherit the kingdom of heaven. It is just as conclusive that flesh can not inherit the kingdom, as it is that blood can not inherit the kingdom. I have not a particle of doubt, but the apostle meant to show that this animal body, could never inherit the kingdom.

Abrahamic promise. I showed you that that part of it that was temporal, had been fulfilled to the Jews, and that the fulfillment of the spiritual part of that promise, would result not only in the blessing of the Jews, and will result in the purifying and making holy of all souls, which will take place before Jesus comes personally, at the end of the world, or at the end of his reign, when the living will undergo a change equivalent to death, and will be caught up in clouds or flocks to meet the Lord in the air, and then he will deliver up the kingdom to "God the Father, that he may be all in all." It is remarkable, that right where I believe Jesus ends his reign, my brother thinks he commences it. I read Thessalonians in regard to this matter. I showed my brother in regard to the body of Christ, that it could not be an exact type of our bodies. Christ was only three days and three nights in the grave, and we lay, according to our brother, a longer period of time than that. How many thousands of years has there been since the creation of mankind, and men have died and their bodies were buried in the graves. There is no resemblance between Christ's body being in the grave only three days and three nights, and other bodies lying for thousands of years. I admitted that Christ's literal body was raised from the dead; but what became of that literal body that ascended to heaven, I do not know, neither does any other man know.

The moral resurrection. I showed you that much that is said in regard to the subject of the resurrection, pertains to the moral resurrection of the believer in this life; represents his being made alive from the dead, and receiving everlasting eternal life now. Paul was trying to attain unto the resurrection. Phil. 3:10-12:

"Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus."

This has no reference to the resurrection of the literal body, but to the moral resurrection under the reign of Jesus Christ, as I have shown.

Two resurrections of the literal dead, I have denied all the way through this debate. I wanted him to explain himself. There may be a resurrection now, or there may be one by and by. A resurrection now, a resurrection then, and another by and by. I wanted him to distinguish the two. I do not think the Bible teaches any such doctrine. Paul speaks of a resurrection of the dead, of all mankind; again, he speaks of a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust. It is one resurrection, not a half a dozen. John 5; Romans 20. It would be partial if John 5 is taken, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves," tombs, showing that it would be partial. In Revelations two resurrections are spoken of, but not of the literal dead. That is not a literal resurrection, but a moral resurrection. It represents the reign of the Messiah on the earth, as I understand it.

Thus have I recapitulated my brother's arguments. Now I have a recapitulation of my own to present.

I showed first, in opposition to my brother's view of the material animal body, that man was first made in the image of God. That God was spirit, and man being in his likeness, the true man was a spirit entity.

I showed that man was given a form, that he was clothed upon with skin and flesh, and "fenced with bones," in the language of Job. I showed that this was in harmony with Paul, where he says, "I knew a man about fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body," showing that the true man was a spirit entity, and that Paul understood that he could live in the body or out of the body, and that he could be caught up to the third heaven. I showed you Peter's testimony in harmony with this, and drew this argument from it, that the true man is the spirit, or inner man. 2 Corinthians 4:16; Ephesians 3:14-16.

The spirit in the inner man, I believe to be the true man, a spirit entity. I also read 2 Corinthians 5:6-8, "We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." Mark you, the true man is to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord. Same chapter 1-4, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved," referring to the animal body, "we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, * * * that mortality may be swallowed up of life." This destroys the infidel objection against Christianity, and explodes the idea of a resurrection of the literal body. 2 Corinthians 4:8, "While we look not at the things which are seen," etc. Hebrews 11:3, "Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God, etc.

Then I showed you the testimony of others, showing you they had at least some idea of a future life. I showed you that Moses and Elias were living away back there, and that it was demonstrated to Moses at the burning bush, that all live unto God, according to the testimony of Jesus Christ. This is in harmony with a progressive resurrection, that "all live unto God."

My brother presented the view that Christ was the first one resurrected from the dead. I presented the theory that Christ came to create no new truth, but to bear witness to the truth. That he brought life and immortality into the light. That those truths existed before he came into the world, that they were eternal truths.

I presented as my fourth argument, that immortality and progressive resurrection are eternal truths.

I shall be compelled to omit further recapitulation. I would say to my brother in conclusion of the discussion, though we may have differed, I accord to him perfect honesty; and, my brother, I offer you my hand in perfect friendship at the close of this discussion. I thank you, Gentlemen Moderators, for the candor which you have manifested during the debate. And to you, ladies and gentlemen, who have so kindly listened to us, I return my heartiest thanks.

The inexorable call of "Time," closed the discussion as Elder Shinn yielded the floor.

Elder Forscutt. "Messrs. Moderators,—In behalf of the negative of the first question, and the affirmative of the second, I move that a vote of thanks be tendered to the Gentlemen Moderators, who have conducted this debate with such credit and precision.

The motion was put by the reporter, at the request of Elder Forscutt, and carried unanimously.

D. F. LAMBERT, *Reporter.*

Elder John H. Lake, of Farmington, Iowa, acted as Moderator in behalf of Elder Forscutt, and Rev. J. Hughes, of Table Grove, Illinois, in behalf of Rev. Shinn.