

is invited to offer to the readers of this work a chapter of correction. Meanwhile we quote the following from the pen of the editor, which will be found in his letter to us of June 8th, and published in the October issue:—‘My Spiritualism,’ says friend Newton, . . . ‘includes christianity, and is the elucidator and demonstrator of it; going further in the unfolding of certain departments of truth than Jesus and his apostles were able to go eighteen hundred years ago, for the reason that the world was not able to bear or to understand what is now made known.’ Let us likewise hear Dr. Hoyt, of Syracuse: ‘I have visited New York, and there found the precious boon I so much desired—a certainty, of not only immortality, but *the immortality of my dear loved ones*. I am now as sure of this one thing as I am of my own existence. Is not this a *pearl of great price*?’

From these sayings we deduce at least four Spiritualistic assumptions or positions: 1. That Spiritualism, speaking after the progressive style, is in advance of Christ’s religion; 2. That Spiritualism is so much wider and greater than christianity that the latter is ‘included’ in the former; 3. That the religion of Jesus is both certified and simplified by Spiritualism; 4. That the question of immortality is not certainly settled by the gospel, but by Spiritualism. If, too, we need other data by which to look with an intelligent eye upon the new doctrine, we may find an additional supply in the subjoined paragraph, which is part of a late speech by Dr. Hallock:—

‘Think you God’s work presses only upon the shoulders of twelve apostles? that the good of the whole is committed to the tender consciences of the few? Every ‘four-footed beast and creeping thing,’ aye, and the thing that cannot creep, utters its modicum of gospel, and whispers a divine truth into the ear of reason. Look into *their* Convention, and hear what *they* have to say on this subject of evil. They never lie—their language is their life. Look! one is food, and another is poison; one will preserve life, and the other will destroy it. Is not one good and the other evil?—is not food a saint and poison a sinner? . . . Poison is bad food, but good medicine. It plays a thousand parts in the grand drama of uses, besides that of destroyer. Inexperience forcing it out of the natural sphere of its uses, demanding, for example, that it shall do duty as food, insisting that strychnine shall perform the office of wheat, commits just the blunder which is the origin of evil! In this one example we have the exact character of evil, its undoubted origin and its absolute cure. The evil complained of consists of a disagreeable surprise communicated to the consciousness through the organs of sensation. The *cause* of it is ignorance of the