

THE  
UNITY OF MAN;  
OR,  
LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES.

A REPLY  
TO  
REV. LUTHER LEE.

*By Anthropos.*

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
1850.



# UNITY OF MAN.

---

THE Rev. Luther Lee, Editor of "The True Wesleyan," published at New York, having come out with an elaborate defence of inherent immortality, the consciousness of the dead, and eternal torments, it was thought that his position in his denomination, his standing as a writer, and his reputation as a Logician, called for a reply. The public will judge whether I have fairly met his arguments.

ANTHROPOS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

1. Mr. Lee proceeds to give us the properties of matter, and all he says about the essential properties of matter, is just as applicable to a stone as to any part of the human body. He gives us the essential properties of *inanimate matter*, and finding no consciousness, no reason, no intelligence in this, he rushes to the illogical and unphilosophical conclusion, that *organized living matter* cannot think! This foundation—his starting point, is wrong, and his superstructure worthless. The question is, not whether a *stone* can think, but whether a *living man*, organized from the elements of nature, *thinks by his brain*. When Mr. Lee has proved that *thought* is not an *essential* property of matter, he has gained nothing. I can prove that *sound* is not an *essential* property of a musical instrument, but what will that prove? Will it prove that the harmony of

sounds is not dependant upon the *organization* of the *wind* (or other musical) instrument? Take the *wood* of which an instrument is made, and there is no music in it. Let it be *organized*, and yet there is no music. What is the reason? Why music is not an essential property of *wood*; this is *matter*, and there is no music in matter; what is wanting now to produce the "concord of sweet sounds?" We must have the atmosphere, for where there is no atmosphere sound cannot be produced. But the *atmosphere* is *matter*, and there is no music in matter? Ah, says Mr. Lee, an *intelligent mind* is necessary to the production of sound. Yes; but there is no music in the mind. The mind has the power of producing what is not an *essential* property of itself. And it has the faculty of appreciating the harmony of sounds produced. Now for the application of this illustration: There is no sound, or harmony of sounds, in an *instrument*, none in the *atmosphere*, and none in the *mind*; but, by combining the *three* we have what was not in either *separately*. So, there may be no thought, no reason, no intelligence in *inanimate matter*; but when that matter is *organized*, as we see it in man, who will affirm it cannot manifest *thought*? But it may be objected that, in the case supposed, there is an intelligent mind operating upon the instrument and the atmosphere, producing the result.

Let us take another, then; and we will suppose the case of a *watch*. There is no *time* in the materials of which a watch is made; and, yet, when *organized* by an intelligent mind, it will indicate the hour, minute, and second. The maker winds it up, and it continues to perform its *functions* until it runs down. So with man; there may be no reason, or thought in the component parts of his constitution separately considered; but when *organized*, and put in motion by the spirit of life in the atmosphere, breathed into his nostrils by his Maker, he awakes to consciousness, to thought and reason.

Mr. Lee has not to be informed, I trust, that by combining, chemically combining, two substances, a *third* can be produced, possessing none of the properties of the two elements used. He has not to be informed, I hope, that man is chemically formed or organized; and that the light of analogy makes it highly probable, to say the least of it, that matter, thus chemically combined, is capable of manifesting mental functions.

2. Mr. Lee makes "indestructibility," an essential property of matter; perhaps he means *annihilation*; for "indestructibility" is certainly not a property of matter.

One word as to what Mr. Lee and other natural philosophers term the essential properties of matter. It must be evident to those who reflect, that philosophers have only given us the essential properties of *some forms* of matter; for *Inertia* is certainly not an essential property of *all matter*. We have no evidence that inertia is an essential property of light; on the contrary light seems to be self-moving and ever-acting. This is true of caloric, galvanism, electricity, and magnetism. May it not be true, in a much higher sense, of the *aura* that pervades the brain and nerves?

One word as to the use of terms. The word *nature* embraces all created things, animate and inanimate. Thus we have organized and unorganized nature. The organized is again divided into the vegetable and animal. Matter is nowhere in the scriptures, contrasted, or put in opposition to spirit. Spirit is not the antithesis of matter. *Animal* stands opposed to *spirit*. We use the term matter as expressive of that which is tangible, or of which the senses take cognizance. But matter exists in ten thousand forms, and is capable of almost endless combinations and sublimations. The term spirit, when used in relation to the *wind*, to *man*, and to *angels*, seems to express different modifications of matter. The word *immaterial*—

*not material, not matter* does not appear to be applicable to anything in the universe. But, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that there is an *immaterial thing* in existence; how will you prove it? You cannot *see* it, for if you can see it, it is no longer *im-material*. You cannot smell it, nor hear it, nor feel it; it is not tangible to any of the senses; how, then, will you define it? The fact is, that which is immaterial has a name but no local habitation.

Matter may be regarded as embracing all that God has created, but under this generic term we have various orders, classes and species of matter; thus we have matter in its *simple*, or *elementary* form, then in its *compound* form, without regard to chemical affinity; then we have it chemically constituted, without relation to life; then in its *organized* form, in relation to vitality, as seen in the vegetable kingdom, and in the lowest orders of animalculæ; then in its more refined and exalted form as we see it in the human constitution; and lastly, in its highest degree of refinement and sublimation, called spirit, of which the angelic nature is a specimen. God is alike the creator of all forms of matter; or, if Mr. Lee likes it better, he is the creator of matter and spirit; and why should we affirm intelligence of one and not of the other? How does Mr. Lee know that volition is an *essential* property of spirit? The fact is, he assumes this, and then argues that gross matter, no matter how organized, cannot think. If God has created beings purely spiritual, they must have been created *before* they were endowed with consciousness, volition and thought; and therefore thought, &c., would not be an *essential* property of spirit. Mr. Lee does not know the essential properties of all matter, and therefore cannot affirm that thought is not an essential property of *some forms* of matter. God who formed matter can make of it what He wills to make; He can combine, refine and organize it in a

thousand proportions and forms, with a view of its manifesting as many functions. From the same original elements of matter He can make a thousand different kinds of fruit—the orange, the apple, the pear, the cherry, &c., &c. Yet these are all matter, but how different their qualities? And as is the organization, so is the quality of the fruits whether of acidity or sweetness.

And so it is in the animal world. Out of matter God makes bones, muscles, ligaments, nerves of motion, nerves of sensation, arteries, veins, glands, &c. Here we have matter in various forms, and each form has its own peculiar function, which it possesses in virtue of its organization. The man, therefore, who affirms that matter in none of its forms can think, neither understands what he says, nor whereof he affirms. I shall return to this question in my next article.

---

## CHAPTER II.

Mr. Lee says,—“If matter can think, thought must be an essential property of matter, or it must be the result of some peculiar modification of matter; neither of which can be maintained. If thought be an essential property of matter, every part and particle of matter must think. If thought be essential to matter, what does not think is not matter.”

Mr. Lee's logical powers fail him here, for it does not follow “if matter can think,” that “thought must be an *essential* property of matter.” The “*essential* property” of a thing is that “property” without which it cannot exist. Both matter and spirit can exist without thought, consequently thought is not an essential property of either. It is possible, however, for “thought to be the *result* of some peculiar modification of matter.” But what sort of reasoning is this? “If thought be

essential to matter, what does not think is not matter!" We might as well argue thus:

Inertia is an essential property of matter.

And that which does not possess this property is not matter.

But light, electricity, &c., do not possess inertia.

Therefore they are not matter.

Thus according to the received principles of natural philosophy, we see that light, &c., is not matter; it must, therefore, be spirit, and consequently intelligent; for Mr. Lee holds thought, &c., to be an essential property of spirit; and then, according to his own mode of reasoning, "if thought be an essential property of" spirit, "every part and particle of" spirit "must think!" Thus his whole theory, when exhibited in the light of reason, vanishes into thin air.

Mr. Lee asks the question—"Is thought the result of some modification (of) matter?" His whole reasoning on this question amounts to this—*that matter cannot think, because it is matter!* This is the alpha and omega of his argument. Now, I ask Mr. Lee, what are the *attributes of organized matter*, in its various modifications? He answers—"Indestructibility, Divisibility, Impenetrability, Inertia." &c. This is not the whole answer; it does not meet the case. And the question recurs—what are the properties of matter? Now, in order to meet this question fully, let us state a few principles. And,

1st. Spirit is defined to be that which has the power of self-motion, volition, consciousness, thought, reason, and intelligence. And,

2d. Matter is defined as above. (See indestructibility, &c.) Now, we affirm that the true answer is not given in either case. Let us see. Here are four nerves: the function of one is to transmit sounds; the function of another is to transmit light; the function of another is to transmit odors, and



the function of another is to transmit the sensation of taste. These nerves are matter, yet they have different properties. One will transmit sounds, but will not and cannot transmit light. This proves that matter may be so organized as to possess different functions. This is true not only of sound and sight, but of taste and smell. Here are two nerves; the one a nerve of motion, and the other a nerve of sensation. They have different functions, but they are both matter. In all this there is no addition to matter, nor subtraction from matter; but matter, by being modified in its organization, develops new properties and functions. There is no infidelity or atheism in this philosophy, for we maintain that matter only possesses those properties with which God has endowed it. Mr. Lee's argument, on this point, is all lost. Man is not God, and therefore it is presumption to argue from the nature of one to the nature of the other. The nature of God is *unorganized*, while the nature of all other beings is *organic*. This fact proves them to be material.

But let us come to the point more closely. It is admitted that man thinks, feels, and acts; but how does he do this? Mr. Lee says, "By his rational soul." That is, by his spirit or mind. Now, what are the functions or faculties of man? Let us look at them: Here is amateness, or the sexual feeling. But this, according to Mr. Lee's philosophy, is not an essential property of matter; and therefore it belongs to the spirit or "rational soul." Here then we have mind, immateriality, immortality, desiring sexual intercourse. But, then, this function is not confined to man, but the whole animal world possesses the same. They, therefore, have the same "rational soul." Mr. Lee, perhaps, may say this is mere instinct. Very well, is *instinct* a property of matter? Here you are stranded again! Take another human faculty—love of offspring. Is this a function of matter,

or spirit? Of matter it cannot be, according to Mr. Lee's theory; therefore it must be of spirit: so we have the "immortal spirit" exercising the parental function! And the beasts have the same faculty, therefore they have the same spirit!

Take another case. Man has the faculty of love, combativeness, destructiveness, love of gain, &c. &c. Are these functions of matter or spirit? Of matter they cannot be, according to Mr. Lee's theory; therefore they must be properties of spirit; and thus we have the "immaterial spirit" in love with human flesh, quarrelling, disputing, destroying, seeking gain, &c. &c.

But it may be said that the animal propensities are not attributes of the spirit; then, pray, of what are they attributes? Of matter? This would be fatal to your whole theory! For love, anger, sexual feeling, and the love of gain are not among your "essential properties of matter."

But if man possess an immortal mind, which is the seat of *all the affections, moral and mental powers*, of what use is the body? of what use is matter? of what use are the five senses? of what use is the brain? Just none at all! According to Mr. Lee's philosophy, a man is just as perfect without matter as with it; and, in fact, *more* perfect:—more perfect in the *ratio* that spirit is superior to matter! Of what use are impenetrability, divisibility, inertia, &c., in the economy of man? Matter is of no account. These are its only properties! away with it, it is not fit to live! yea, it does not, and cannot live! Man can live, and think, and reason; love, be amative, desire gain, hate and destroy without it! Certainly God degraded Himself by making anything out of it! Why did He create it? Why don't He annihilate it? Mr. Lee's hand and pen, which he uses in advocating error, are made of it. His mouth and organs of voice, which he uses in speaking, are made of it. What a pity! His Bible is made of matter, the baptismal element is mat-

ter, his paper is matter, his eyes are matter, his ears, his nose, his palate, his nerves, his lungs—they are all matter, *merely* possessing impenetrability, inertia, &c. ! Of what account are they ? Surely it was a work of supererogation to create them ! The steam he uses in printing is matter, the locomotive is propelled by matter, the magnetic wire is matter, the electric fluid is matter ! All is matter !

But, if man be in possession of immortality, he inherits it. And Mr. Lee says—“matter can only act as it is acted upon.” Now look at the *laws of generation*. Here we have matter acting upon matter, producing what ? Transmitting what ? “Immateriality,” says Mr. Lee. That which is *material* can give birth, then, to that which is *immaterial* ! Matter can produce that which is *not matter*. ‘But,’ will Mr. Lee say, ‘the mind begets mind—spirit begets spirit ?’ Then it has “divisibility” which is a property of matter ? Man has the power of transmitting the elements of his own organization, and if immortality be a part of his organization, he can transmit this. This is self-multiplication—“divisibility”—matter !

Again, *life* itself is transmitted, together with diseases of various kinds. And here we come to a very important consideration, viz: *That which has no constitutional function cannot be diseased*. If matter therefore, in none of its forms and modifications, has any attributes or functions, it can never be diseased. And as the body of man is matter, it cannot be diseased ! We never hear of marble or stone being diseased. The diamond is not subject to fever ; but vegetables and animals, including man, are liable to disease and death

We come back to the conclusion then, that organized matter is capable of manifesting a variety of functions, which are susceptible of derangement or disease.

But, upon Mr. Lee’s hypothesis, disease cannot

exist, for matter, having only the properties he ascribes to it, is not susceptible of disease, and immortality *cannot* be diseased; and, therefore, we come to the happy conclusion, that there is no such thing as disease! This is certainly the long-looked for philosophers' stone!

But the truth is, all parts of man are subject to derangement, disease, and death; and still all is matter; but if the mind be "immaterial" or immortal, it can not be deranged or diseased. And here we leave this argument for the present.

In Mr. Lee's article No. 4, he introduces a long quotation from Mr. Watson, in which it is argued, that because "God is spirit" the mind of man is of the same nature. This argument is not only a lame one, but altogether out of place in this connection; so we shall merely observe respecting it,

1st. That the nature of God is not the subject of discussion.

2d. That God *only* hath immortality. And,

3d. That men are exhorted to seek for it, which would be absurd if they had it.

---

### CHAPTER III.

Mr. Lee argues that "the soul, the rational man, cannot be the body, nor any part of it, as is proved from the identity which the mind is conscious of maintaining from the dawn of existence to life's final close."

"The soul, or rational man," then, according to Mr. Lee's philosophy, is "*not the body, nor any part of it!*" Mr. Lee is not so good a philosopher as Paul. See 1 Cor. xii: 12—26. Here Paul teaches us that "*the body is one*"—it is a unit, but "*hath many members.*" Again, he says, "*the body is not one member, but many.*" He teaches us that the "*hand,*" the "*foot,*" the "*ear,*" the

“eye,” are all members of the body; hence he says—“But now are they many members, yet but one body.” The truth is, all the parts of man are members or attributes of his body; and if you take away any one, you make a schism in it. But Mr. Lee says—“the soul is not the body, nor any part of the body.” Of course, then, according to Paul’s reasoning, it—“the soul”—can say to the “hand, I have no need of thee:” to the foot, the ear, the eye; and, indeed, the whole body, I have no need of any of you! for I am not of the body!!

Mr. Lee speaks of “the soul” as the “rational man:” then there is a man connected with the “soul,” which is not “rational!” Such is the confusion of this Babel of theology and philosophy.

But if it be true that “the soul is not the body, nor any part of it,” then no injury or disease of the body can disturb the functions or powers of the soul; for the reason that it “is no part of the body.” Let us throw this into the syllogistic form, thus:

1. That which “is no part of the body” cannot be injured or deranged by disease of the body.

But the “soul is no part of the body.”

*Ergo*—It can never be injured or deranged by disease of the body.

This is Mr. Lee’s position; but is it a true one? We shall soon see. What does Mr. Lee mean by “the soul, the rational man?” He doubtless means the *mind*. Is it true that no disease of the body can injure or derange the *mind*? *This is not true*, as we shall see in the course of these articles. In view of all the *facts* in the case, we are compelled to come to the following conclusion:

2. Whatever is “a part of the body” can be deranged or destroyed by disease of the body.

But the “soul”—the *mind*—can be deranged, &c. by disease of the body.

*Ergo*—The *mind* is a part of the body.

I shall leave this part of the question just now,

for the purpose of examining Mr. Lee's great argument on "*consciousness*."

Let it be remembered then, that Mr. Lee predicates "*identity and self-consciousness*" of the *immortal soul or mind*, and not of "the body, nor any part of the body." Mr. Lee argues that as the body, in all its parts, is the subject of constant waste and decay, it cannot be the subject of identity and consciousness.

Here we have both sides of the question fully before us.

1. The soul is immortal—our identity and consciousness are always the same—these, therefore, are attributes of the soul, which is not subject to any change.

Let us look at this a little. Mr. Lee says—"consciousness is that notice which the mind takes of its own operations and modes of existence." This may be true in a qualified sense, but it is not susceptible of the use Mr. Lee wishes to make of it. Mr. Lee contends that the mind is *immortal*; if so, it cannot be deranged, diseased, destroyed. If Mr. Lee's position, therefore, be a true one, a man should never lose his identity nor consciousness. Is this a fact? Far from it; for there are many cases on record of persons losing their identity, and becoming the subject of *double consciousness*. Why is this, if consciousness be an attribute of an "*immortal soul*." Mr. Lee says—"we cannot say consciousness is that notice which the brain takes of its own operations and modes of existence." But, why can we not? Can Mr. Lee give a reason? When the skull is fractured, and pressure is made upon the brain, *all consciousness is suspended*. Why is this, if consciousness be not connected with the brain? If consciousness were an attribute of a mind immortal, this phenomenon would not follow from such a cause.

Mr. Lee says—"the brain is not the subject of

this consciousness of identity." Suppose this were so, what would it prove? Would it prove that the brain is not the seat of consciousness? Is Mr. Lee, apart from the knowledge of the fact, conscious of having any brain? Does this prove that he has none? Is he conscious of having a heart, whose office is to propel the blood? Can he tell by his consciousness that his heart is the centre of the circulation? The brain may be the seat of personal identity, and give rise to consciousness without our being able, by reflecting on our modes of existence, to determine its location. But, the truth is, if we can determine anything by consciousness, we should certainly be induced to localize it in the brain. And, so far as we are conscious of our own identity and thoughts, we refer them to the brain; and learn, by reflecting upon our own feelings and sensations, to refer them to the encephalon. Mr. Lee contends he has an immortal soul: is he conscious of such a possession? Is he conscious of having an incorruptible mind, and does he know, by reflection, that this is the seat of his identity and consciousness?

2. But Mr. Lee urges the continual change of the particles of the body, as an objection to consciousness being dependant upon organization.

This argument is not new—I have met with it frequently before. A person at the age of seventy may have changed ten times; and there are corresponding changes in the mind. Every organ, of course, is subject to the same waste and renovation. This applies to all parts, external and internal—the hardest and softest. It applies to the heart and blood vessels generally. And yet all the organs preserve their identity and sameness of organization, unless diseased. The process of absorption and deposition is so gradual, so admirable, so complete, that the organization retains its identity. In childhood this process is very rapid, but *deposition exceeds absorption*; hence the increase in

bulk, in size, &c. This excess of deposition continues till maturity; after which, the process of waste and renovation are about equal, till old age supervenes, when the waste exceeds that of renovation; and the man, unless previously cut off by disease, gradually wears out, and sinks into the grave. In this case, there is a second childhood; the mind again becomes imbecile and childish.

In childhood, but few mental powers are manifested; but, as the individual approaches puberty, new powers come into play; and, when manhood is attained, we see a corresponding change in the mind. The judgment is now mature, and the mental powers acute. But in old age all this is reversed—a second childhood obtains, and imbecility reigns! And, as we have before observed, there is a corresponding change in the organization. The brain is shrunk, and the mental fires decay. But now let us look on the other side of this interesting question. Suppose Mr. Lee's argument to be correct, then it follows, *the mind being immortal*, that every incident, every impression, every feeling, every thought, must be retained; memory must be perfect; nothing can be forgotten. If the mind be immortal, memory must be immortal. If the mind be deathless, the memory must be deathless. If the mind be incorruptible, the memory must be incorruptible. We defy Mr. Lee to evade this. But what are the facts in the case? The memory is defective—it is neither immortal, deathless, nor incorruptible! And yet it is an attribute of the mind. But if the mind—the soul—the spirit, be immortal, not an idea—not an impression—not an incident—not an event—not a word—not an act—not a feeling—not a sentiment—should be erased from its tablet! Get over this who can: Mr. Lee cannot. When Mr. Lee explains how partial memory, partial or total insanity, partial or total idiocy can be reconciled with the idea of mental immortality, it will be time enough to bestow upon his



difficulty, concerning identity, additional arguments.

In conclusion, Mr. Lee says, speaking of the "conscious-smitten sinner," "I am guilty; not my feet, not my hands, not my brains, not any part of my material body, but I, myself, am guilty: it is not my body, but myself; and this I, this self, denotes the thinking moral man—the soul, which, of course, cannot be the body, nor any part of it."

Let us change this, and see how it reads—thus: "I am guilty; not my feet, not my hands, not my brains," nor my *immortal soul*, "but myself," &c. According to Mr. Lee's philosophy, "*the soul*" alone, by which he means that which is *immaterial*, is guilty before God and man. How, then, will you punish the guilty one? If the soul be immaterial, it is intangible, and can never be brought to trial before any human tribunal. Why punish the body for the sins of the immortal soul? This is punishing the innocent for the guilty. According to Mr. Lee, the body is no more guilty than the telegraph wires, along which a slander is transmitted! Why hang a man if this be true? Why punish him in any way? His immortal soul is alone guilty—"not his body, nor any part of his body!" not even his "brains!" I would ask Mr. Lee if a man can be guilty without brains? And, if not, why this *puerile* argument? *I affirm that MAN in the CONCRETE, and not in the ABSTRACT, is guilty.* Not his feet, hands, brain, nor "soul," but the man as such; and in this light he is held responsible by all law, human and divine.

---

#### CHAPTER IV.

• Mr. Lee's last philosophical argument is that, "*nothing but spiritual good can satisfy the human mind—the phenomena developed in the progress of the body and mind, prove them not to be identical.*"

Let us analyze the proposition. And,

1st. "Nothing but spiritual good can satisfy the human mind." How does this harmonize with Mr. Lee's previous declarations?—with mental philosophy?—and with the facts in the case?

It does not harmonize with Mr. Lee's previous remarks upon the "essential properties of matter." He has given us what *he* conceives to be these "essential properties," and, of course, *all other properties* in his estimation, belong to spirit. How then can he say, *consistently*, that "nothing but spiritual good can satisfy the human mind?" Amateness is either a property of matter, or spirit. According to Mr. Lee's theory, it cannot be a property of matter; and must, therefore, be a property of spirit! Does it desire "spiritual good?" And we might make the same enquiry about a variety of the *elements* of the "human mind."

Neither does it harmonize with mental philosophy. The mind is made up of a number of elements, some of which relate to things physical, others to things of a moral character, and others to intellectual objects. *Facts* are opposed to his proposition, for the "human mind," as is demonstrated by observation, has a multiplicity of desires which do not relate to "spiritual good."

2d. Who asserts that "the body and mind are identical?" No man in his senses! Vision is an element of the "human mind," but vision and the body are not "identical." The *brain, medulla oblongata, medulla spinalis*, and the *nerves* departing from these centres, belong to the body—they are organs of the body; and motion, sensation, feeling, sentiment, and intellect are *functions* of these organs, and *attributes* of the body. The *cerebrum* is a part of the man—the organ of *thought*. &c., thought is an *attribute* of the man, and an *element* of mind. Matter is thus endowed with *affective, moral, and intellectual functions*.

"The spirituality of the human soul," says Mr.

Lee, "may be inferred from the nature of its desires," &c. This only carries us back to a former point, so we will leave it and proceed. Mr. Lee says, "All men desire happiness," and that "the greater portion seek it where it is not to be found."

Indeed! One would suppose, if the mind were immortal, that *its* desires would all be *pure*, properly directed, and only centered on that which is good; and that men would "seek happiness" only where it *could* be found.

But Mr. Lee explains by saying, "the reason is, they seek it in the gratification of their *animal propensities*." Are there "animal propensities," "properties," or attributes of matter? If not, what argument is there in all this?

The fact is, all Mr. Lee says under this head is in perfect harmony with our view of the subject; but altogether incompatible with the immortality of the mind.

Man finds his happiness in all the physical, moral, and intellectual objects to which he has *elements* of mind adapted. These *elements* of mind inhere in organized material organs. And therefore, although "man" be "only matter," "compounded of the elements of the material world," the "centres of attraction" are just as numerous as the *elements* of his mind. And therefore, "that matter (*man organized of matter*) should seek" the gratification of all its powers, whether this be in "fountains of spiritual bliss," or in objects of sense, is neither "absurd" nor "unphilosophical;" but, on the contrary, in perfect accordance with "its own essential laws," and the "essential properties of its own nature."

Mr. Lee says, "The fact that the world of matter never did, and never can satisfy the desires of the human soul, is one of the clearest proofs that the soul is not itself matter." Now, in my estimation, this "proof" amounts to no "proof" at all. Let us see: "The fact that the world of mat-

ter" *ever has*, and *ever will* (in man's present state) "satisfy the desires" of a *majority* of "human souls, is one of the clearest proofs that the soul is itself matter." Now, what has Mr. Lee gained by his so-called "proof?" Just nothing at all! So it is not true that "the world in any and all its forms, cannot satisfy the desires of *one* human soul." For the *majority of mankind* are satisfied with "the world in any and all its forms of pleasure, without regard to the "spirit world." "Give it," (the soul) says Mr. L., "all the elements of earth, sea, and air, moulded into every possible form, and it would grasp the whole, and thirst and famish still, and pant for higher bliss," &c. This is contrary to facts, for multitudes of men, "who have their portions in this life," neither desire nor seek for "higher bliss." And, if they "grasp the whole, and thirst and famish still," it is for more of the *same nature*. Tell me that such a soul is "immortal?" "The reason is," to use the language of Mr. Lee, "the soul is matter"—not "spirit." "Were it" spirit, all its desires would be in harmony with its nature.

Mr. Lee says, "It" (spirit) "originally came from God, and hence can be happy in God alone, as God dwells in us, and we in God." Let us try this statement: *matter* "originally came from God, and hence can be happy in God alone, as God dwells in us, and we in God." This is just as good an argument as Mr. Lee's, and both may pass for what they are worth; but so far as the "*origin*" of them is concerned, the reader can see that if one be good evidence, so is the other.

Mr. Lee asks, "But does God dwell in matter, and matter in God?" We reply, that God "fills heaven and earth;" and as the heavens and the earth are matter, "God dwells in matter." He fills the vast universe. It has not inaptly been said that "his centre is everywhere, and his circumference is nowhere." And so far as it re.

spects "matter dwelling in God," I will say that *man* is matter; and "*in* God he *lives* and *breathes*, and has his *being*." "Matter," then, in the form and capacity of man, "can have fellowship with the Father and the Son;" "can have communion with the eternal spirit;" can drink joys from the fountain" of all joy. Mr. Lee bases another argument on "the desire of knowledge in connection with the capacity of the mind to improve."

This argument will only hold good in relation to a *part of mankind*, for there are many who have neither the "desire" nor the "capacity" to improve. It is, therefore, of no avail, for either immortality is hereditary, or it is not; if it is, *all men* have it; but, if it is not, *none* have it.

But Mr. Lee admits that "the soul commences its career without knowledge." Now, only think of an "immortal mind"—self-conscious, self-intelligent, possessing all the attributes of intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom, "commencing its career without knowledge!" The very idea is absurd! But Mr. Lee says, "its *capacity* furnishes the basis of the argument." This merely brings us back to those who have no "capacity to learn," and thus the argument fails.

Mr. Lee has foiled himself—he has precipitated himself overboard, and carried all his arguments with him! Hear him: "*The mind, in its present state, is dependant upon the BODILY ORGANS for primary ideas!*" This admission is fatal to his whole theory! What is the meaning of it? Why, it means this—that the "IMMORTAL MIND" is DEPENDANT upon MATTER "FOR PRIMARY IDEAS!" Mind dependant upon matter for ideas! "Ideas" do not "inhere in mind," then, as Mr. Lee first taught us. They must "inhere" in matter, for mind is "dependant upon the bodily organs for primary ideas." Yes, and I will add, for *all* "ideas," "primary" and secondary. But Mr. Lee limits this to "the present state." Very well, that will

answer our purpose ; but how does he know but the same arrangement may obtain in the next "state?" But what and where are "the bodily organs, upon which "the soul is dependant for primary ideas?" Mr. Lee mentions two—the eye and the ear ; but these are not all. The *brain* is full of them. The "soul is dependant" on the brain "for primary ideas." Now, friend Lee, let us shake hands and be good friends, for we have met at the same focal point.

I hope that we shall hear nothing more about materialism from that quarter ; but, that henceforth, life, mind, intelligence, all the mental phenomena, will be predicated upon organization ; and that eternal life, immortality, and incorruptibility will be proclaimed through Jesus, who is "the resurrection and the life."

---

## CHAPTER V.

Mr. Lee says—"Its (the spirit's) improvement, is a distinct matter from the improvement of the body."

What does he mean by the "improvement of the body?" Does he mean the *growth* of the "body?" What does he mean by the "body?" Does he mean the whole physical organization, or a part of it? If he uses the term as indicative of the whole organism, then it is equivalent to the *man* ; which would be to make "the improvement of the spirit a distinct matter from the improvement of the man." Understanding Mr. Lee, therefore, to mean the physical constitution, the question recurs—does he mean by "the improvement of the body" its growth in bulk or size? If so, I would remark, that *stubborn facts* establish the *law*, that other conditions being equal, the development of mind is in the *ratio* of the development of the physical organization. What are these "*other conditions?*" The

answer to this question is found in the fact, that there are several *systems of organs*, giving rise to different functions, and modifying the manifestations of mind. The *ample* development of the *glandular system* does not increase the mental power, but modifies it. The *excessive* development of the *muscular system* does not import mental activity; but it gives *durability* to body and mind. The *sanguineous* and *nervous systems* impart physical and mental activity.

Again, a person may be born with an organization unfavorable to the development of much mind—they may be idiotic; but, in this case, the *nervous system* will be defective. Again, they may be diseased, and, from this cause, imbecile. Again, education may have been *partial* and defective; the muscular system may have been cultivated at the expense of the nervous; and then, “the body may grow and flourish in all the perfection of health, and the mind make little or no progress.” Again, the *nervous system* may be developed at the expense of the *sanguineous*, and “the body,” or man, “be of exceedingly frail structure, pale and wan;” but it is not true that “a giant mind may develop itself from within.” The mind of such a person may possess great *vivacity*, *sprightliness* and *brilliancy*, but it will be wanting in *strength*, *depth*, *power* and *durability*. But, in all this, the law holds good, that, *as is the organization, so is the mind*.

Mr. Lee says—“Some of the greatest geniuses the world has ever produced, have had but just body enough to hold the soul.” This is a mere fancy sketch, containing no argument. A man, however, may be a “*genius*,” with little or no *talent*. Again, Mr. L. says—“These facts certainly indicate that the soul and the body, are not one and the same thing!” Truly! who ever contended that they were “one and the same thing!” The one may be an attribute of the other, and both may

be mortal—both matter—Mr. Lee's "facts" to the contrary notwithstanding!

2. Mr. Lee tells us, that "the body comes to maturity and begins to decline, at an age when the mind has but just commenced its career of improvement." This is a fallacy, for the "career of improvement" begins almost with our birth. "A sound mind in a sound body" is a sentiment, which embodies the truth upon this subject. The *nervous system* may be healthy, unimpaired and elastic, when the muscular and glandular have declined; and the mind may thus be proportionably active, when the physical strength is partially gone. But when there is a general decay of the whole organization, the mind goes down with the body. And whether a man shall be a *dotard* at "fifty, sixty, or seventy," depends upon the strength, soundness and durability of the *whole* constitution.

3. Mr. Lee alludes to the doctrines of phrenology, and informs us that nothing is gained by admitting their truth—that phrenologists "will not make this the issue, and base their science on the doctrine of materialism, to stand or fall with it." If by "*materialism*" Mr. Lee means *matter*, I affirm that phrenologists do base their science on "*materialism*;" for they base it on the anatomy and physiology of the *brain*—which is matter; while, at the same time, they may not follow up their *principles* to their *legitimate results*. I shall not reflect upon the *motives* of those phrenologists, who have labored to popularize, and harmonize phrenology with sectarian theology. *But, for one, fearless of all consequences, I DO MAKE THE ISSUE, AND BASE THE PHRENOLOGICAL DOCTRINES UPON THE MATERIAL ORGANIZATION OF MAN, INDEPENDENT OF ALL "IMMATERIALITY," IMMORTALITY, OR INCORRUPTIBILITY; AND I CHALLENGE ALL PHRENOLOGISTS, NO MATTER WHO, NOR WHERE THEY ARE, WHETHER IN EUROPE OR AMERICA, TO DISPROVE THE CORRECTNESS OF THIS POSITION.*



This is the only view that will, or can harmonize with the volume of Revelation; and every effort to harmonize the sublime science of mind, with the paganized traditions of modern sectarism, degrades both it and them!

Yes, sir, a voice speaks from the highest heavens, and proclaims to all the sons of men, that they *are mortal*, having *not* one spark of immortality, but corruptible and perishing; and mental science—the science of man—sends back the sound, *all is mortal!*

4. We shall now examine Mr. Lee's concluding philosophical argument, which is this: "The mind often develops itself in greater power and glory, just at the moment of death, shining out from an emaciated body, already wan and cold."

Here Mr. Lee rallies all his powers, concentrates all his forces, and pours along his logical troop! We shall pay particular attention to this argument, not on account of its strength, but on account of its commonness.

"The mind often develops itself in its *greatest power and glory*, just at the moment of death." This, as a proposition, is monstrous; as an argument, absurd; and as a fact, is not true. "The mind develops its **GREATEST POWER and GLORY, at the moment of death!**" Did ever the mind of a man, "at the moment of death," develop the powers of a Solomon?—a Bacon?—a Locke?—a Herschell?—a Franklin? Here are specimens of mind in its "greatest power." Did ever the mind of man, "at the moment of death," when the "emaciated body" was "already wan and cold," develop the "glory"—the eloquence of a Cicero, or a Demosthenes? The answer is, and must be, in the negative. But Mr. Lee says—"It is true that in some cases the mind appears to decay with the decaying body, but to prove that it is the body or any part of it, this would have to be always so without exception, which is not the case." Mr. Lee has the

argument here by the blade, instead of the handle, and cuts himself rather than his opponent! The mind should *never* "appear to decay with the decaying body," if it be immortal! If it be neither "the body nor any part of it," there should be no "exception" to the "power" and "glory" of its development "at the moment of death," "which," as Mr. Lee says—"is not the case." And now I will explain to Mr. Lee why it is, that some minds are more brilliant in death than others.

1. It depends upon the *nature* of the disease, and its *seat*. There are some diseases which preternaturally excite the brain, and consequently, the mental powers. We witness this in various forms of *fever*. And sometimes this febrile condition becomes so exalted and intense, that the patient becomes eloquent, musical, furious and insensible by turns, according to the nature of the case. In this condition the patient's animal, moral, or intellectual faculties may be principally excited, and develop their functions accordingly. They may shout, pray, sing, or curse, swear and rage, just as their different faculties are the seat of the most intense cerebral action. Some, in this condition may "die shouting glory! glory!! glory!!!!" and others die perfectly frantic and furious.

Again, in disease of the heart and lungs, the integrity of the mind is partially maintained till death closes the scene; but this is because the brain is not immediately involved in the disease, and therefore it manifests its functions, though with less power, to the last.

2. Another cause, already hinted at, is, the fact that *death* sometimes commences at the *heart*, and at the lungs. The first is called *death by anæmia*—the want of a due supply of blood to the heart. In this case the faculties may be retained to the last for the reason already given.

The same remarks apply to *death by apnœa*, privation of breath. The person, being cut off sud-

denly, retains his senses to the end; or, if not dying suddenly, he gradually wastes away by consumption of the pulmonary organs, and dies in possession of a degree of mental power.

*Death by coma* may either be sudden, or more or less protracted according to circumstances.

These are some of the reasons why some persons die in the possession of some mental power, and others perfectly insensible. These *phenomena* are perfectly plain upon the view we take of the constitution of man; but can Mr. Lee, or any one else, explain them upon his hypothesis? "The mind may kindle up at the moment of death, and blaze out with intellectual fire," but it is the mere flickering—the mere flashing up, of the waning intellect, which, like the dimly burning taper, gives signs of its extinguishment! "The body" may be "wan, cold and helpless," and the mind will shine as dimly, and burn as faintly as the expiring lamp! An occasional out-burst—an occasional flash, is not the strength, power and glory of a giant mind; but the sure indications of a speedy dissolution.

Mr. Lee speaks of "the mind, being roused by the prospect of heaven, or seized with the terror of impending perdition," as "flashing with the fires of immortality," and "shedding a living glare as it quits its house of clay and enters upon the destinies of the spirit world!"

The whole of this is a beautiful delusion! a sublime absurdity!! There is no truth—no argument—no logic in it. This going to "heaven" at death, or down to "perdition," are old wives' fables. They are pagan traditions, newly vamped by the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth.

No, gentle reader, man is mortal, death is the extinction of life and sense and mind; and nothing but the resurrection can restore these attributes to man. So we come back to our starting point—no organization, no life; no life, no mind.

And here we leave Mr. Lee, to the *mercy* of his own ill-fated philosophical arguments.

## CHAPTER VI.

Having examined Mr. Lee's philosophical argument, I now proceed to his scriptural.

1. His first argument is based upon Gen. 35 : 18, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died,) that she called his name Ben-oni."

The reader will please bear in mind that the subject before Mr. Lee's mind is the "immateriality of the soul," and that this text has been adduced to prove it! But if he can see any connection between *it* and the subject, he can see far better than I can. Her "soul departed," *ergo*, it is immortal! Truly, this is an "age of reason." Mr. Lee says, "Her body did not depart. Her brains did not depart!" And was there nothing else which could "depart," and which, in scripture language, is termed the "soul?" Could not her *breath*—her *life* depart, and "her body" and "brains" remain? This text proves only one thing, and that is the *departure* of the woman's soul, life, or breath; and has no bearing whatever upon Mr. Lee's question.

But Mr. Lee thinks his doctrine of "immateriality," is taken for granted in the Bible! This is begging the question. The Bible, so far as I know, takes nothing for granted: and, even if it did, this would not do away with the necessity of Mr. Lee's proving his position, by *proving* that the Bible takes it for granted. Let him not assume this, but prove it.

2. His second proof is Numbers 16 : 22, where God is spoken of as the "God of the spirits of all flesh." What has this to do with Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul?" I admit that God is ~~the~~ "the God of the spirits of all flesh," because "in Him we live, move, and have our being;" but this does not prove that "the spirits of all flesh" are the "immaterial souls" of all flesh. Inasmuch as "the spirit of life," or "breath of life," which inflates the lungs,

oxygenizes the blood, and gives life to the flesh, is from God; He is emphatically the "God of the lives of all flesh." And, I apprehend, this is the meaning of the passage. In Numbers 27: 15, 16, there is a passage of similar import.

3. Mr. Lee's third argument is Job 14: 22. "But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn." Were I disposed to be hypercritical, I might analyze this thus: First, we have the "flesh;" second, the "him;" and third, the "soul." The "flesh" is not the "him," because it is *upon* "him;" and the soul is not the "him," because it is *in* "him." It follows, therefore, according to this mode of reasoning, that neither the "flesh" nor the "soul" constitutes the "him," or man. How will this tally with Mr. Lee's theory? This shows the folly of all such reasoning. The simple meaning of the text is this: The "flesh upon" his person "shall have pain, and his heart within him shall mourn."

4. His fourth proof is Job 31: 30, "Neither have I suffered my mouth to sin, by wishing a curse to his soul." Here, again, I may ask the question, What has this to do with the "immortality of the soul?" The term soul is often used as a Hebraism for the person, and as often used for life; so that the text and context must determine its signification in any given case. In the text before us, it evidently means life, or the person of whom life was an attribute.

5. His fifth argument is chapter 32: 8, "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." This is the most plausible scriptural argument yet offered by Mr. Lee, but this does not prove his point. Mr. Lee himself admits that this "appears to be an allusion to God's breathing into man the breath of life, after he had formed him of the dust of the ground, by which he 'became a living soul.'" In addition to this admission on the part of Mr. Lee

it is remarkable that the spirit is represented as being without knowledge until the "inspiration of the Almighty gives *them* understanding." Mr. Lee makes another important admission, which I hope the reader will remember. It is this: "*Man* here denotes the visible, tangible frame, the *body*; in this there is a spirit." Very well; "man," then, is the "body," animated by "a spirit"—"the breath of life," and God gives them "understanding." Thus Mr. Lee has helped us to the refutation of his argument.

6. Mr. Lee's sixth proof is Proverbs 19 : 2, "that the soul be without knowledge is not good." He thinks "this text clearly implies the existence of an intelligent soul, distinct from the body." But how can an "immortal soul," which is self-conscious—self-intelligent, "be without knowledge?" Here Mr. Lee is caught in his own snare! I regard this text, therefore, notwithstanding what Mr. Lee says about the definite article, as being similar, in this respect, to the passage, "the *soul* that sins, it shall die;" and as referring to man, in relation to that attribute of his nature which is the seat, or *sensorium* of the mind.

7. His seventh argument is based on Eccles. 12 : 7, "Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." This clearly refers to God's "creating man of the dust, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life;" and has no more to do with the "immateriality of the soul," than the *blood* of man. When man dies, that which came from the earth, returns to the earth; and that "breath of life" which God "breathed into his nostrils" returns to him in the expanse of Heaven. In point of *fact*, however, the *body* is not less from God than the spirit, or "breath of life." Both are from Him. And this same author, Solomon, as well as Moses, speaks of the beasts as possessing the same "spirit

of life." "They all have one breath; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

8. Mr. Lee's eighth proof is Ezek. 18: 4, "Behold, all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine." Why did not Mr. Lee quote the whole verse? Why did he omit the last clause? Was it because the whole verse would not answer his purpose? "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die,*" was too strong for Mr. Lee! He reminds me of a person, who is running along a beautiful lawn, where everything is pleasant to the eye, and grateful to the senses; but suddenly an awful precipice presents itself, and the man starts back with horror at the impending danger! So Mr. Lee, conscious of the truth of his position, passes rapidly from text to text, hoping to fortify his favorite doctrine of "immateriality," when suddenly and unexpectedly he treads upon the very brink of a logical abyss, where all his arguments are in danger of being precipitated to the gulf below. He pauses, starts back, and retreats!! with the words sounding in his ears, and vibrating along the fibres of his brain,—"**THE SOUL THAT SINNETH, IT SHALL DIE!**" This text, so far from helping Mr. Lee, is fatal to his whole theory; for it affirms that the sinful soul shall die, which is incompatible with his view of the subject.

9. His next argument is founded on Zech. 12: 1, where God speaks of forming "the spirit of man within him." There is no difficulty here, according to our view, whether we understand the term "spirit" to apply to the *life* or the *mind*. Both life and mind are "formed," developed, or manifested "*within*" the man. But Mr. Lee takes a liberty which the rules of logic do not allow him. He proves that man has a soul or spirit, but its *nature* he takes for granted. He is not required to prove that man has a "spirit," but to prove that spirit "*immortal*." This he has failed to do; for to do this it is not enough to prove that the spirit is a

distinct entity from the body ; but he must also show that it is necessarily immortal. This he can never do.

10. His tenth argument is based on Rom. 8 : 16, where Paul speaks of the witness of the Holy Spirit "with our spirit." On this I remark that neither God nor man "bears witness," except by words or signs addressed to the minds of men. "The spirit bears witness with our spirits," minds, or hearts, if you please, that we are the children of God : but this "witness" is in his word, and addressed to our understandings ; and not to our feelings or passions. The christian has better evidence of his being a "child of God," than a mere impulse, or feeling, which is the sport of a thousand circumstances. When his heart, his life, his words, &c. are all in harmony with the Gospel, then it is that "the spirit," by that word, "bears witness" with his mind, his conscience, that he is born of God.

11. His next proof is 1 Cor. 2 : 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him?" This belongs to a class of texts already examined, and means no more, I apprehend, than that a man is alone conscious of the operations of his own mind.

12. Mr. Lee refers to chap. 6 : 20 as a proof— "For ye are bought with a price ; therefore glorify God in your body, and your spirit, which are God's." This proves that men can glorify God "in the body," although "matter," which, I suppose, is more than Mr. Lee would willingly admit. The text clearly teaches us the *whole man*, "soul, body and spirit," should be devoted to His cause. That all the physical, moral and mental powers should be consecrated to his service. I see nothing in this to favor the popular theory.

13. He then refers us to 2 Cor. 4 : 16, where Paul speaks of an "outward" and "inward man." I am willing that Peter shall explain Paul. See



1 Peter 3: 3, where he defines the "inward" or "hidden man" to be "the heart."

14. His fourteenth proof is 2 Cor. 7: 1, "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." Apart from the absurd idea that "*filthiness*" is here ascribed to an "immaterial spirit," it must be evident to those who think for themselves, that the apostle meant no more than that they should put away all evil—all immoral contaminations, and be holy in life, temper and disposition.

15. Mr. Lee's final argument in the article I am reviewing, is James 2: 26, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." In this passage, it is perfectly evident the term "spirit" signifies "breath," the breath of life; and it is so rendered in the margin. This text is *against* Mr. Lee, and proves that, after the *expiration* of the breath, there is not an "immortal spirit" animating the body; but that as "faith without works is dead," so "the body without breath is dead also."

In Mr. Lee's concluding article on the immateriality of the mind, he argues thus: "The same words which are applied to man to describe his spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the human soul is spirit, and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

Now, kind reader, that you may see the force of this argument, I will apply it to another matter, thus: "The same words which are applied to" *the wind*, "to describe" its "spiritual nature, are applied to God," "and any criticism which will invalidate the evidence in proof that the" *wind* "is spirit and not matter, will equally weaken the argument in support of the idea that God is a spirit."

This is Mr. Lee's argument, only it is applied to

the wind instead of man; and the reader can at once see its fallacy. I could give examples as Mr. Lee has done, but this is unnecessary. We might as well argue that because certain terms, generally applied to other objects, are used in relation to God, that their natures were similar, as to argue that because the term spirit is applied to man, therefore his spirit is like God's—immortal. The terms "sun," "soul," "heart," "wings," "shadow," &c. are used in relation to Jehovah; but who would thence infer that He is of the same nature with the "sun," or that His "soul" and "heart" are of the same nature with the "soul" and "heart" of man?

Does Mr. Lee really believe that God has a "soul" and a "heart?" If so, He is a *compound* being, and no compound is eternal. These words are used in reference to Him, in an accommodated or figurative sense; so also is the term spirit when applied to man—to the wind—to the breath of life—to the mind—and to the life itself.

"God is a spirit" in the highest sense of the word; but when this term is applied to the wind, and to man, it is used in a subordinate sense. As well might Mr. Lee argue that because the same word is applied to the *beasts*, therefore, they have "immortal spirits." Mr. Lee's argument, to be valid, must hold good in all cases to which the term is applied; or else, if there be an exception, I shall maintain that *man* is an exception.

Mr. Lee refers to the text, "the spirits of just men made perfect," which, I apprehend, applies to persons raised from the dead, and not to men in the flesh. He also quotes the text, "God is spirit; and they that worship him must worship him *with* spirit and *with* truth," to follow his reading. What is the meaning of the passage? It is this; that mere outward forms—the "drawing nigh unto God with the lips, while the heart is far from him"—is not acceptable worship. His worship must pro-

ceed from the heart—be pure, sincere, and according to the “truth;” for “in vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.” But the text contains not the slightest proof that the spirit of man is immortal, which is the point to be proved. Mr. Lee has signally failed in this part of his argument; indeed, we may say of them all, that they contain the elements of their own refutation. He set out to prove the “immateriality of the soul,” and the reader can judge how far he has succeeded. Sometimes he affirms “immateriality” of the “soul,” and then of the “spirit:” he quotes a text to prove this of the “soul,” and, *anon*, of the “spirit;” so we are, after all, at a loss to know whether he affirms “immateriality” of both, or of one. The popular theory presents a chaotic system—a confused mass—a perfect Babel, without order and without light. The advocates of it talk of “*spiritual* SUBSTANCES,” and yet deny the existence of *spirit-matter*, as though there was any difference between “*substance*” and “*matter!*” But I have gotten through with Mr. Lee’s arguments, and must await his next article

---

## CHAPTER VII.

In Mr. Lee’s article No. 9, he takes up the question of “the conscious existence of the soul, after the death of the body.” His argument is “from the immateriality of the soul.” He tells his readers that “the foundation for this argument has been laid in preceding numbers, in which the immateriality of the human soul has been proved.” Those of our readers, who have read his articles, and our Review, will doubtless be prepared to determine whether Mr. Lee has “*proved*” the “immateriality of the soul.” I humbly conceive he *has not* “*proved*” it, nor is it in his power to

“prove” it, by all the argument he can bring to bear upon the question.

Mr. Lee thinks the question has been “misunderstood,” and attempts to define it more accurately. He quotes from Brother Storrs’ “Six Sermons” the following paragraph :

“It is said—*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.* One single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—‘Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.’”

Upon this he remarks, that “as a reply, it is defective in two particulars :”

1. It assumes that “destruction,” means a loss of conscious existence, when applied to the soul ;” which is “not admitted ;” but, because “it belongs to another branch of the subject,” he does not argue it. I will also let it pass, at present, for the same reason.

2. Mr. Lee says—“Its capital defect is, it entirely misapprehends the question.” Let us see : Mr. Storrs states the argument of his opponents thus : “*The soul is spiritual, hence indestructible, and therefore immortal.*” There is no “misapprehension” of the question here, for Mr. Lee himself argues upon this hypothesis ; and the very article I am now reviewing, is based upon this assumption.

But, perhaps, Mr. Lee alludes particularly to the latter part of this paragraph, where Mr. Storrs says “one single consideration is sufficient to overthrow this argument, and show that it has no force. *He who created can destroy.* Our Saviour saith—‘Fear him who is ABLE to destroy both soul and body in hell.’”

I apprehend that, if Mr. Lee will examine this argument again, he will find more force in it than he is disposed to admit. The radical idea of *immortality*, is, *not subject to death, or deathlessness.* It follows, therefore, that that which is *absolutely*

immortal cannot be "destroyed" by any power in the universe ; for, to reason otherwise, would be to make it mortal and immortal at the same time, which is an absurdity. And hence the force of Mr. Storrs' argument—if God be "able" to "destroy" the soul, it is not *absolutely immortal*, because if immortal, it is necessarily *indestructible*. There is more argument, therefore, in Mr. Storrs' reply than Mr. Lee could perceive, or, perhaps, was willing to admit. Mr. Storrs' argument stands thus :

That which is immortal cannot be destroyed ;  
 But God can destroy the soul ;  
 Therefore it is not immortal.

But, I apprehend, Mr. Lee himself does not state the question as clearly as it ought to be stated. The *primary* question, and the one Mr. Lee has been discussing, is this—*is the soul naturally immortal?* Mr. Lee says *it is* ; and that it is *in its nature* analogous to the *nature of God*. If so, it cannot be destroyed, because God cannot destroy himself ! But God can destroy the soul, therefore it is not analogous to the nature of God—it is not immortal. Thus Mr. Storrs' argument comes back in all its original force.

We take the broad ground, first, *that the soul is naturally mortal* ; second, *that he is able to destroy it* ; and third, *that he wills to destroy it, if wicked*. In order, therefore, for Mr. Lee to meet this question fully in all its latitude, he must prove, *that the soul is naturally immortal—that God is not able to destroy it—and that he does not will to destroy it!* under any circumstances.

3. But, the fact is, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He says "it is a *simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible*. Now, how does Mr. Lee know that the soul is "a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible?" All this is mere *assumption*, without the shadow of a shade of proof !

May I not ask Mr. Lee how he knows the soul is "uncompounded and indivisible?" From whence did he get his information? for it must be based upon facts, or be a matter of revelation. If upon facts, where are *they*? And, if upon revelation, give us the proof.

But he says—"This argument is not designed to prove that God cannot destroy the human soul, nor even that he will not, but only that the soul, being spirit and not matter, simple and not compound, indivisible and not dissoluble, it must be immortal in its nature, and live after the body is dissolved; yea, live forever, unless destroyed by the Almighty power that gave it being."

Here Mr. Lee argues the immortality of the soul, upon the absurd assumption that it is "*spiritual, uncompounded and indivisible!*" What an argument! *Credat Judæus Apella.* But, after all, Mr. Lee virtually yields the question, for he does not introduce this argument to prove that God cannot, or that he will not destroy the soul! Then, pray, what is gained to his cause by his argument? I confess I can see nothing, for he says it "will live forever, *unless,*" yes, "*UNLESS destroyed* by the Almighty Power that gave it existence!" Well, suppose God should "*destroy*" it, as he says he will, what then becomes of Mr. Lee's favorite doctrine? It will be as though it never had been! Moreover, in confirmation of this view of the subject, we are taught that the Lord God "*drove out*" the man from the Garden of Eden, lest he should partake of the tree of life, eat, and live forever, an *immortal* sinner. Immortality, being an attribute of God—"he only having immortality,"—he cannot destroy that which is immortal, because to do so would be to act contrary to himself. To prevent, therefore, such a result as would have followed the act of Adam's eating of the tree of life, he drove him out, and obstructed his way to the life-imparting tree; knowing that, if he should partake

of it, he would live forever as a necessary consequence. All the evidence, then, going to prove that God is "able," and that he *wills* to destroy the soul of the sinner, equally disproves the "*natural immortality of the soul.*"

But, I repeat it, Mr. Lee does not know what the soul is. He speaks of it as an *entity*—as a distinct thing or essence, "uncompounded" and "indivisible." But, the truth is, Mr. Lee has been discussing the merits of an *attribute*, rather than an *entity*. Life, strictly speaking, is not an *entity* but an *attribute*. Immortality is not a *thing-entity* or essence, but a *quality*, an *attribute* of the *thing* of which it is predicated. Reasoning, therefore, upon a false assumption, what a flourish of "saws," "knives" and "axes" Mr. Lee makes in his *first* paragraph. His whole argument on this point, is inconclusive and defective in the extreme, when considered in relation to the truth of his own theory! The fact is, he subverts his own hypothesis, as we shall presently see.

Mr. Lee concludes from his reasoning on the "immateriality of the soul," that "God cannot destroy it, in the manner in which destructionists suppose." Further on he says—"God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible." Thus Mr. Lee's own reasoning brings us back to the point, that, if the soul be immortal, it will, by a necessity of its own nature, live forever. But, as God has declared that, "the soul that sins shall die," it follows, as a necessary consequence, that it is not immortal; and, therefore, that it can be destroyed by an "exertion of power upon it;" and also, by being left to the operation of its own laws, as in the case of Adam.

Having subverted his own theory, Mr. Lee invokes the aid of Mr. Drew to effect its annihilation! Mr. Drew's first sentence is a *death-blow* to Mr. Lee's whole argument on the fancied "immortality of the soul!" Mr. Drew says—and Mr. Lee en-

dorses it—"It has been already proved, that material bodies can never act but when they bring their surfaces into contact with each other!" This may have been deemed sound reasoning in the days of Mr. Drew, but, at the present time, every school boy of ordinary intelligence, knows better. Mr. Lee appears to have been asleep for a quarter of a century, without even *dreaming* in the time; and now that he is waked up he supposes every thing is just like it was when he fell asleep! He is waked up in the wrong place! and supposes himself living a quarter of a century past; and, consequently, speaks and reasons in harmony with the ideas which he obtained at that time! But he is behind the age, or else he would never have endorsed the sentence already quoted. Mr. Drew continues: "As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into contact with it," &c.

I am willing to submit it to the reader, yea, to Mr. Lee himself, whether Mr. Drew has not *disproved* the very position he intended to establish! Let the reader remember, then, that Mr. Drew and Mr. Lee regard it as "a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought into *contact* with" that which is "immaterial." It follows, therefore, from their own principles, that, as the body is matter, and the soul, in *their estimation*, is "immaterial," *they can never be brought into contact!* They, therefore, have no *connection* whatever! If this argument is not *suicidal*, there is no truth in the universe. According to this absurd and "vain philosophy," God, being "immaterial" in their view of the subject, can have no connection with the universe of matter he has created. I hesitate not to say, that this opinion is atheistical in its tendency, and absurd and monstrous in fact!

Mr. Lee, by endorsement, says—"Whatever has an exterior, must have an interior; and what has both must be extended: and what is thus extended



cannot be immaterial." Mr. Lee, by the aid of Mr. Drew, has clearly proved, admitting the correctness of their reasoning, that the soul is *nothing*! The following is their description of it: It is "simple," "uncompounded," "indivisible," "indissoluble;" without "exterior" or "interior surface," is not "extended," and "can never come into contact with matter!" Thus they have, by laboring to make the soul everything, reduced it to *nothing*! They have proved the very point we at first stated, viz.: *That that which is immaterial is nothing—it is a nonentity!*

And, just at this point, let me ask Mr. Lee a few questions: Upon your hypothesis, was the "immaterial soul," as you will have it, created of the dust, or breathed into the nostrils of Adam? If created of the dust, it is not "immaterial;" and, if breathed into his nostrils, it had "extension"—"surface," and necessarily came in "contact with matter;" and is, therefore, not "*im*-material!"

Again, how many "immaterial souls" did God create in the beginning? How many had Adam? How many had Eve? Did they have more than *one* each? If they had only *one* each, whence have their numerous offspring derived theirs? You say it is "indivisible" and "indissoluble," consequently it is not *transmissible*! And that which is *transmissible* comes in "contact with matter;" but you say the "immaterial" soul "cannot come into contact with matter;" therefore it is not transmitted; and, consequently, unless God creates an "immaterial soul" for every child born, the offspring of Adam have *no* "immaterial soul"—ERGO, in your opinion, *they have no soul at all*! So Adam, according to the working of your philosophy, has given birth to a *soulless progeny*! Thus Mr. Lee, in attempting to prove that men have "immaterial souls," has actually proved that they have none at all!

The remainder of Mr. Lee's article abounds in the same sort of logic: it is suicidal in reference

to his own theory! If Mr. Lee can reason no better than this upon his favorite view, he will murder his own cause, and bury it so deep, that no mortal hand shall ever be able to disinter it!

It would be a waste of time to extend the review of this article any further; but the reader, who is curious to see how completely Mr. Lee subverts his own theory, is referred to the article itself.

In conclusion, let me say, that Mr. Lee is utterly unable to sustain his theory by such arguments as he has adduced in the above article; nor do I believe that the man lives who can do it, by any sort of argumentation within the grasp of mortal intellect.

We fall back upon the conclusion, established alike by philosophy and revelation, that man is mortal in every part, and that immortality is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead!

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

‘*The common sentiment of mankind.*’

Gentle reader! I am glad, for your sake, that Mr. Lee has introduced the subject of, and based an argument on, “*the common sentiment of mankind*”!

He has proved, overwhelmingly and incontestably proved, the PAGAN ORIGIN of the popular doctrine of immortality! He has triumphantly sustained the very position we have long maintained, viz.: That “*the immortality of the soul*” is pagan in its origin, and was generally believed among pagans.

But, strange to say, while Mr. Lee has sustained the above point, he makes use of it for the purpose of proving the soul immortal! His argument amounts to this:

The ancient Egyptians, Persians, Phenicians, Scythians, Celts, Druids, Assyrians, &c., believed in the immortality of the soul—it was “*the common*”

sentiment" of all these nations. *Therefore*, the soul is immortal!

Or, to state it differently:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind," is true;

But the immortality of the soul is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

THEREFORE, the immortality of the soul is true!

By this logic Mr. Lee's proposition stands or falls! Mr. Lee says—"If destructionists can prove that the doctrine in question had some other, or if some other sentiment can be named, manifestly false, and equally common in the world, of the origin of which no account can be given, we acknowledge they will evade the force of this argument; but until this is done the argument must prove ruinous to their theory."

1. We are called upon, by the above, to prove that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul had some other origin than the Bible. And, on this point, Mr. Lee, himself, has helped us to a considerable amount of evidence, as we before remarked; but we shall examine the question more closely than he has done. What if the Babylonians, Medes and Persians believed the soul immortal? What if Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, taught it? What if the sentiment abounds in Homer, Ovid and Virgil? Do these facts prove the doctrine all divine? If so, the prevalence of other "sentiments," held by these nations and distinguished persons, upon the same principle of reasoning, must also be divine. If Mr. Lee's logic will prove conclusive in one case, it will in another—yes! in all others! If he receive the pagan idea of immortality, he must take along with it the pre-existence of souls—the transmigration of souls—and the rejection of the resurrection of the body! He must not divide the dose, though bitter! but swallow the whole like a man!

The oldest hypotheses of the Oriental World, upon this subject, resolved themselves into the doctrine of *emanation* and *imantion*; issuing from the "*soul of the universe*" at birth, and reabsorbed at death. They regarded the soul as a part of the Deity; thus making him *divisible*, which is one of Mr. Lee's "essential properties of matter"!

DR. GOOD says—"If we turn from Persia, Egypt, and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which *it is certain* that Persia, and highly probable that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject" (*of the immortality of the soul*), "left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or, if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief. The tradition, indeed, of a future state of retributive justice seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, *and to have been generally*, though perhaps not universally, accredited; BUT THE FUTURE EXISTENCE IT ALLUDES TO IS THAT OF A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, AND NOT OF A SURVIVAL OF THE SOUL AFTER THE BODY'S DISSOLUTION"! Here, then, is an exception to Mr. Lee's universal "consent of mankind." We have one place—one country—where the popular dogma of immortal-soulism was "blank and barren;" and where the opposite view was "*generally*" believed. And we find this, too, just where we might expect to find it, *viz.: where the light of revelation shed its illuminating beams!* That country is Idumea! Here Job, that venerable patriarchal saint, who held communion with the Living God, and not with the *Buthos* or *Demiurgus* of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Assyrians, &c.—here, I say, Job lived; and from this quarter we have, as Dr. Good expresses it, "that astonishing and transcendent composition" called "the Book of Job;" "a work," says he—although on Mr. Lee's side of the

question—"that ought assuredly to raise the genius of Idumea above that of Greece," &c., and, may I not add, the *knowledge* of Job far above that of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Dr. Dick and Mr. Lee—all combined!

Dr. Good continues—"Yet in this sublime and magnificent poem, replete with *all the learning and wisdom of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before us is merely as I have stated it, a patriarchal or traditional belief of a future state of retributive justice,* NOT BY THE NATURAL IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, BUT BY A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY"!

Dr. Good makes this belief "patriarchal or traditional;" but this is unnecessary, as Job was doubtless an inspired man. Dr. Good's testimony is the more valuable, because he believed in the popular doctrine of immortality.

Whether, therefore, the dogma of natural immortality originated with the old serpent, who said, "Ye shall not surely die;" or whether it originated in Egypt, Persia, Media, Babylonia, or elsewhere, it matters not. One thing is certain, it did not originate from God, else Job would have been in possession of it; and I will put Job's knowledge and wisdom against all the Babylonians, Persians, Medes, Assyrians, Zoroasters, and Platos on earth! Again, this is doubtless the oldest book or document extant, and on that account demands the attention of the sincere inquirer after truth on this subject.

"*The Hindoo philosophers,*" says Dr. Good, "TOTALLY and UNIVERSALLY denying a resurrection of the body, and supporting the doctrine (of future existence) alone upon the NATURAL IMMORTALITY of the soul, and the Arabian philosophers (among whom was Job) passing over the immortality of the soul, and resting it alone upon a RESURRECTION OF THE BODY."

The Hindoo view of this question, is the legiti-

mate tendency of the modern dogma on the same subject—it leads to a denial of the resurrection.

Mr. Lee, then, is welcome to his Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Assyrian, and Hindoostan associates, and their authority! He is welcome to the company of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Orpheus, Socrates, Plato, and a host of others! He is in *learned!*—but superstitious company! But, to be consistent, he should go all the way with them: he should believe in the pre-existence and pre-intelligence of the soul—that it is a part of God—that it *may suffer* in purgatory—and that it may be transmigrated!

The Grecian philosophy was imported by Pythagoras from India, whose philosophers reprobated the doctrine of a resurrection. So, when Paul preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead, in the Argora of Athens, the Athenians declared he brought strange things to their ears, and inquired what the new doctrine was.

Here, then, we have the whole subject before us. On one hand we have Mr. Lee's long array of nations, composing "the heathen world, believing in the natural immortality of the soul, with its kindred appendages. On the other hand, we have the light of truth, concerning the resurrection of the body, pouring its steady rays from the days of Job, through the dark ages, down to the present time.

And, now, I shall turn Mr. Lee's argument against him, by affirming that the "common sentiment of mankind" is wrong! *Truth* has always been in the minority, and it always will be, until the Lord comes and takes the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven! Error, in some, or all its forms, is "the common sentiment of mankind." And if Mr. Lee were to carry out his rule, he would be compelled to admit the *eternity of matter*, although he seems to have such an abhorrence of it, for his "heathen"

witnesses depose to *its* truth! Let us now state this argument in form:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind" is true;

But *error* is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

Therefore, *error is true!*

But why should we take "mankind" as the standard of truth? Why not take a nation? A "heathen" nation, to follow Mr. Lee's example? Why not take Europe? or one of the nations of Europe? Why not take Italy? Why not take the Pope? Why not take the most enlightened nation on earth? Will Mr. Lee submit his faith to such a standard? If he were to submit his faith to the "common sentiment" of any nation on earth, he would be weighed in the balance and found wanting. Go to the "heathen world" to learn the doctrine of immortality! Go to Babylon—to India—to Egypt—to the Eastern Magicians, Soothsayers, Astrologers and Philosophers, to learn the doctrine of eternal life? Place these in the collegiate chair, and let the venerable Job, of the land of Uz, sit at their feet, and learn? Place the wisdom of Zoroaster and his associates, which is "foolishness with God," in opposition to the spirit of wisdom divine? A man must be hard pressed for evidence to sustain his faith, when he leaves the oldest and most venerable document on earth, and seeks to the Vedas of the Brahmins and the Zendavesta of the Parsees for light on the question of immortality!

Here, then, is a fact to which we call special attention, viz.: *That the denial of the resurrection of the body was as much "the common sentiment of mankind," as the doctrine of the soul's immortality.* Among all Mr. Lee's witnesses, only one—Zoroaster—believed in, or taught, a resurrection. Now, I can find as many exceptions to Mr. Lee's "common consent of mankind," in relation to the

immortality of the soul, as he can find on the subject of a *non-resurrection*. Will Mr. Lee give me the "*origin*" of this "*sentiment*?"

Mr. L. says—"If the doctrine of a future existence be an error, it is the most general one that ever entered the world," &c. Mr. Lee here makes a false issue; for it is not the "*doctrine of a future existence*" that is denied; but it is the predication "*of a future existence*" on the "*natural immortality of the soul*," instead of the resurrection of the body.

Mr. Lee says—the doctrine of the immortality of the soul "*prevails most where the Scriptures are most known and read.*" But, alas! for Mr. Lee's cause, *his evidence* is all on the other side of the question! If he had said—that the doctrine in question "*prevails most where the Scriptures are least known and read,*" he would have spoken the truth; and his statement would have harmonized with his "*heathen*" testimony! For surely he will not contend that the Scriptures were "*most known and read*" by the men and nations of whom he has spoken!

Again he says—"The doctrine must have had its origin." Of course, Mr. Lee, it had its origin; but was that origin divine? If it was, you have failed to prove it, for your witnesses are *pagan*. Taking the *non-resurrection of the body* as a sentiment running parallel with the doctrine of the soul's immortality—among the nations and tribes referred to, I will adopt Mr. Lee's mode of reasoning, thus: As the NON-RESURRECTION OF THE BODY prevails in the heathen world, "and as no account can be given of its introduction, it follows that it must have sprung from some one of the following sources:—It must be instinct, the result of natural reason, from the light of nature, the impression of God's spirit on the mind, or the principle of revelation contained in the Bible. Now, if it be instinct, it must be from the Creator; if it be the



result of natural reason, it cannot be unreasonable ; if it be from the light of nature, it is a revelation from God ; if it be the impression of God's spirit on the mind, it is no less a divine revelation ; and if it be the sentiment of the Bible, none but infidels will deny it"! Thus Mr. Lee's logic will work both ways ! It will alike apply to every prevalent sentiment, true or false ! It will apply especially to many of the appendages of the immortality of the soul. But Mr. Lee makes a bad use of his own logic ; for, will he tell me what sentiment has not sprung from one or the other of the sources he has mentioned ? I apprehend he will find that every sentiment extant proceeded from one or the other of those sources. What, then, has Mr. Lee gained by this flourish ? Absolutely nothing ! What is "natural reason" ? If Mr. Lee mean by this *unenlightened reason*, then I affirm that it has given birth, not only to *his* favorite doctrine, but a thousand other vagaries and absurdities which revelation repudiates, and *enlightened reason scouts!*

2. Now, let us look at this subject from another point.

In perfect harmony with what we have said, concerning the origin and prevalence of the popular view, I will remark, *that before the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests*, the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the dead. They spoke of it as a place of silence, darkness, and inactivity. This fact speaks volumes as to the "heathen" or pagan origin of the doctrine we are calling in question. They knew nothing of natural immortality till they were carried captive to Babylon, and mingled with some of Mr. Lee's witnesses !

Again, "after the Hebrews mingled with the" Babylonians, "Greeks and Romans, they insensibly slid into their use of terms, and *adopted some of their ideas on such subjects as those on which THEIR ORACLES WERE SILENT.*" Hence the pecu-

liar views of the Pharisees, many of whom not only believed in the pre-existence of souls—but, also, their immortality and transmigration. This is the reason why the question was put to our Lord, concerning the man who was born blind. They supposed it possible for the man to have sinned in a previous state, which was the cause of his being born blind. They also thought that Jesus Christ was in possession of the soul of John Baptist, or one of the prophets. Let us now sum up the whole argument :

1. We have seen that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of the soul, and its transmigration, together with a reprobation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, was in its origin pagan or heathenish. Mr. Lee has given us ample proof of this. I have given additional proof.

2. That in Idumea or Arabia—the country of Job, who is the author of the oldest document extant, we find the opposite doctrine prevailing; and a future life predicated on the resurrection of the body.

3. That the prevalence of a sentiment is no proof of its truth, or correctness; but, if anything, affords presumptive evidence against it. Truth has always been in the minority.

4. That previous to the Babylonish captivity, the Jews were silent on the state of the dead, regarding it as a state of silence and darkness.

5. But that *after* the Hebrews mingled with the Babylonians, Greeks and Romans, they adopted their *ideas* on such subjects as those on which their oracles—the Old Testament—was silent. (See Appendix to New Version.)

6. And that reason unenlightened, has given birth to a thousand vagaries, and among them the dogma of “natural immortality.”

But, we are not done with this subject yet; we wish to place it where the hand of mortal disinter-

ment can never reach it! And I now affirm, that revelation has placed the seal of condemnation on the oriental science, of a part of which Mr. Lee is the special advocate.

First, then, in reference to the very nations whom Mr. Lee has convoked as witnesses, Paul says—"Professing to be wise men, they became fools; for they changed the glory of the immortal God into the likeness of an image of mortal man, of fowls, of four-footed beasts, and of reptiles." This will apply to Mr. Lee's Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek and Roman witnesses. Idolatry was as current among them as the idea of the soul's immortality; so that even in Athens, at that time the most enlightened city of the oriental world, they had *thirty thousand gods*, and held the *natural immortality* of the soul; but *rejected* the resurrection of the body. In the above quotation I have not followed the common version, though I have no objection to it; but have given a better rendering of the language, which is sanctioned by Campbell and McKnight. Here is another: "For this doctrine (the preaching of Christ) is, indeed, foolishness to the destroyed; but to us, who are saved, it is the power of God. Therefore, it is written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the knowledge of the prudent. Where is the wise man? Where the Scribe? Where the disputers of this world? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Again, Paul says—"The world by wisdom knew not God." The Greeks sought after wisdom—the wisdom of the Platonian school, and consequently, the preaching of life and immortality, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead, was "*foolishness*" to them. Paul did not teach "the wisdom of this world"—he did not speak the theological dialect of Greece and Rome. And here we are reminded of an important fact, that, although the words and ideas, concerning

natural immortality, are found scattered through the works of pagan philosophers, *we have neither the one nor the other in all the revelations of God!* Why this singular *omission*, if it be the doctrine of the Bible? "O," says Mr. Lee, "it is taken for granted." Taken for granted, indeed! This is a mere *evasion* of the argument. There is not a particle of truth in it. The Bible does not take one doctrine "*for granted*," and then *teach an opposite one!*

"The theological dialect of the oriental and occidental schools is a compound of foolish words and phrases, which make a foolish language," the product of confusion, mythology and ignorance. They taught "a vain philosophy;" the philosophy of Greece and Rome, which Paul justly avers is "falsely so called." Hymeneus and Philetus appear to have been professors of this oriental science. What this science is, we have already seen; and I would here only remind you, that the dogma of a *translation to heaven or hell at death, is one item of that profane science by which they overthrew the faith of some in the resurrection.* It was upon this hypothesis that "some" among the Corinthians said there was "no resurrection;" and this, I repeat, is the legitimate tendency of the philosophy and theology of my friend Mr. Lee.

In concluding this long review of Mr. Lee's, No. 10, I will, without arguing them, present the legitimate tendencies of the view we are opposing. It is furnished to my hand by an intelligent living author.

1. *The dogma of "immortal souls" contravenes the Mosaic account of the Fall.*
2. *It reduces the Mosaic account to an absurdity.*
3. *It necessitates a change of the words of the Spirit from their proper to a figurative signification.*

4. *It is subversive of the resurrection and the judgment.*

5. *The pagan tradition of the soul's immortality, not only renders null and void the resurrection to life and judgment, BUT IS EQUALLY SUBVERSIVE OF THE PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF MESSIAH ON EARTH AGAIN.*

6. *THE HYMENEAN GNOSIS of immortal soul-ism, and ethereal translation at death, abrogates the reign of Messiah on David's throne for a season and a time.*

I pledge myself to make good every item in the above indictment, when it is demanded by counter-evidence.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

Mr Lee's article, No. 11, is devoted to "the well known opinions of the Jews," in reference to the state of the dead.

In the opening sentence of this article, Mr. Lee says—"The Jews *have* ALWAYS believed in the conscious existence of the soul after the death of the body, and in its immortality."

This is not a fact—it is not true—and his evidence has failed to prove it, as we shall see.

1. We have before shown that, *before* the Babylonish captivity, the Jews observed the most profound silence in relation to the dead; and spoke of their state as one of darkness, silence and inactivity.

2. That *after* the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests, they adopted their language and ideas, on such subjects as those upon which their oracles were silent. *Let these facts be remembered*, for they disprove the assertion of Mr. Lee, that "the Jews *have always* believed in the conscious existence" of the dead, and the "immortality" of the soul. Let the reader, also, notice, that Mr. Lee's testimony does not extend

back to, much less *beyond* this period. He has failed, then, to prove his *first* point.

Mr. Lee quotes from Josephus; and here let me state a principle in giving testimony. A witness, in deposing to a fact or truth, is required and expected to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Josephus tells us what the Jews believed in his day; but he does not tell us they "*always*" so believed. He gives us to understand that they believed in the immortality of the soul, in a restricted sense; but he does not stop there, and, if his testimony upon the subject is to be received as evidence of the *truth* of the doctrine, we must receive it all or none. Josephus says—"the Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that *under the earth* there will be *rewards* and punishments." This was the great "national doctrine," to use Mr. Lee's words. Let Mr. Lee, then, be a Pharisee in all this, as the doctrine was not *specially* condemned by our Lord! This testimony proves *too much*, and what proves too much, proves nothing. This is all in harmony with Mr. Lee's pagan witnesses. They also proved too much for Mr. Lee's cause.

While it is admitted then, that the mass of the Jews believed in the pagan doctrine of immortality, Mr. Lee gains nothing from the admission; because we have seen from whence they derived these ideas—ideas upon which their oracles were silent. And the fact, that they placed "*rewards* and *punishments* UNDER THE EARTH," clearly enough indicates their pagan origin.

According to the testimony of Josephus, the Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection of pagans: for he says "they believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them; and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life: and the vicious are to be *detained in an everlasting prison*, but that the *virtuous*

SHALL HAVE POWER TO REVIVE AND LIVE AGAIN." Antiq. B. xviii. C. 1. 3. In another place he says—"they say that all the souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of *good men* only are *removed into other bodies*"—that is, they are transmigrated. In a word, from all the testimony of Josephus, we come to the following conclusions: 1. They believed the heathen would not be raised from the dead. 2. That the righteous children of Abraham only would rise. 3. That his *unrighteous* children would not rise; but be detained in the prison house of the dead forever. 4. That the souls of *good men* passed into other bodies, or were transmigrated. So that Josephus' testimony proves more than Mr. Lee desires; and, if it be good on one point, it should certainly be received on collateral points. But the Lord has put the seal of condemnation upon the doctrines of both Sadducees and Pharisees. He said to his disciples—"BEWARE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PHARISEES AND OF THE SADDUCEES." They were both wrong; the Sadducees occupied one extreme, and the Pharisees another. And, as we have before seen, these views were Babylonish in their origin; and are not supported by the Jewish Scriptures.

Mr. Lee refers to the "Jews' Service Book;" and in reference to this I will only quote the language of Christ—"In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." And again—"Ye make void the law through your traditions."

Mr. Lee also goes into the Apocrypha; and for what purpose does he go there? To prove that "the Jews *always* believed in the immortality of the soul?" If so, his evidence fails, because the Apocrypha, according to his admission, was "written before the Christian era;" but not before the Babylonish captivity! But, were I disposed, I could show from the very passages Mr. Lee has quoted from Esdras and the wisdom of Solomon,

that he totally misapprehends and misapplies all the quotations he makes. But I do not deem the document of sufficient importance to do so. I will, however, proceed to show that the most authoritative parts of the Apocrypha, those bearing the names of some of the authors of some of the books composing the Bible, teach a very different doctrine from Mr. Lee's.

First, then, as a specimen, read 2 Esdras vii. 31, "And after seven days the world, that yet waketh not, shall be raised up, *and that shall die that is corrupt.*" If this refer to the resurrection, which it appears to do, from the context, then it proves the "second death" of the "corrupt," which Mr. Lee denies. Again, at the 15th verse—"Now therefore, why disquietest thou thyself, seeing thou art but *a CORRUPTIBLE MAN?* and why art thou moved, whereas *thou art but MORTAL?*"

But let us examine the "Wisdom of Solomon," which has a much higher claim than the Book of Esdras, and see what he says on the question of death and immortality. Chapter i. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16—"Seek not death in the error of your life: and pull not upon yourselves destruction with the works of your hands. For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. For he created all things that they might *have their being*: and the generations of the world were healthful; and there is no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth: (FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS IS IMMORTAL;) but *ungodly men* with their *works* and *words* called it to them: for when they thought to have it their friend, *they CONSUMED TO NAUGHT, and made a covenant with it, because they are worthy to take part with it.*" This certainly does not teach the natural immortality of the soul. Again, in the 2d chapter, "For God created man TO BE IMMORTAL, and made him to be an *image of his own eternity*; nevertheless," notwithstanding this purpose on the part of God,



'through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side DO FIND IT.' Here it is clearly taught, that God, when he created man, designed his immortality—his eternal life, but that through the envy of the devil, death came into the world, and those who hold of his side, find death their portion. The passage Mr. Lee quotes from the 3d chapter, he totally misapplies. "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die," in the Sadducean sense of not living again, "*but they are in peace.*" "This hope is full of immortality," which it could not be, if they already possessed it, for "hope" relates to the future—"the time of their visitation," which is spoken of in the 7th and 8th verses. The reader is requested to turn to the 7th chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon, and read the five first verses, and compare it with what we have already quoted here; and, also, what we have elsewhere said on the nature of man.

I will quote one passage more from the Apocrypha; it is found in Ecclesiasticus xvii. 27-32. "Who shall praise the most high *in the grave*, instead of them which *live* and give thanks? *Thanksgiving PERISHETH FROM THE DEAD, AS FROM ONE THAT IS NOT: the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. For all things cannot be in men, BECAUSE THE SON OF MAN IS NOT IMMORTAL.*" Again, he says—"All men are but earth and ashes." The Wisdom of Solomon was doubtless written *before* the Babylonish Captivity, and Ecclesiasticus appears to have been written about, or a little *after* that time. Thus we have proved, first, that the Jews did not "*always*" believe in the immortality of the soul; and, secondly, that, even after their return from Babylon, one of their principal writers, the author of Ecclesiasticus, did not teach it; all of which is in harmony with the Bible. Mr. Lee's cause has gained nothing, I apprehend, by going into the Apocrypha!

He next appeals to the Bible; but, alas! for his theory, he crucifies it afresh, and puts it to public shame! He quotes Math. xiv. 26, and Luke xxiv. 36-39, Mark vi. 49.

In Matthew and Mark the original word is *phantasma*, a phantom; and such is also the marginal reading in Luke. In the cases recorded by Matthew and Mark, the disciples thought they saw a *phantom*, but they were *mistaken*, as all other persons have been ever since. Let the reader notice, then, that in the only cases recorded, where the disciples supposed they saw a *phantom*—*ghost*. they were deceived; and that there is not a case differing from this on record!

In the case referred to by Luke, we have the subject presented in all its power and force. The Lord Jesus had arisen from the dead; his Father "had shown him the path of life," and "demonstrated him as his son, by his resurrection from the dead"—"death" now "had no more dominion over him,"—he was immortal—and as such he appears in their midst! "They were terrified and affrighted and supposed they had seen a spirit—a *phantasma*, or phantom—ghost. And now he proceeds to *correct* their ideas of such things by asking, "Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts! Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit—a *phantasma*—hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet." Thus *correcting* their errors on the subject of spirit, or *phantoms*, and, at the same time, *demonstrating the MATERIALITY OF SPIRITUAL BODIES!*

Here is "a quickening spirit," as Paul says, with "*flesh and bones, hands and feet.*" Here we have a glorious specimen of a spiritual, immortal body—not "immaterial," but *material*—*real*—*tangible*; something which could be "*handled*" and "*seen!*"

What becomes of Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul" in the light of this fact? His theory is exploded! his foundation demolished! his superstructure crumbled into dust, and his theology a thing of nought! the *ignis fatuus* of a day! This fact, I repeat it, sweeps away Mr. Lee's whole theory of "immateriality," demolishes Mr. Drew's logic, and nullifies all the rhetoric of Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates, and Zoroaster. It eclipses all the philosophy of Babylonia, Egypt, Media, Persia, Greece and Rome! It swallows up all the traditions of the Jewish Service Book, Josephus, and the Apocrypha! It casts into the shade all the learning of Pharisees and Sadducees, ancient or modern! *because it is LIFE AND IMMORTALITY BROUGHT TO LIGHT!!*"

---

## CHAPTER X.

IN Mr. Lee's article No. 12., he bases an argument on the doctrine of what he is pleased to call "the primitive church," or the "Apostolic Fathers." He says—"In an investigation like the one in which we are engaged, it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them."

As a preliminary question, I would ask, What do we understand by "*the primitive church?*" and "the early Christians?" I understand what Mr. Lee means, but, I apprehend, he is utterly wrong in his hypothesis. "The primitive church," in point of fact, was the first church established by the Apostles; and this will carry us back to Jerusalem, the locality of the first Christian Congregation. The "early Christians" are those who first received the Gospel of Christ, and obeyed it. And, in this view of the subject, I grant that "it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what their doctrine was; but I do not suppose it possible to determine this point by an appeal to those who have been termed "Apostolic Fathers." But, why appeal to these "Fathers" at all? Mr. Lee's doctrine was either taught by the Apostles, or it was not; if it was, surely he can make it appear from their writings; but, if it was not taught, why appeal to the Fathers to prove that which is *false?*

That must be a bad cause which requires such testimony to sustain it, in the absence of all scriptural evidence!

But in reference to these Fathers, I will remark, that their writings are not to be relied upon. The five Fathers who flourished in the first century, were Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The first of these quoted by Mr. Lee is St. Clement. This Clement, if I mistake not, is claimed as one of the *Popes* of Rome, by Catholic authority. They place *Peter* in the chair first, then *Linus*, who transferred it to *Anacletus*, then CLEMENT. EUSEBIUS. book ii, chap. 2, page 82; chap. 13, page 100.

Speaking of the writings of Clement, Du Pin, who is regarded as an authentic Roman Catholic historian, proves them to be spurious; because, first, "The second epistle of St. Clement directed to St. James, speaks of the *Ostiarrii* or door-keepers, arch-deacons and other ecclesiastical officers, *that were not then introduced into the church;*" 2d., "This letter mentions

*sub*-deacons, an order not then established in the church." p. 584.

But, in relation to all, or most, of these writings of the Apostolic Fathers, I will again refer to Du Pin. "Criticism is a kind of torch, that lights and conducts us, in the obscure tracts of antiquity, by making us able to distinguish *truth* from *falsehood*, *history* from *fable*, and *antiquity* from novelty. "T is by this means, that in our times we have disengaged ourselves from an infinite number of very common errors into which our fathers fell for want of examining things by the rules of true criticism. *For it is a surprising thing to consider how many SPURIOUS BOOKS we find in antiquity; nay, even IN THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHURCH.*" He then proceeds to give the reasons which prompted persons thus to publish "Spurious Books," the first of which is, "the malice of heretics; who, to give the greater reputation to their heresies, composed several books, which they *attributed to persons of great reputation,*" &c. "And thus the first heretics devised *FALSE GOSPELS, FALSE ACTS and FALSE EPISTLES of the APOSTLES, and their DISCIPLES,*" &c.

Mr. Hinton says of these Fathers, that "There are no writings of these venerable men that can be safely relied on as the productions of their pens, except, *perhaps*, the epistle of Clement;" and the reader has seen the disposition we make of his writings. Furthermore, he says—"Indeed, such was the state both of literature and morals, in the fourth and subsequent centuries, that the favorite occupation of the Monks of those days, seems to have been first to write the most *ridiculous nonsense* by way of indicating their literary taste; and then *fraudulently* to attach to it the name of some eminent Father of the *first* or *second* century, by way of proving the high state of their moral sensibility."

Mosheim says—"The epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew," &c. "The 'Shepherd of

Hermas,' was composed in the second century by Hermes, who was brother of Pius, bishop of Rome."

But, after all, it seems to me that Mr. Lee has rather *forced* Polycarp to testify in favor of his hypothesis, than otherwise, and that the quotation made does not *legitimately* prove it. But, be this as it may, there is little or no reliance to be placed on any of these reputed Epistles, as we have already seen.

But, I would have the reader remember, that even in the Apostles' day, "the mystery of iniquity" began to work, and to develop itself. Many errors, and among them, I apprehend, that advocated by Mr. Lee himself, were quite prevalent; even in the Apostolic Age. Of this class were Hymeneus and Philetus, who, by advocating the opinion now taught by Mr. Lee, Mr. Brewster, Dr. Bush, and others, denied the proper resurrection of the body, and "overthrew the faith of some." If a man puts on his "resurrection body" when he dies, then the resurrection of the body at the coming of Christ is a nullity and a fable! This view obtained before the death of the Apostles; no marvel, therefore, that we should find traces of it in the first and second centuries, and down to the present time.

What doctrine, I ask, has not been proved by the testimony of the Fathers? Mr. Lee goes to them to prove the "immateriality" (the *nothingness*) of the soul: the Pædobaptist to prove Infant sprinkling; the Baptist to prove immersion; the Catholic to prove that Peter was the first Pope, the truth of the doctrine of Purgatory, the invocation of saints, Apostolic succession, &c., &c. Mr. Lee says—"It is of the *utmost importance* to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them." Let HIM, then, be *honest* to them, and to himself, and believe *all* they taught! But, I apprehend, he would not be willing to endorse the sentiments of even all the extracts he has made!

And I am sure that their testimony is not necessary, except to sustain a *rotten* cause!

But, in order to rebut all the *remaining* force of Mr. Lee's argument, I will introduce a passage from JUSTIN MARTYR, who was born A. D. 89., and suffered death for Christ A. D. 163. He tells Typho, the Jew, "*that some indeed called Christians, are in fact atheists (ATHEAI—without God) and impious heretics, because in every way, they teach blasphemy, impiety and folly.*" He gives proof of his own sincerity, and protests that he was "*determined to follow not men, nor human authority, but God and the doctrine taught by him;*" adding, "*should you happen upon some who are called Christians indeed, and yet are far from holding these sentiments, but even DARE to assail the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob with blasphemy and say, 'THERE IS NO RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD; BUT INSTANTLY WHEN THEY DIE, ARE RECEIVED UP INTO HEAVEN, DO NOT COUNT THESE AMONG CHRISTIANS, even as they are not Jews, if accurately considered, who are called Sadducees, and the like sects of Genistar, Meristar, Galileans, HELLINISTS, PHARISEES, Baptists (a sect that followed John the Baptist) and others;* but under the name of Jews and sons of Abraham, they worship God, as he accuses them, with their lips only, while their heart is far from him. But I, and all who are sound in the Christian faith, are acquainted with the resurrection of the body, and the 1000 years in Jerusalem, that shall be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the Prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare." Brooks on Prophecy, page 52; also Duffield's work. Justin Martyr himself affirms that he was contemporary with the Apostle John, who wrote the Revelation, in which mention is made of the 1000 years five times, in connexion with the universal subjugation of evil, the resurrection from the dust of the sleeping saints, and their reign with Christ.

Here, then, we have a clear and distinct expression of sentiment, in relation to this point; while Mr. Lee

has to *infer* from the language he quotes, that such was the view of the authors he cites. Justin Martyr distinctly tells Trypho, that he was not to "count those as Christians" who believed the, *now*, popular doctrine! Mr. Brooks says—"Irenæus ranks these professors, in his work against Heresies (book v.) as among the heretical; and the testimony of the church is uniform on this point (if we except some questionable passages in Cyprian) *down into Popish times*; and, indeed, it was the general opinion of the Greek and Latin churches down to the Council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV., A. D. 1439.

Bishop Taylor, in his work on the 'Liberty of Prophesying' (viii.) sets this in a clear light. He says—"it is a plain *recession from antiquity*, which was determined by the council of Florence—*piorum animas purgatas, &c., mox in cælum recipi et intueri clare ipsum Deum Trinum et Unum sicuti est*—**THAT THE SOULS OF THE PIOUS, BEING PURIFIED, ARE IMMEDIATELY RECEIVED INTO HEAVEN AND BEHOLD CLEARLY THE TRIUNE JEHOVAH JUST AS HE IS:** for those who please to try, may see it resolved dogmatically to the contrary by *Justin Martyr*, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Arethas Cæsariensis, and Euthymius, who may answer for the Greek church. And it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek church, by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine Council, where the Latins acted their master piece of wit and stratagem—the greatest that hath been till the famous Council of Trent. And for the Latin church, Tertullian, Ambrose, Austin, Hilary, Prudentius, Lactantius, Victorinus, and Bernard, are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atriis*—in unseen receptacles and outer darkness—where they expect the resurrection," &c.

The early Reformers maintained the *primitive* faith on this point, plainly perceiving *that the object of the Papists was to help forward the doctrine of PURGATORY*



*and INVOCATION OF SAINTS.* Thus TYNDAL, disputing with the Papists, says, "IF THE SOULS BE IN HEAVEN, TELL ME WHY THEY BE NOT IN AS GOOD CASE AS THE ANGELS BE? *And then, WHAT CAUSE OF THE RESURRECTION!*"

And, again, in reply to Sir Thomas More, who objects against LUTHER—that his doctrine encouraged the sinner to continue in sin, seeing it so long postponed the ultimate judgment, TYNDAL says, "CHRIST and his APOSTLES taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's coming again every hour; which coming again, BECAUSE YE BELIEVE IT WILL NEVER BE, therefore have ye FEIGNED THAT other merchandise"—of the instantaneous translation of souls to heaven at death!

Calvin also, in his *Psycopannuchia*, replies thus to another objection against this doctrine:—"I answer, that Christ is our head, whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared. If the members were to go (to heaven) before their head (comes) the order of things would be inverted and preposterous. But we shall follow our Prince then, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit upon the throne of his majesty, p. 255. It is greatly to be lamented, that the Protestant Church of a later period should have fallen into the errors of the Papists on this subject (abating the distinct acknowledgement of Purgatory)—errors, the adoption of which has done more than any other thing, perhaps, toward withdrawing from the church the lively expectation of Christ's Advent." This doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, being pagan in its origin, was incorporated with Christianity, and constituted the grand work of the Apostacy. Upon it was built the doctrine of Purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. When MARTIN LUTHER first commenced his crusade against "the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth," he repudiated the doctrine in question, as a part of the strong delusion of the wicked One.

D'Aubigne says—"Duke George of Saxony, who

would neither connect himself with Rome nor with Wittemberg, had written, as early as the 15th October, 1521, to Duke John the the Elector's brother, to induce him to side with those who opposed the progress of the Reformation. 'Some,' wrote he, '*deny the immortality of the soul, and these Friars too, drag the Relics of St. Anthony through the streets, and through them into the gutters. All this comes of Luther's teaching.*'"

The following is an extract from Audlin's Life of Luther, which will prove that Luther rejected the pagan dogma of an immortal soul in the animal Man. "He is speaking of the bad principle of every one construing scripture to suit himself, and adduces the Italians as illustrative of its evil tendency, which practise, says he, was first introduced by Martin Luther. Thus he writes: "These were new lights, who came to announce, that they had discovered an irresistible argument against the Mass, Purgatory, and Prayer to the saints. This was simply to deny the Immortality of the soul, an idea that had been hatched in the brains of some Italian refugees, who were publicly laughed at. They left Wittemberg and went to Geneva, where we find them in 1561, sustaining in a crowded school, and in printed *theses*, that all which has been said about the Immortality of the soul was invented by Antichrist for the purpose of making the Pope's pot boil. *Purgatorium cum missa et pontifice romano melius abolere possumus, quam si dicamus simul anima cum corpore extingui. Quidquid animarum habetur immortalitate, ab Antichristo ad statuentiam suam culinam excogitatum est.* This proposition was really maintained in Geneva, not however in General Assembly as Prateolus relates in Elench. voce. p. 72, but by some Italian exiles, who published their *theses*, and maintained them in full school.—Boyle, Art. Luther.

"They quoted Luther, who had said, '*It is idle to trouble ourselves with endeavouring to prove that the soul is produced by way of propagation, or that it is*

*infused into the body at the moment of creation. I maintain with the poet, THAT THE CHILD FOLLOWS ITS PARENT. 'Nilul est quod dicitur, anima rationalis creando infunditur et infundendo creatur: melius hoc in re docuit poeta dicens: patrem sequitur sua proles.'* OP. LUTHER, T. XI; BOYLE, ART. LUTHER. They mis understood the passage." *Audlin, pp. 192, 193.*

The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, is the foundation on which the Harlot Mother sits; and, as she is the mother of harlots, all her daughters have drank deeply of her spiritual fornication! The whole Protestant World is tinctured with this subtle heresy; and in vain do they oppose the Mass, Purgatory, and the invocation of saints, whose very existence depends upon the popular dogma of immortality, while they maintain, uphold and defend this foundation! If the popular doctrine be true, what argument can you bring against Purgatory? What against the invocation of saints? None, so effective as the one we oppose to those false and delusive dogmas.

Men, Brethren and Fathers! be *protestants* indeed, and renounce every relic—the last vestige of Catholicism, or cease to call yourselves such! We are now grappling with the great City of Pagan-papal Babylon; come, and with us lay hold of the mighty lever of Truth, that the superstructure may fall, and, like a millstone cast into the deep, be found no more at all!

In Mr. Lee's article No. 13, he introduces the History of Eusebius, from which he quotes to prove his favorite theory. I shall make but few remarks on this testimony—just enough to show its inadequacy to prove the doctrine in question. And, *first, Mr. Lee does not distinguish between an HISTORICAL FACT and the MERE OPINION of Eusebius himself.* He quotes from page 148, where Eusebius gives an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, and speaks of him as "*now crowned with the crown of immortality and bearing off the indisputable prize.*" Now, as

Eusebius is professedly giving us a *history of the church*—of things on earth—of persons in this life, *and not after they are dead*—I apprehend *this* is no history at all, but merely the opinion of the author, which is worth no more than the opinion of Mr. Lee, or any other man living or dead. And I might ask the question—How did Eusebius know that Polycarp was then “crowned with the crown of immortality?” Is such information as this a matter of history, or of revelation?

What we have said of Polycarp is equally applicable to what Eusebius says of Lucius, Blandina, and the martyrs in general. They were, in the *opinion* of Eusebius, *living* and *happy* although *dead*!

But, what is the opinion of Eusebius worth, in *opposition* to the teaching of the Apostles? If the opinion of Eusebius, in reference to the martyrs, was true, they were more fortunate than Paul, who did not expect his “crown” till “the day of Christ.”

Mr. Lee quotes the following from Eusebius: “But about this time, other men sprung up in Arabia, as the propagators of false opinions. These asserted that the human soul, as long as the present state of the world exists, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection. And as a *considerable* COUNCIL was held on account of this, Origen, being again requested, likewise here discussed the point in question, with so much force, that those who had before been led astray, completely changed their opinions.” p. 153.

The reader will please observe that in this extract, Eusebius first gives his own personal view of the doctrines propagated by the persons alluded to, and characterizes them as “false opinions.”

2d. That these “opinions” were so prevalent as to call for a “CONSIDERABLE COUNCIL” to suppress them. This was not the only truth suppressed by a “*council*!”

3d. That ORIGEN was “*again* requested” to dis-

cuss the question involved, by which we learn that this was not the *first* time this question had been agitated; nor was this the first effort made by *Pagochristians* to nullify the *truth*. Bearing in mind the fact, that ORIGEN was in fact the *Father*—the *origin* of almost all heresy in the church; and that he lived in the *third* century, long after “the mystery of iniquity began to work;” and comparing the above facts with the testimony of Justin Martyr, who taught Trypho the Jew “not to regard such as Christians,” who held the doctrines inculcated in this extract; and, I apprehend, Mr. Lee’s cause has gained but little from the authority of Eusebius.

To recapitulate, I will remark,

1st. Mr. Lee has not sustained his doctrine *philosophically*, but has effectually subverted his own theory.

2d. His argument, based on “*the common sentiment of mankind*,” is null and void.

3d. He has failed to make it good from *Jewish testimony*.

4th. The writings of the *Apostolic Fathers*” are not reliable—are inconsistent, contradictory, and often absurd; and, being alike quoted to prove every other disputed question in Theology, utterly fail to sustain his theory.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

In Mr. Lee’s article “No. 14,” he comes at *last* to the Bible for proof, that the soul survives the body. It really seems as if he was unwilling to risk his doctrine upon the authority of the *Bible only*; and hence he has “compassed sea and land” to fortify his position before coming to the sacred Record, as though any amount of human testimony could *invalidate* the word of God! We have followed him in his meandering course, in order that the reader

might appreciate the value of his *extraneous* testimony. And, now, having come to the word of God, let us examine the subject in its heavenly light.

1st. His first Bible argument is Eccles. iii. 21. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." Not satisfied with the common reading, he invokes the aid of Dr. Clarke and Prof. Roy. Clarke gives us a paraphrase, rather than a translation, in which he weaves his own theological dogma; and Prof. Roy professes to give a literal translation. Well, I will meet Mr. Lee on his own ground, and adopt the translation of Mr. Roy: "Who knoweth the spirit of the sons of Adam that ascends upward to the highest place; or even the spirit of the cattle which descends downwards into the lowest part of the earth?"

In order to understand this, we must examine the context, for Solomon must not be supposed to contradict himself. In the 19th verse he presents an *analogy* between man and the beasts. "As the one dieth, so dieth the other; yes, they all have one breath; so that a man (in these things) "hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is *vanity*" or *mortal*. "All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Now, with this context before us, what is the meaning of the 21st verse? surely not that man has an immortal spirit, which outlives the body, for that is incompatible with the context. But, using the term "spirit" to designate the *mind*, he proceeds to show, by interrogation, the *difference* between man and the beasts—the mind of one "ascends to the highest place," while the mind of the other is low—"descending to the earth"—cannot rise higher than the earth. If this be not the meaning of the passage, then there is no reconciling the *text* with the *context*. And, I apprehend, this text does not refer to the *destiny* of either man or beast. It has no bearing whatever upon Mr. Lee's question, and he must feel himself hard pressed to force this

into his service. The preceding verses *do* refer to the common *destiny* of man and beasts at death, but the 21st verse contains the *contrast while living*.

2d. Mr. Lee next refers to Eccles. xii. 7. "Then shall the dust return," &c. But we have already, in a previous article, examined this; and, therefore, will only remark in further reply to Mr. Lee, that the fact of the "spirit returning to God who gave it" does not prove its consciousness or happiness. "He gathers to Himself the breath of all flesh," but must we thence infer that the breath is conscious? Mr. Lee takes too much for granted, and reasons too loosely. In a former article he admits, himself, that the above text may refer to the "breath of life breathed into the nostrils of Adam."

3d. Ps. xc. 10, is quoted as proof. The latter clause is all we have to do with at present—"We fly away." "Our argument," says Mr. Lee, "hangs upon this." "No man of sense and taste," says Mr. Lee, "would use such language, with reference of death, who believes that there is in man no living soul, which continues to live after the body is dead." Mr. Lee waxes hot! Keep cool, my dear sir, and you will feel the better for it!

With all due deference for your sweeping assertion, I shall have to come to a contrary opinion. Job said "My days are *swifter* than a weaver's shuttle"—"My life is *wind!*" And the Psalmist, using a figure of the same character, speaks of death as "a flying away." That David meant death, and nothing but death, is evident from the whole passage. But I forbear further comment on this passage, lest Mr. Lee may think me severe; for, really, I think he could not have selected a more inconclusive text in the Bible. But, my worthy friend has, from the beginning, given constant proof of his inability to sustain the popular dogma of immortality; and hence he—

"runs to each avenue, and shrieks for help!  
But shrieks in vain!"

4th. His fourth proof is founded on Matt. x. 28, and Luke xii. 4, 5. Mr. Lee displays his strength on these texts, but he does not treat the subject fairly; for he writes as though a single word had not been said on the passages quoted! This is not a candid policy, though it may be best for his side of the question.

The first deduction Mr. Lee makes from the texts quoted, is, that "*the body and soul are not the same.*" This is not the first time he has intimated that his opponents assumed this absurd position. And I now take occasion to inform Mr. Lee, if he does not know it, that I know of no man so superlatively ignorant as to maintain such an idea; and I hope, for the sake of his own reputation, for honesty and truth, he will not again make the insinuation.

Mr. Lee has entered upon the discussion of this subject without defining his terms, and hence the confusion attending the presentation of his testimony.

Now, I ask Mr. Lee *what is the soul?* Does he not know that this term, various in meaning, must be defined by the context? Does he not know that it is often used to signify life!—the mind!—the person!—the body? If he knows this, why does he not define it in the passages he quotes? Why does he slur it over, taking it for granted that it always means "an immortal soul?" The fact is, Mr. Lee dare not *define*, lest he be ensnared by his *definition!* He does well to keep in the dark, because the light would show up the monstrous deformity of his argument!

1. Now, let us examine these passages. And, first, I affirm that the term "*soul*" in these texts means *life*, and nothing but life, which is an *attribute* of the body. Life is not an *entity*, or essence, but an attribute of the man. The "*soul*," or life, is not intelligent or conscious in, and of, itself.

2. Hence Jesus said to his Apostles—"And fear not them who *kill* (murder,) the *body*, but are not



able to *kill* the *soul*." The word here rendered "*kill*" is *apokteino*, and signifies *to kill, to put to death, to murder*. It carries with it the idea of a *violent death*—of being *executed*, or put to death by *violence*. Of this the *body* may be the subject, but the *soul*, being an *attribute*, and not an *entity*, like the body, cannot. The *murder* of the body, or its *execution*, involves the *suspension* of the functions of life; but, as the soul, the life, "the breath of every living thing" is in the hands of God; and especially as the soul, or life of the Christian "is hid with Christ in God," Christ says to his Disciples—"Fear not them who kill the body, but *after that* have no more that they can do."

3. "But rather," says Christ, "fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in *hell*." The word here translated "*destroy*," is *not* the same which is rendered "*kill*" in the preceeding part of the text. Here it is *apolesai*, from *apollyo*, which signifies to *destroy, to perish, to render vain, to bring to nought*. Now, when we apply these terms to the *body*, what do we understand by them? Do we not understand the total *destruction, or bringing to nought, of the body*? Well, here they are applied to both *soul and body*, and cannot mean less than when applied to the *body only*.

4. "Fear him who is *able to destroy,*" or *bring to nought, both soul and body in GEHENNA.*"

The term *Gehenna* refers to the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, where the filth of the city, the dead bodies of animals and malefactors were consumed by fire. The reference, therefore, imports a *final* and utter destruction; which God only could inflict.

How beautiful and forcible, then, is the language of Christ in view of the facts we have submitted:—"And fear not them"—*your persecutors*—"who *murder* "the body," or kill you—"but are not able to" *murder* "the soul;" "but rather fear him who is able to" *bring to nought* "both soul and body in" *gehenna*—which is the "impending vengeance" hanging over sinners.

And, in view of this fact, Christ further states—“He that findeth his soul,” or preserves his life by rejecting me, “shall lose it” in *gehenna*: and he that loses his life for *my sake*,” at the hands of his persecutors, “shall find it,” by a resurrection from the dead. I have paraphrased this, in order to give the obvious sense of the passage.

Having analyzed the paragraphs quoted, the reader will see, that Mr. Lee’s construction of them is *forced*, *inconsistent*, and *contradictory*. *Forced*, because he fails to define his terms; *inconsistent*, because the integral parts of the passage, according to his view, cannot be made to harmonize; *contradictory*, because his exposition is not in unison with collateral testimony.

5. Mr. Lee’s fifth proof of the consciousness of the dead, is Matt. xvii. 3. “And there appeared unto them *Moses*,” &c. Mr. Lee thinks the resurrection of *Moses* a perfect *assumption*. I wish he may never be guilty of perpetrating a greater!

I grant the historian records the death of *Moses*, (though *Josephus* denies that he died;) and that no man knew of his sepulchre *one year* after; and, also, that the Devil disputed about his body.” But, in the text quoted, *Moses* and *Elijah* appear on the Mount of transfiguration. Mr. Lee says he was *not raised*; *Mathew* says *he* appeared on the Mount—not his *soul*—but the *man, Moses*, himself. It follows, therefore, either, that *Moses* was raised from the dead, or that the whole affair was merely a “*vision*,” in which absent things, or persons, were represented as being present. *Daniel* “saw one like the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven,” and yet this was merely a vision whose reality is still future. If Mr. Lee had been in Jerusalem after the resurrection of Christ, and had seen those “many saints who came out of their graves,” he would, upon the same principle, have denied their resurrection, and affirmed that he saw their “immortal souls!” The presence of a man I should always regard as *incontestible* proof of

his having been raised from the dead, unless I was assured it was a mere *vision*. Not so, however, with Mr. Lee! He would regard it as an "*assumption*!"

6. Mr. Lee's next proof of the consciousness of the dead, is based upon our Lord's conversation with the Sadducees. Matt. xxii. 31, 32.

Notwithstanding all we have heretofore written upon this paragraph, we shall now examine it fully and impartially.

Mr. Lee denies that the resurrection is the only point presented in the text referred to, but I shall not allow him to decide that question. The Apostle has settled it by the following:—"The same day came to him the Sadducees, who say that there is no *resurrection*," &c. (verse 23.) Again, "therefore in the *resurrection*, whose wife shall she be of the seven?" &c. Again, "for in the *resurrection* they neither marry," &c. (vs. 28—30.) The resurrection, then, and nothing but the resurrection, is the subject of discussion here, Mr. Lee's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question between Christ and the Sadducees was a *resurrection, or no resurrection*. Christ *affirmed*, and the Sadducees *denied*. And, as the Sadducees rejected the Prophets, he appeals to the Books of Moses, whose authority they regarded as divine. He makes the following points: 1st, "*God is not the God of the dead*." The Sadducees believed the dead would live no more, and, therefore, the Lord makes the first point to meet this objection—"God is not the God of the dead," who live no more, as you Sadducees believe. Jesus did not say that "God was not the God of the dead" in any other sense than that, in which the Sadducees held the doctrine; which was in the sense of there being "*no resurrection*."

Mr. Lee labors to prove that these worthies are *not dead*—hence, he says—"they must be living." What a strange doctrine that must be, which sub-

verts the Christian's hope, and stultifies the meaning of language!

Now, I *affirm* that "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are dead," unconscious and profoundly asleep in the dust. But they are *not* dead in the sense of the Sadducees, i. e., *to live no more*. We have the record of the death of these saints in the Old Testament, and Paul says—"these all *died* in faith, *not having received* the promises." They are *dead*, then, and, according to Mr. Lee's theory, *never can be raised!* This is *modern Sadduceeism!*

Mr. Lee's doctrine of *consciousness in death* is based upon a *rotten assumption*, viz: THAT A MAN MAY BE DEAD AND ALIVE AT THE SAME TIME. This is just as absurd as to say, *a man may be in heaven, and in the grave rotten, at the same instant!* I know not by what terms to designate this vain and foolish philosophy! it is so absurd, so baseless, so irrational, illogical and unphilosophical, that it defies language to describe it! Let it pass, then, *a thing of nought!*

Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, iv. 17, thus writes "As it is written, I have made thee (Abraham) a father of many nations before him whom he believed, even GOD WHO REVIVETH THE DEAD, and CALLETH THOSE THINGS (or persons) WHICH ARE NOT, as though they were." It is in this sense, Mr. Lee, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are living! and *only* in this sense; and, therefore, "God is the God of Abraham," &c.

Mr. Lee's doctrine is this—*no consciousness in the intermediate state, no resurrection*. His language is—"There can be no resurrection, unless the soul maintains its conscious existence during the interim," &c. *Let the reader mark and remember this.*

But, in opposition to the above, I state the position, that, *if Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are not dead, they can never be raised*. This the word itself will prove. ANASTASIS, *a rising up, to live again, recover life* It is a *re-living*—a *re-standing*, and can only be applied to those who *were dead*. The *living* are not the

subject of a *resurrection*. It is not a *coming-down*, but an *up-rising*. Mr. Lee's view renders the resurrection an *impossibility*. The dead, if unconscious, he says, never can be raised; and I affirm that, the *living* are not raised; and, therefore there is no resurrection.

The resurrection of the dead saints, and the change of the living saints, is, however, clearly taught in the Bible. And all that Mr. Lee says on this point is prompted by his strong desire to maintain his *theory*. Mr. Lee's whole reasoning tends to the point of *no resurrection*. His objections are those which *Infidels* have made before him, and which, on his part, show a great want of *faith*. He reasons, that as the particles of the body "may have floated in the clouds, flowed from the fountain, run in the stream, and mingled with the Ocean," there can be no resurrection! This whole paragraph is rank *infidelity*! I say, all I have quoted, and a vast deal more, is *infidelity without a veil*! This may be thought harsh, but the case calls for a prompt rebuke, and, by the grace of God, I will expose this skepticism in the light of God's truth. And, *1st Job's testimony is against Mr. Lee.*

In the 14th chapter, 10—15, he says—"But *man dieth*, and *wasteth away*; yes, *man yieldeth his breath*, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: So **MAN LIETH DOWN**, and *riseth not*, till the heavens be no more, they shall not *awake*, nor be *raised* out of their sleep. O that thou wouldst *hide me in the grave* that thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath is past, *that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me*. If a *man dieth*, shall he *live again*? all the days of my *appointed time* will I wait, till my *change come*. Thou shall call and *I will answer* thee? thou wilt have a desire to the *work of thy hands*."

Here Job teaches that the "*man dies*," that he "*lieth down*" and shall not "*awake, nor be raised* out of his sleep," till the heavens be no more. He prays to be hid "*in the grave*" till a "*set time*," when he

desired to be remembered." He asks the question—"If a *man die* shall he live again?" And says he would wait his "appointed time, till his *change*," or resurrection, "come." And affirms that then God would "call," and he would "answer;" that He would then "have a desire to the *work of his hands*." Again, he speaks of "*resting in the dust*." Again, he says—"For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he will 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."

From this testimony we learn that the *man dies*, and that the *man* is raised. And Job, unlike Mr. Lee, and all others of his school, believed that, after the "*worms destroyed*," or devoured, "his *body*, yet in his" immortal "*flesh*," made alive from the dead, "he should see God."

2. *The testimony of Isaiah is against Mr. Lee.*

Isaiah xxvi. 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.*"

This requires no comment; it clearly proves that the body interred will be raised.

3. *The evidence of Daniel is opposed to Mr. Lee.*

Daniel xii. 2. "And many of them that *sleep in the DUST OF THE EARTH SHALL AWAKE*," &c.

4. *Jesus testifies against him.*

"I will raise him *UP* at the last day." John vi.

5. *Paul's testimony is against Mr. Lee.*

Rom. viii. 11. "But if the spirit of him that *raised* Jesus from the *dead* dwelleth in you, he that raised Christ from the dead *will also QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES* by his spirit that dwelleth in you." The *body* that *dies* is *quicken*ed, or made *alive*. Again, "Who will *change our vile bodies*, that they may be *fashioned* like to his *glorious body*." Phil. iii. 21. (see chap. xv. 1 Cor.)

6. *The resurrection of Christ testifies against Mr. Lee.*

Jesus was "brought again from the *dead*," his "soul was not left in the grave." "I am he that liveth, and *was* DEAD, and, behold! I am alive forever more." He is the *first fruits* of them that slept—"the first born from the dead"—not the living. His resurrection is the model—the pattern of the saints. If he had brought up any *body*, other than the one buried, it would have been no resurrection at all! And, according to Mr. Lee, the disciples, or, indeed, the soldiers, might have *stolen* his body away, without invalidating his resurrection!

Mr. Lee "greatly errs, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God."

The resurrection, then, does not depend upon the possession of an "immortal soul," in which resides Mr. Lee's fancied personal identity. So far from it, his view is directly opposed to any resurrection, nullifies the gospel of the Son of God, and fosters the blackest infidelity! an infidelity that scruples not to assume the robes of an "angel of light." The true state of the question, then, is this:

God is not the God of the dead, who rise not;

But Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will rise;

*Ergo*: God is the God of Abraham, &c.

Mr. Lee's "facts," then, have nothing to do with the *great* FACT proved by the testimony submitted. And, I care not if the *body* pass through a thousand changes, God's WORD stands pledged for *its* resurrection; and no man, unless to sustain a theory, or he be a skeptic in relation to God's word will dispute it. Mr. Lee evidently maintains the position, that the body which dies will not be raised, which is tantamount to no resurrection at all. In opposition to this atheistical view, I have proved it will be the *same* body in fact, changed from an *earthly* to a *heavenly*—from an *animal* to a *spiritual* nature. Those raised from the dead "neither marry nor are given in marriage," which argues a change in the conformation of the body, and, therefore, "in the resurrection," are "neither male nor female, but one in Christ." It

was this glorious faith which prompted Joseph "to give commandment concerning his *bones*"—a commandment which Mr. Lee's reasoning would have prompted him to disregard. But space will not allow me to follow this argument further; I will therefore leave it for the next.

7. Mr. Lee's seventh argument is founded on the Parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22, 23. One would have thought, after all that has been said and written on this portion of God's word, that no author would again refer to it in proof of the consciousness of the dead; but in this we are mistaken.

Without following Mr. Lee, I shall proceed to give, in as brief a manner as possible, the meaning of the paragraph. And,

1. I regard it as a parable, and not an history.
2. It is not designed to represent the condition of men between death and the resurrection.
3. It does not represent *physical* death at all.
4. The symbols used are not expressive of the state of the dead, as held by our opponents.

There are two classes of persons represented here by the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, viz: *Jews and Gentiles*. Their *politico-ecclesiastical* and *social* conditions are described as follows: The *rich man*—THE JEW—is represented as being "clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day." He was "rich." This I regard as a true and graphic description of the Jew.

On the other hand "there was a certain beggar named Lazarus"—representing the Gentiles, "who was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table."

But the haughty Jew, who regarded the Gentiles as dogs, refused even these. He is therefore represented as dying, and being carried to Abraham's bosom by angels. An excellent illustration of the fact, that when the gospel was rejected by the Jews,



and they were consequently broken off, the Gentiles were grafted in to the good olive, and made partakers of its fatness; and so became children of Abraham by faith, and heirs of the promises made to him. The poor man is said to die in order to maintain the decorum of the parable; hence, it is immediately added—"The rich man also died and was buried—the Jew *died* and was *buried* POLITICALLY and ECCLESIASTICALLY, as well as SOCIALLY; "and in hell—*hades*—he lifted up his eyes, being in *torments*," as their history for the last 1800 years fully proves, "and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." In this political "torment" he cries to Abraham for help—for mercy—for water to cool his tongue, "for I am tormented in this flame." But Abraham is represented as replying—"Son, remember that thou in thy *life-time*"—in thy DISPENSATION—"receivedst thy good things," which were all abused; "and likewise Lazarus evil things," being in "the valley and shadow of death" politically and ecclesiastically; "but now he is comforted" by the gospel, "and thou art tormented" by thy persecutors. "And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed"—the decree of God for their unbelief—"so that they who would pass from hence to you," to aid you ecclesiastically, &c., "cannot; neither can they"—any of you—"pass to us that would come from thence," for God has decreed you shall not, "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Then the rich man—the Jew, is represented as supplicating for the "remnant of Israel"—"the five brethren"—"lest they also come into this place of torment," and share the same fate. Abraham gives him to understand, that "they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." The rich man replies—"No, father Abraham: but if one shall go to them from the dead, they will repent." Abraham responds—"If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead," which was fully verified in the

case of Christ, whom the Jews rejected both before and after he rose from the dead.

Such, I apprehend, is the simple meaning of the parable. The word *Hades*, in which the rich man is represented as being tormented, is not used as indicative of *future punishment* any where in the Bible. It is used, however, to express a low or abased condition; and such is the analogical meaning of the word.

Having made these observations upon the article before me, I shall conclude by remarking, that Mr. Lee, and all others on his side of the question; and not a few on *our* side, have made sad havoc of this beautiful parable, which is such an admirable illustration of the condition of the Jewish world.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

(The intermediate state, continued.)

In Mr. Lee's article, "No 15," he bases an argument, in favor of the consciousness of the dead, on Luke xxiii. 42—43, and 46. The things to be examined in these passages are these:

1. The thief's request—"Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy Kingdom."
2. Our Lord's answer—"To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."
3. Christ commending his "spirit" to God.
4. His giving up the "ghost."

We may remark, on the first point, that the thief desired to be remembered at a particular time which he specifies, *viz*: "*when thou comest into thy Kingdom.*"

The Lord has not even yet come into his kingdom. and consequently, the thief's desire has not been realized. Christ's kingdom will be on earth—his throne in Jerusalem, and his dominion fill the world! When he "comes into this kingdom," he will "come on the clouds of heaven," and the righteous dead will

be raised to share the kingdom with him. The thief will then be with him, and realize his request.

On the second point, I will observe that, the Lord's answer is in perfect harmony with the thief's request—"To day shalt thou be with me in *Paradise*," which is the "kingdom" referred to by the thief.

The word *Paradeisos*, a Persian word adopted into the Hebrew, and used by the "SEVENTY," in the Septuagint Greek of the Old Testament, to signify a park, a forest, a garden of trees of various kinds, a delightful grove, the garden of Eden. This word is never used to express the state or condition of the dead; neither is it the place of *dead men's "ghosts!"* Paul was "caught away to" or had "a vision" of "Paradise;" and in Rev. ii. 7., the Lord says—"to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the *Paradise* of God." (See, also, Rev. xxii.) The terms "kingdom" and "Paradise" fix the meaning of the whole passage. The phrase "to day" or "this day" must therefore be referred to the "day" of Christ's "coming into his kingdom." The Lord's answer is equivalent to his having said—"I will remember you at the 'day,' time, or period of which you speak." The term "day" often refers to a time, or period, and not to a literal day. "Thou art to pass over Jordan *this day*." Deut. xi. 1. And yet they did not pass *that day*. In Gen. ii. 4. 17. "In the day (time or period) when God made the heavens and the earth." "*To-day* if you will hear his voice," &c. "Now is the *day* of salvation," &c., Heb iii. 16. This *day* of salvation has lasted 1800 years!

Mr. Lee contends that Paradise means "heaven" above. In this he is *utterly wrong*; but, suppose, for the sake of argument, we grant it and then what follows? why it follows that Jesus Christ did not go *there*; for he says to Mary after his resurrection—"Touch me not: for I have *not yet ASCENDED to my Father*," &c.

Thus Mr. Lee subverts his own hypothesis

Christ commended his "spirit" to his Father, and

gave up the "ghost." The word *Pneuma*, here rendered "spirit" signifies, when used in reference to man, the *breath*, or *life*, &c., and the word *ekpneo*, compounded of *ek*, *out*, and *pneo*, to *breathe*, and literally means *to breathe out*; so that the passage literally runs thus:—"Father, into thy hands I commend my *life*; and having said this, he *breathed it out*," expired, or died.

Mr. Lee says—"Christ's soul, or ghost, which he commended into the hands of his Father and gave up, did not die with the body, and hence it was with *it* that the thief had the promise of being in paradise." While Mr. Lee was writing the above, he must have forgot that "Christ's soul was poured out unto death"—that "it was made an offering for sin," and that in reference to it, it is said—"thou wilt not leave my *soul* in the grave!" Mr. Lee believes the "*soul*" goes "to heaven at death," and, therefore, he comes under the condemnation of *Justin Martyr*, as well as the Bible.

Mr. Lee also refers to Acts vii. 59, where Stephen says—"Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This belongs to the class of texts already examined. This phraseology occurs in Job xxxii. 8. Peter, also, refers to the same when he exhorts those, who "suffer according to the will of God, to *commit the keeping* of their *souls* to God." Mr. Lee refers to Mr. Grew's view of this text, and thinks his rendering "a violation of common sense." As Mr. Lee's "common sense" is not mine, I fully endorse Mr. Grew's "that the life" is not "a distinct substance, susceptible of consciousness without the material organization." *Life*, being an *attribute*, and not an *entity*, as Mr. Lee supposes, can have no *consciousness* apart from the *man* of whom it is an attribute.

2. The argument on Rom. viii. 35, 38, 39, is not at all relevant to the subject. There is no point whatever in Mr. Lee's comments on the passage. Of course nothing but *sin* can "separate" the Christian from "the love of Christ;" his being "asleep in the

dust of the earth" does not intercept the love Christ has for him; and, consequently, in proof of his great and abiding love for him, he "raises him up at the last day."

What Mr. Lee says on this text may serve to fill up his book, but the intelligent reader will fail to find any proof of his position, or relevancy to the question in hand.

Mr. Lee remarks—that "to be the object of the love of God involves conscious existence;" if so, what "*world*" was that which "God so loved" that he gave his Son for it? I opine, thousands of persons, for whom Christ died, and whom God loved prospectively, had no "conscious existence" at that time. Mr. Lee is the most incautious author I have ever read.

3. The argument founded on 2 Cor. v. 1—8, has been answered several times before, but Mr Lee makes it a rule "not to know an argument" on the opposite side. Let us examine the text: "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." This verse stands connected with the last verse of the preceding chapter, where Paul contrasts "things seen and unseen, *things* temporal and eternal." And then, speaking of those "temporal" things, which constitute our "earthly house of *dwelling*," he says, "if this *dwelling* were *dissolved*," as Peter taught it would be, "we have a *building* of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Not in "heaven" above, as Mr Lee imagines; but "in the new heavens and earth"—a city whose *builder* and *maker* is God;" for which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob looked, as well as all those worthies enumerated by Paul. "For in this" *dwelling place* "we *groan*, earnestly desiring to be *clothed*," or invested, "with our house," or *building*, "which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed," invested, "we shall not be

found naked," or destitute. "For we that are in this tabernacle," or dwelling place, "do *groan*, being burdened: not because we would be unclothed," naked or destitute, "but clothed," or invested with an "eternal" dwelling place, "a building of God—not made with human "hands"—"*that MORTALITY might be swallowed up by life.*"

In Rom. viii. 22, 23, Paul speaks of this "*groaning*" and waiting for the adoption—the redemption, or resurrection "of the body." Now Paul did not wish to be "unclothed," naked, or destitute; but he desired to be invested with that "tabernacle," or dwelling place, into which he would be introduced when "mortality is swallowed up by life."

"Now," says he, "he that hath wrought us for this same thing," a resurrection to life, "is God, who also hath given to us the earnest of the spirit." "Therefore," because we have the "earnest of the spirit," we are always confident, or full of confidence; knowing that, while we are at home in the "*mortal*" 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 "mortal" body, in the sense of having it "swallowed up by life," "and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour, that whether present" with the Lord, "or absent" from him, "we may be accepted by him," when he shall come. "*For* we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *in* body, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad." Such is the meaning of the whole paragraph, I conceive, according to the text and context.

The Apostle did not desire to die; this is not the subject before him; neither did he desire to be without a tabernacle, or dwelling place; but he earnestly desired to be "clothed," and this he explains by "mortality being swallowed up by life." "Mortality" is not "swallowed up by life" at death; but, rather, *life* is swallowed up by *mortality*. The

whole structure of the passage is incompatible with Mr. Lee's view; nor can he harmonize it, according to his theory, with other parts of God's word; nor, indeed, with itself. Mr. Lee has *wrested* it from its connexion, and *pressed* it into his service. His doctrine is not in it, nor can he prove it legitimately by it.

4. Mr. Lee's next argument is based on 2 Cor. xii. 2—4. "I knew a man in Christ," &c. (see the passage.) His first deduction from this, is, "the body and mind are two distinct things." I wonder how often Mr. Lee will repeat this. The mind and body, Mr. Lee, are not the same; but for you thence to infer that either the one or the other can be conscious separately, shocks all common sense!

The only *real point* of discussion in this text, is involved in the phrase—"Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell." Mr. Lee, and all others, on his side of this question, supposes this text to prove the *possibility* of a man's being *out* of his body in a literal sense. But, I apprehend, Paul designed to make no such impression, because, to interpret the passage literally would be equivalent to saying *a man could be out of himself*, which is an absurdity. I understand the apostle simply to say, that *he did not know whether, in his "vision," he was BODILY caught away, or simply transported in mind, and thus mentally wrapt in "visions and revelations" of the future.* And one thing is certain, if Paul's case was as Mr. Lee has represented it, Paul's *body was dead*, and he must have been *raised from the dead* after his "vision" ceased! Mr. Lee stumbles at the idea of Moses being raised from the dead; but, I opine, he will have to take the position that *Paul was*, if his doctrine be true! Having examined this passage fully before, we merely make the above remarks on it, that we may not seem to omit any thing said by Mr. Lee.

5. Mr. Lee refers to Eph. i. 10, in proof of his position. He misunderstands, and misapplies this

text. The "*dispensation of the fulness of time*" is doubtless the *age to come*, when Christ will be the head of all *political and ecclesiastical power* on earth. Men will then be united, or "collected, in one" vast empire, so that the "things in the heavens"—political, "and on the earth," will be "*under Christ.*" This text knows nothing of Mr. Lee's subject.

6. He also quotes chap. iii. 15, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." The being referred to here is the "*Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" The "family" spoken of, is the "family" of the "*Father;*" and the text seems to indicate that the *whole intelligent creation* is referred to; but, whether this be true or not, it can mean no more than that, *the angels in heaven and saints on earth* constitute one great family."

7th. His seventh argument is based on Phil. i. 21—24; and here he merely reiterates what has been said a hundred times before; and said too much better than he has said it. In reply to this argument, I shall repeat what I have before written, and which Mr. Lee has failed to refute, that Paul points the Philippians to "*the day of Christ,*" as the time of their reward; and it would be preposterous to suppose he expected to meet with his before them. His address to Timothy is proof of this. Paul is not discussing his own fate, except so far as Christ and his Gospel were involved. He says all his afflictions, bonds and imprisonments had *furthered* the Gospel, instead of retarding its progress. And in reference to this he makes one bold and unmistakable declaration, that "*Christ will be magnified IN MY BODY, whether by life or by death*"—it mattered not,—*THIS would be the result.* Having thus driven the nail, he clinches it by saying, "*For me to live, is CHRIST,*"—it will redound to *his* glory, for "*I am set for the defence of the gospel;*" "*and to die,*" in such a cause, and for Christ's sake, "*is gain;*" not to me, Paul, but to Christ; for otherwise how could "*Christ be magnified in my body by death?*" The reader



will please note the fact, that it was "IN BODY," and *not out of it*, nor in the "*spirit world*," that Christ was to be magnified. "But," says Paul, "if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; *yet what I shall choose I know not.*" Why did he not know what to choose? "For," or because, "I am in a strait betwixt *two.*" What "*two*" things were these, between which he was in a strait? Were they *life and death*? Then, according to this view, he did not know which to "choose," life or death. While in this strait, therefore, what choice did he make? Did he choose life? Did he make choice of death? No; for between these he could make no selection; but there was a *third* point in reference to which he could, and did make a choice; and that was *the returning and being with Christ*," which was *far better* than *life or death.*

Mr. Lee says—"His (Paul's) choice was between dying then and being with Christ, and living longer to serve the Church," &c. This is *the* point of his argument, and it is a pure assumption, as a faithful exegesis of the passage will show; and, as we think, we have already shown. That Paul expected to "be with Christ," *in death*, is not so much as hinted at in the whole paragraph. It was not a "*departure*" that Paul desired, but a RETURNING AND BEING WITH CHRIST, a point totally distinct from either *dying* or *living* in the present state.

8th. Mr. Lee's eighth proof is Rev. vi. 9, where John "Saw under the altar the *souls* of them that were slain for the word of God," &c. Upon this text I shall not dwell, for it must be obvious to every intelligent reader of the Scriptures, that John gives a *symbolical* description of what he saw; and that he speaks of things which had no *real* existence when he saw them; and, therefore, that they were merely *images*, or *symbols*, representing other things. That John should see the "*souls*" of the martyrs under the altar, and that those "*souls*" should be represented as "*crying with a loud voice*," is all in per-

fect harmony with the whole subject. The *blood* of Abel *cried from the ground*; and the blood of Christ is said "to **SPEAK** better things than the blood of Abel;" and, in perfect harmony with the nature and decorum of the figure, the *blood* or *souls* of the saints, slain for the word of God, is represented as being "under the altar," upon which we may suppose they were sacrificed.

Thus we have followed Mr. Lee through all his proofs of the *consciousness of the dead*; and, having done so, I will now offer some *direct* proofs that *the dead know nothing*. And,

1st. Apart from the fact, that there is no promise of rewards or punishments *to the dead*, the following testimonies clearly sustain the position, *that they are unconscious*. Job asks—"Why died I not from the womb? Why did not I expire at the time of my birth? Why did the knees receive me? Or why the breast that I should be nursed? *For now should I have been still, and been quiet—I should have slept: then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth, who built desolate places for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver: or as a hidden untimely birth I had not been: as infants which never saw light.*" Job iii. 11, 12, &c.

This passage clearly proves the dead unconscious. They *sleep*: they rest in the *dust*: they are as though they *had not been*, even as *infants who never saw light*.

Again, "As the cloud is consumed, and vanisheth away, so **HE** that *goeth down to the grave*, shall come *up no more*," &c. chap. vii. 9. Here we are taught that **HE**, the man, "*goeth down to the grave*," and comes up no more till the resurrection; but Mr. Lee says the *man* goes to heaven!

"Why hast thou brought me forth from the womb? O that I had expired, and no eye had seen me; *I should have been as though I had not been*. I should have been carried from the womb to the grave. Are not my days few? Cease then and let me alone,

that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, *even to THE LAND OF DARKNESS, and the SHADES OF DEATH; a LAND OF DARKNESS AS DARKNESS ITSELF; and the shades of death, without any order, and where the LIGHT IS AS DARKNESS.*" chap. x. 18—22. Reader, behold the contrast! Mr. Lee says the saint when he dies goes to *heaven*—to the "spirit world;" but Job teaches otherwise; he tells us they go to the "*land of darkness—to the shades of death—a land of darkness as darkness itself, where there is no order, and where the light is as darkness,*" IS THIS HEAVEN, MR. LEE?

"But *MAN dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man yieldeth up his breath, and where is he?*" Mr. Lee says, in *Heaven* or in *Hell*; but what says Job? "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; So *MAN LIETH DOWN, and RISETH NOT: till the heavens be no more, THEY SHALL NOT AWAKE, nor be RAISED OUT OF THEIR SLEEP.* O that thou wouldst *hide me in the grave.*" Mr. Lee would say—"O that thou wouldst *hide me in Heaven!*" "That thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath is passed, that thou wouldst appoint me a *set time*, and remember me. If a *man* die, shall he live again?" Hold! says Mr. Lee, *man* does not die—his *body* merely dies, but his *soul* goes to heaven; and the soul will never have that *body* again, for before the resurrection it will have passed through a thousand changes, and have entered into the organization of other substances—trees, animals, water, dust, wind! *Its* resurrection is impossible! But, says Job—"All the days of my appointed time will I wait till *my change come.* Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; *thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands.*" chap. xiv. 10—15. No, says Mr. Lee, God will have no "desire to the *work* of his hands"—the body is gone—crumbled into dust, so that God, Himself, cannot *raise it!*

"If I wait, the *grave* is my house; *I have made my bed in darkness.*" No, says Mr. Lee, *Heaven* is my

"house," and, instead of a "bed of darkness," I wing my flight to the regions of *light and glory!*

Job continues—"I have said to *corruption*, Thou art my *father*; to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister." But what would Mr. Lee say? I am *immortal*; "*corruption* is not my *father*;" neither is "the *worm* my mother nor sister." But let us hear Job again—"And where now is my hope? As for my hope, who will see it? They shall go down to the pit, when our *rest* is together *in the dust*, chap. xviii. 13—16. When Job died, he expected to find his "*rest in the dust*;" but Mr. Lee expects to find his in a place which he calls "the *spirit world*."

David asks—"wilt thou show wonders to the *dead*? Shall the *dead arise*, and praise thee? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the *grave*? Or thy faithfulness in *destruction*? Shall thy wonders be known in the *dark*?—and thy righteousness in the land of *forgetfulness*?" Ps. lxxxviii. 10—12. Here we learn, that for the *dead* to praise the Lord, they must *arise*; that the state of the dead is one of "destruction, disorganization, or corruption; that their abode is '*dark*,' and that they dwell in a land of *forgetfulness*." How strongly, again, does this contrast with Mr. Lee's theory! But let us proceed.

"*THE DEAD PRAISE NOT THE LORD, neither ANY THAT GO DOWN INTO SILENCE.*" Ps. cxv. 17.

Here is a text which sweeps Mr. Lee's theory from the face of day! He cannot make it harmonize with it, by all the logic he can command. It will defy all his mental powers, and withstand all his sophistry. The Spirit of the Living God says by the mouth of David, "the *dead* praise not the Lord." But Mr. Lee, and his pious associates in the advocacy of pagan superstition and infidelity, declare that "the *dead*" do praise the Lord—and that they are with Him! But, as if the above was not enough; and lest there might be some skeptic on the subject, like Mr. Lee, the Holy Spirit adds this sweeping clause—"neither *ANY* that go down into silence."

Agai, "For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten."

Here we are taught that the *dead know nothing*; but what says Mr. Lee? He tells us the dead know a vast deal—that they are in Heaven, receiving a "reward." "Also, their love, and their hatred, and their envy hath now *perished*," &c. Say you, that such a person is conscious? But more still—"Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave—*sheol*, whither thou goest." Eccl. ix. 5, 6, 10. The state, then, into which men pass at death, is one where there is no love, no envy, no hatred, no work, no device, no knowledge, nor wisdom.

Once more: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His *breath* goeth forth, he *returneth to his earth*; in that *very day* his *thoughts perish*." Ps. cxlvi. 4.

I feel satisfied to leave this question just here. The view we have taken is the only one which harmonizes with the teachings of the Scriptures; while it is impossible for opponents to explain the proofs we have submitted, and make them accord with their Platonic speculations.

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### The Destiny of the Wicked.

HAVING reviewed Mr. Lee's articles on "the immortality of the soul," and "the consciousness of the dead," I shall now proceed to the examination of the subject of *future punishment*.

In Mr. Lee's article (No. 16.) now before us, he sets out to prove, that "*the wicked will not be annihilated, or cease to exist, at, nor subsequently to, the general resurrection.*" His first argument is "*founded*

*upon the immateriality of the soul, and its conscious existence between death and the resurrection."*

Mr. Lee says,—“If these two points have not been proved, we have no hope of sustaining the present proposition, upon the principle that nothing can be proved,” &c. Of course the whole value of Mr. Lee’s present argument, which in fact is *only* an inference drawn from false premises, depends upon, 1st, whether he has proved the “immateriality of the soul;” or, 2d, the “consciousness of the dead.” These points he claims to have proved; we deny it, however, and his inference goes along with that denial, for, to argue his inference, would be to go back and argue those points over again. This we are not disposed to do, and shall therefore proceed at once to file an objection to Mr. Lee’s leading proposition.

He uses the term “*annihilation*” as expressive of the view which we advocate, in reference to the punishment of the wicked. We repudiate the term as unscriptural, and as not expressive of our idea of punishment. Annihilate, *ad* and *nihilum*, signifies *to reduce to nothing*. This is not the sense in which we speak of the *destruction* of the wicked. To *destroy*—*DESTRUO*—to unbuild—to ruin, to lay waste—to make desolate—is the word which we generally use to express the sentiment.

But, without making further remarks upon the proposition before us, let us proceed to Mr. Lee’s arguments, and review them.

Mr. Lee (Article No. 17,) first inquires into “the penalty of the law,” without defining what law he means. This point, therefore, we must take for granted. He cannot mean the law under which Adam was placed, for this, according to his theory, would make “eternal torments” the penalty of Adam’s sin; from which position, I apprehend, Mr. Lee himself would revolt. Neither can he mean the Law of Ten Commandments, given to Israel on Mount Sinai. I conclude, then, that he means the

Gospel—the Law of Liberty; but, for the sake of *his* argument, he should have been more explicit. In the absence, however, of such explicitness, I shall meet the question in its most extended sense.

Mr. Lee says the punishment, or penalty, of the law must be one of the following things.

“First, annihilation without conscious suffering; or, 2d, it must be conscious suffering and annihilation combined, consist in both; or, 3d, it must be conscious suffering without annihilation.” Mr. Lee adds—“It will not be denied that the penalty of the law must be found in one or the other of these propositions.” Notwithstanding Mr. Lee’s assertion, I deny that the penalty of God’s law is expressed in either proposition.

Mr. Lee’s mind must be barren of language and ideas, judging from his selection of terms. The Bible alone furnishes varied phraseology in reference to this point. It is strange he could not find a single scriptural term by which to express the penalty of the divine law!

I proceed to remark upon the *penalty* of the *primitive law*, under which Adam was placed.

The penalty of the original law was not *moral* death, for this is but a *state of sin*, and no *punishment* at all. Neither was it “eternal torments,” for the language used to express the penalty excludes the idea. It follows, therefore, that it was death—physical, animal, or organic death; a death embracing a process which is expressed by the words—“*dying thou shalt die.*” And “dust thou art, and into dust shalt thou return.” This is the law of death, under which the whole human race is born. The operation of this law brings man to the dust, and leaves him there, with no possibility of escape, except by Christ. The penalty of the original law, therefore, was not “*annihilation*” with, or without “conscious suffering;” but simply *death*—the cessation of life—the extinction of consciousness.

Having made these brief remarks on the penalty

of the original law, and its operation upon the race, I shall glance at the law of Ten Commandments, as given to Israel on Mount Sinai.

The blessings and penalties of the law of Moses, were *national*. If they refused to keep His laws, He said He would "appoint over" them "terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it." Lev. xxvi. 16. God also threatened them with dispersion and captivity among the nations of the earth. (see the whole chapter.) All this was *national punishment*. So far as *personal punishment* is concerned, Ezekiel and Paul both testify it was *death*. "The soul that sins, it shall die." "He that sinned under Moses' law, died without mercy."

We now come to the main question, *viz*: *What is the penalty of the divine law, in relation to the future destiny of the wicked?*

Mr. Lee maintains it is "eternal misery," or "torment;" and insists upon it, that *destruction* admits of no *degrees*. As it respects the doctrine of "*degrees in punishment*," so far as the *final* destiny of sinners is concerned, I apprehend it is a fallacy. The punishment is *death*. That may be preceded or attended with more or less anguish and suffering. One mode of inflicting death, among the Romans, was by crucifixion. That was preceded by *scourging*—few or many stripes, according to the nature of the crime. Our Lord himself was scourged prior to his death. To this practice reference is made in speaking of retribution; but not to the exclusion of *death*, that followed it. For some crimes more, and for others fewer stripes were inflicted, but the "*end* is death:" Rom. vi. 21. Rewards and punishments are always spoken of in reference to character—and character is expressed more than once by the terms, "*good and evil*;" the one standing related to "*eternal life*," and the other to "*death*:" for "the



wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Upon this point, however, I cannot enlarge, and will therefore, pass on to the consideration of Mr. Lee's proofs.

Punishment is always *national, social, or personal*; but Mr. Lee makes no distinction at all. He quotes text after text and applies them to *future* punishment, without ever stopping to enquire whether the punishment be *national* or *personal*. And, consequently, every text he quotes is misapplied, In Matt. xxv. 30,—“and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth”—the punishment is upon the Jewish nation, and is *national* and *personal*, because the term nation embraces under it *persons* who give character to the nation: but if it relates to future punishment only it does not exclude *death* as the *end* of the anguish.

He quotes Luke xiii. 28,—“There shall be weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.” This text does not express the *nature* of the punishment threatened, nor its *duration*; and, therefore, it is out of place so far as the doctrine of “eternal torments” is concerned. That the characters spoken of will or have been the subjects of this “weeping and wailing” I have no doubt; but what has this to do in opposition to their final *extinction*? I may have occasion to notice this text again, and therefore for the present will leave it. •

The next passage quoted by Mr. Lee is Luke xvi. 23,—“And in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torments.” This is undeniably a national punishment, and is perfectly foreign to Mr. Lee's subject. See our previous remarks upon the Parable.

He also refers to Rom. ii. 8, 9. The punishment here is also *national and personal*; and it is inflicted on “the Jew first,” as in the destruction of their commonwealth; and then upon the “Gentiles.”

That the apostle here describes personal judgments is clear; but that they are to end in death is equally clear. He had just enumerated a catalogue of crimes and said the persons committing them were "worthy of death;" and he describes the termination of the tribulation and anguish to be to "*perish*," verse 12; and this in contrast with "*immortality*," verse 7. The conclusion is irresistible that the apostle here teaches a miserable destruction, which he defines to be *death*, to all who wilfully persist in abusing God's "goodness and long suffering."

Mr. Lee has made a false issue, and hence in all his arguments he is "beating the air." An example of this we have in his remarks on Matt. xv. 46:—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Here an "everlasting punishment" is threatened, but it is not defined except by *contrast*. Its *duration* is clearly defined, but its *nature* has to be inferred. The righteous are to have "eternal life," and the opposite of "eternal life" is *eternal death*, or "eternal punishment." We are not under the necessity, therefore, to seek for the idea of "annihilation" in the term "everlasting," nor, indeed, in the term "punishment;" for the Bible is sufficiently explicit elsewhere in defining what this "everlasting punishment" is.

Mr. Lee argues as though *death* was no punishment at all; hence his criticism upon the word *kolasin*. In all civilized governments, *death*, not the *pain* of dying, is regarded as the *greatest* punishment which can be inflicted upon a transgressor. If *pain* was the radical idea of punishment, the end could be more certainly secured by *torture*, without death. *Penalty*, from *pœna*, is the radical idea in punishment; hence *punio*, to punish, or inflict a penalty. This penalty, or punishment, may be *whipping, cropping, branding, imprisonment, hard labor, confiscation of goods, transportation, or DEATH*

the last being regarded as the *greatest*. *This* is the penalty of the divine law.

But, as we are now merely presenting general principles, we will proceed.

Mr. Lee writes thus—"To maintain that the curse of the law, or the proper punishment of sin, is both suffering and annihilation, is to suppose that all the righteous suffer the penalty of the law once, and that the wicked endure it twice." Again, he remarks, "All the dead therefore have suffered the penalty of the law once, inasmuch as they have once died, which is a dissolution of their being, a loss of their existence." Once more, he remarks, that "this theory represents God in the attitude that government would be in, should it, having the power so to do, hang men, and then bring them to life for the sake of the privilege of hanging them again." I admit there is some force in this part of Mr. Lee's argument, but, at the same time, his own theory is more monstrous than the one he is opposing. For, for a man to die, and his "immortal soul" to be sent to "Hell" and "tormented" till the resurrection; and then for the "soul" to be united to a body, and sent back again to "Hell" to suffer "eternal torments," seems to be a strange penalty, and alike revolting to God and man.

---

#### CHAPTER XIV.

The destiny of the wicked, continued.

The intelligent student of the Bible, I think, cannot fail to perceive the truth of the following position: **THAT DEATH IS THE FULL AND FINAL PENALTY OF SIN.** Of course, in this proposition I make no allusion to *national penalties*; but to the *end* of sin *personally*

considered. The principle I have stated runs parallel with the Revelations of God, and may be found on almost every page of the Scriptures. And I apprehend, we shall find but *one* penalty, in reference to the final destiny of man, from Genesis to Revelation. The penalty of Adam's sin is **THE PENALTY of the divine law, in every dispensation**. If we sustain this position, Mr. Lee's whole superstructure crumbles into dust.

1. The penalty of Adam's sin is thus expressed: "*Thou shalt surely die.*" This penalty is subsequently explained by the Lord, thus: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou shalt *return to the ground*; FOR OUT OF IT WAST THOU TAKEN: FOR DUST THOU ART, AND TO DUST SHALT THOU RETURN.

I wish it fully, distinctly and indelibly, impressed on the reader's mind, that the penalty of Adam's sin was not "eternal torments," but *death*—a death unbroken by a resurrection—a death perpetual in its *dominion*, unless some means were devised for his *redemption*.

Death, then, was and is the penalty of the law. Paul, in his letter to the Romans, presents this subject very lucidly, chapter v. 12, &c. "Wherefore as by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

Here we are taught that by *sin, death*—*THANATOS*, came into the world, or *kosmon*; and this by the sin of one man,—*Adam*. No man can doubt but this death was the penalty of the law, and that but for this violation of law, death would not have entered the world. • This fixes the meaning of the penalty, and shows it to be literal death. But "death passed upon all men, in *whom*"—i. e., in Adam—"all have sinned." The word *dierchomai*, here rendered "passed" signifies *to pass through, to pass over, to be propagated*. Death, therefore, was *propagated* to the race. Adam, himself, being cut off from the tree of life; and the whole race being in his loins at the time, in *him* they

sinned—i. e., became “*subject to vanity*,” and with *him* they came under the law of death. From this death however all are delivered by the second Adam, who died that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living.

In vi. chap. 23d verse, Paul states the principle we have presented—“**THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH.**” This is a general principle—a universal law, running through the Oracles of God.

There are many other proofs of this position, but these must now suffice. I regard the point as established, then, that *death*, and not the *manner of dying*, is the penalty of the law.

Having presented this general principle, or law, I shall now notice Mr. Lee’s proofs of *endless misery*. He refers to Mark ix. 43, 44. “It is better for thee to enter into life, maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”

The punishment here inflicted is in *gehenna*, which, as we have before said, is a phrase used to denote utter destruction; as whatever was cast into the fire of Gehenna was thrown there, not to be *preserved*, but, to be destroyed; and nothing could escape total decomposition. The fire, or if not reached by that, the “worms” destroyed all flesh deposited in that common receptacle of the filth of Jerusalem. So at the execution of the judgment on corrupt and impenitent men, there should be a total and irrevocable extinction of being under most miserable circumstances.

2. His next proof is Luke xvi. 19—31, which is the parable of the rich man. This we have already examined, and shall let it pass.

3. His third proof, in the article before me, is Rev. xxi. 14, 15. “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life,

and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Upon this Mr. Lee remarks—"there is not the slightest allusion to annihilation." And I will add—not the "*slightest allusion*" to "*eternal misery*." There is no proof that they are even *alive*, much less in *torments*. They are merely said to be "*without the city*;" and, for all this text proves, they may be *dead* and *devoured* by worms! Besides their state stands opposed to "having a right to the tree of life"—the privilege of living, and must therefore be *death*.

4. Mr. Lee also refers to Rev. xiv. 11—"The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." Mr. Lee observes on this—"we need not inquire whether or not this text strictly relates to the final destiny of sin," &c. This is not the only text that Mr. Lee has taken for granted refers to the destiny of sinners; and before quoting this, or them, he should have "inquired" whether or not they related to the destiny of the wicked. This is "important to the argument," for "the representation" is not "borrowed" from their final destiny. The passage clearly refers to the "torments" of the living, in the present state, who "worship the beast and his image" and contains no allusion to the destiny of sinners in a future state.

5. His next proof is Rev. xx. 10. "Shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

Mr. Lee is evidently straitened for proof of endless torments, or else he would not have quoted a passage so irrelevant to his subject. The Devil is here said to be cast into "the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *were* and (the devil) shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." Whatever the *Devil* may be a symbol of in this place, the beast and false prophet are symbols of *civil* and *ecclesiastical* powers, which meet with their final overthrow in a place called "the lake of

fire;" and I have no objection to the Devil's meeting his fate in the same place, although he should be "tormented" as long as "day and night" shall continue; for his *end* is *destruction*. See Heb. ii. 14.

6. Mr. Lee refers to the following expressions on the *duration* of punishment: "To be cast into everlasting fire." Math. xviii. 8. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," chap. xxv. 46. "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" verse 41. 2 Thess. i. 9. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction."

"In this argument," he says, "we rely wholly upon the *duration* of the suffering." Leaving out the word "suffering," which is not warranted by Mr. Lee's proofs, I would observe, that we are perfectly agreed as to the *duration* of the *punishment*. Mr. Lee, however, has thrown together texts which have no connexion, and, without stating the context, presses them all into his service.

Mr. Lee quotes Rom. i. 18. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." This is a truth, which I presume, none will deny; but I cannot see any proof of Mr. Lee's position in it.

He again refers to Rom. ii. 8. 9; and as we have promised to examine this passage more fully, we will now proceed to do so.

Having proved "both Jews and Gentiles to be under sin," the Apostle thus addresses the Jews: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whoever thou art, that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another," (the Gentiles) "thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, doest the same things." "But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth, against them who commit such things"—whether they be Jews or Gentiles. "And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them who do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape

the *judgment* of God. Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering," (to thee, O man;) "not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality—**ETERNAL LIFE**:—But to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness—**INDIGNATION and WRATH**; **TRIBULATION and ANGUISH** upon every soul of man that doeth evil of the *JEW first*, and also of the *GENTILE*; but *glory, honor, and peace*, to every man that worketh good, to the *JEW FIRST*, and also to the *GENTILE*; for there is no respect of persons with God." Jews and Gentiles stand on an equal footing before God. In judgment God will be found no respecter of persons. Of whatever nation or people any man may be, he will be judged—rewarded and punished—according to the means and privileges he has enjoyed, and as he has improved or abused them. Those are first to be judged who have been first in privileges, and their guilt will be greatest who have abused the greater advantages; but the whole context, and the epistle generally, shows the "*end*" to be *death* to the wicked: an exclusion from "*immortality*."

The Apostle continues: "For as many as have sinned *without law*, shall also *perish*," *apolutantai*, from *apollumi*, **PERISH—BE DESTROYED—RENDERED VAIN—BROUGHT TO NOUGHT**:—"and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law," &c.

I have been thus particular on this passage, because I do not design returning to an exposition of it again. The reader will see nothing in this passage, favorable to the doctrine of endless misery.



7. Mr. Lee also quotes Heb. x. 28—31. See the passage. Paul, in writing to Hebrews, or Jews, who had many temptations to apostacy, says—"For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.* But a certain fearful apprehension of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* the adversaries," or apostates. "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy," (died without *obtaining* mercy) "under two or three witnesses: of how much more severe punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God," *as the Jews had done*, "and hath counted the blood of the covenant, by which he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace!" Paul teaches these Hebrews, that, if they apostatized, they would be counted worthy of a more severe punishment than the law of Moses inflicted—even a "fiery indignation which should devour" them. "And now," says he, "the just *shall live* by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back to" DESTRUCTION—or "*perdition*;" but of them that believe to the saving of the soul."

The doctrine of absolute destruction is taught here.

8. Mr. Lee's final proof of "*eternal misery*," is founded on the fact that "the Scriptures associate the punishment of sinners with the existence and punishment of devils," &c.

Upon this point we shall say but little, simply because whatever the punishment of fallen angels may be, Mr. Lee has no right thence to conclude that such will be the punishment of sinners. Mr. Lee says he will not undertake to prove that "devils are disembodied spirits." I think he does well not to undertake it!

There is only one passage to which he refers, which has a sufficient bearing upon the question for

me to notice it; and that is Matt. xxv. 41 :—" Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

The term *angels* here is the same, in the original, as in Cor. xii. 7, where Paul speaks of " a thorn in the flesh, the *messenger* of satan." It is *angelos* in both texts; and applies to any instrument or agents satan may employ to annoy the saints. It does not necessarily signify any intelligent being. Hence, so far as the *angelos* of the devil are concerned, the text, Mat. xxv. 41, cannot be made to prove that there is any conscious suffering at all; because it cannot be demonstrated that they are real beings any more than it can be proved that Paul's *angelos*, or *thorn* in his flesh was a *real person*. And if the *angelos*, in the case of Paul, was an intelligent being, it was clearly " false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ:" chap. xi. 13. Hence they were men, who under the pretence of superior knowledge had opposed the truth: " blind leaders of the blind;" both to be irrecoverably *destroyed*, as the figure " everlasting fire" clearly imports. Such we have shown to be the fate of the devil and his works, with all his agencies. See again Heb. ii. 14, and 1 John, iii. 8. Such will be the fate of all wicked men: their *punishment* is " everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord:" 2 Thess. i. 9.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

Objections answered.

IN Mr. Lee's 19th article he presents " an answer to the objection that " *his* theory of the human mind, and " *his* " method of proving its immateriality from

its own phenomena, will prove that brutes have immaterial souls." With what success he has met this objection, we shall soon see.

1. Mr. Lee says—"we shall not deny ourself a soul lest we should give one to our faithful dog!" "We shall not reason our own soul out of existence lest we should reason one into a brute."

Well, I have no doubt Mr. Lee's "faithful dog" has just as much *soul* as *he* has! Of course I use the term now, in its *primary* sense of *life*. Mr. Lee is a "living soul" and so is his "faithful dog!" At least, so taught Moses; and he is good authority.

Mr. Lee further says—"we would sooner embrace a theory which would elevate brutes to men, by giving them souls, than one which would degrade men to brutes, by taking away their souls." No doubt of it, Mr. Lee; for you are so hostile to the truth that you would sooner ascribe *immortality* to every beast of the field, every fowl of the air—the fish of the sea, and all the animalculæ in the universe, than predicate *mortality* of the entire man!

We are not at all "alarmed at the idea that a horse should be so much like a man as to have a soul;" for this is true: both have *souls*, for both are "living souls." Mr. Lee says—"we would rather a horse should have a soul, than not to have one ourself!" Certainly, Mr. Lee, I have no doubt of it!

But what does all this prove? It proves to a demonstration, *that Mr. Lee knows nothing about the soul!*

He continues—"If any one can prove from *them* (his arguments) that beasts have souls, we shall not do violence to the reason which God has given us to escape the consequences." Well, we shall see.

2. Mr. Lee remarks—"The objection, if admitted, would involve the objector in precisely the same difficulty," &c. This is not true: because we make the superiority of man over the brutes, to consist in *ORGANIZATION*. And this difference in *organization* was the result of *design* on the part of the Creator.

Man's superior organization gives him superior powers—some of which are *moral*, and the whole render him a responsible and moral agent. But not so with the brutes. But, to commence with Mr. Lee's arguments, he affirms, that the difference between human intelligence and brute intelligence, lies not in *degree*, but in *nature*."

Mr. Lee evades, or shifts, his original position; for, at first, he contended that *matter had no "intelligence:"* and when pressed on this point in relation to brutes, that his theory must necessarily give immortality to all animals, he meets it by saying it is not the same *kind* of "intelligence!" Pray, then, is matter possessed of any sort of "intelligence?" Mr. Lee's answer must be—"Yes, of brute 'intelligence!'" Thus he has to dispose of his original position; before he can proceed!

Mr. Lee has certainly abandoned his first position. He has profited by my strictures, although he has passed them in sullen silence, lest his readers should know that a stripling with a smooth stone from the brook, had smote the Goliah to the ground, and cut off his head!

But let us see what he makes of his present position. Mr. Lee gives to brutes "sensation and perception," which he calls "instinct." Well, Mr. Lee, do you ascribe "sensation and perception" to matter or not? If you do, you have given up as lost your original position; but, if you do not, you are compelled by your theory to give animals "immaterial" minds! because matter, in your view of the subject, has not the properties of "sensation," "perception," nor "instinct."

What is "instinct?" The word is derived from the Latin *instinctus*, and signifies the *power* determining the *will* of brutes.

Mr. Lee says—"Instinct never improves." This is not true; for that power which controls, or modifies, the will of brutes can be *educated*, as we see in the horse, dog, elephant, camel, monkey, &c., &c. But

even supposing it were otherwise, the very existence of *instinct* in brutes is incompatible with Mr. Lee's theory, unless he can prove *it* to be a property of matter; which he is far from being disposed to admit.

Mr. Lee remarks that animals "*never think*," and immediately after he speaks of "their mental operations," as if "mental operations" could go on *without thought!* Animals do "think," however, as we shall soon prove. And if "animal instinct never imparts to its fellow animal, the limited education it is capable of receiving from the more skilful hand of man," it is capable of teaching its "fellow animal" many things which man cannot. Man cannot teach the newly fledged bird to fly; but she who nursed it, and watched over it, can do this in the shortest possible time.

3. Mr. Lee says "brutes" are not conscious. This is also a fallacy. Mr. Lee's illustration does not disprove it. "Consciousness" is a "sensation" of identity, without which one animal might, and would mistake himself for another, or another for himself. It is folly to say that animals have not a sentiment of personal identity, which is *self-consciousness*.

4. Mr. Lee remarks—"brutes do not" possess "volition and *will*." This is an error; for a horse not only prefers "to go in one direction, rather than to be driven in another;" but he has a "*will*" to return from the distance of many miles, and that too by the most direct route, to the place of his abode. This involves "*will*," "memory" of place, and *locality*, or a perception of *relative distance*, and the "mental operation" of selecting the nearest route. This is more than mere "instinct," or desire, or impulse. "Instinct" is desire—appetite—predisposition; and why should an animal desire one place above another, but for a consideration? The feline species, though tied up in a bag, will return to their original home by the most direct route, even in the dark, when at liberty.

5. "Brutes" have no "memory," says Mr. Lee.

This is a greater error than any of the preceding. If brutes had no memory, when they left one place they would have no desire to return to their original place of abode, more than to another; but this is contrary to fact. Animals prefer one place above another, when they are absent from them. Animals trained by one individual, if taken from them for a time, will recognize their original master when they meet them, and manifest pleasure at the sight. What is this but the associations of memory?

6. Mr. Lee says—"Men have conscience, but brutes have none." This may be true; for we have never maintained that brutes were men! Their organization is different, and, by consequence, their powers, or faculties, are different. But, up to this *item*, Mr. Lee has been in error, and I defy him to reconcile the preceding items with *his* theory!

7. Whether "brutes" are the subjects of "hope," or not, I will not now dispute; but that they have "fears" none who understand their nature will deny. They manifest fear on many occasions, and, also, "joy," or pleasure.

8. But, to sum up the argument, Mr. Lee defines "instinct" to be a compound of "sensation and perception." Then there must be various *kinds* of "instinct;" or,

1. A *Geometrical "instinct;"* for Bees are geometers. Their cells are constructed as, with the least quantity of material, to have the largest size spaces, and least possible loss of interstice. So also is the Ant-lion; his funnel-shaped trap is exactly correct in its conformation, as if it had been formed by the most skilful artist of our species, with the aid of the best instrument.

2. A *Meteorological "instinct;"* for the Mole is a Meteorologist.

3. An *Arithmetical "instinct;"* for the bird called Ninekille is an arithmetician; so is the Crow, the Wild Turkey, and some other birds.

4. *An Electrical "instinct ;"* because the Torpedo, the Ray, and the Electric Eel, are Electricians.

5. *A Navigatorial "instinct ;"* for the Nautilus is a Navigator. He sets and lowers his sails, casts and weighs anchor, and performs the other nautical evolutions.

6. *A Musical "instinct ;"* for whole tribes of birds are Musicians.

7. *An Architectural "instinct ;"* the Beaver is an Architect, Builder, and Wood-cutter. He cuts down timber and builds houses and dams.

8. *A Civil-engineering "instinct ;"* for such is the character of the Marmot: he not only builds houses, but constructs aqueducts to keep them dry.

9. *A Military "instinct ;"* for the white Ants maintain a regular army of soldiers.

10. *An Horticultural "instinct ;"* the East India Ants raise mushrooms, upon which they feed their young.

11. *A Mechanical "instinct ;"* Wasps are paper manufacturers; Caterpillars are silk-spinners; Ploceus Texer is a weaver—he weaves a web to make his nest; the Prime is a tailor—he sews the leaves together to make his nest. The squirrel is a ferryman. With a chip or piece of bark for a boat and his tail for a sail, he crosses a stream. Dogs, Wolves, and Jackalls are hunters. The Black Bear and Heron are fishermen. The Ants have regular days of labour; and the Monkey is an expert rope-dancer.

12. *An "instinct" for Government.* Beavers present us a model of a Republic; Bees with a Monarchy; the Indian Antelope of a Patriarchial; Elephants of an aristocracy of Elders; wild horses have a leader; and sheep are under the control of a military chief ram!

Now, if Mr. Lee can reconcile all these powers with his theory, let him do it; or, otherwise, let him yield his position as utterly unworthy of being defended. But, if he can harmonize these facts with

his view, he will do more than any other author has ever been able to do.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

The destiny of the wicked, continued.

We now resume the question of the ultimate destiny of the wicked. And may God by his truth shine upon us, and illuminate our mind!

1. Mr. Lee admits "that the punishment of sin is termed death;" but denies that death involves the extinction, or cessation, of life. This amounts to this—"that the punishment of sin is termed" what *it is not!*

We do not "ASSUME that death is the extinction of" *life*; for we have proved, in a previous article, that the "punishment of sin is *death*" in a literal sense of the word. We do not define death to be "annihilation" in the strict and philosophical sense of the term, and Mr. Lee evades a correct issue by the continued use of that term. But let that pass. The question to be proved is, *that death is the cessation, or extinction, of the functions of life.*

2. Mr. Lee argues that because the "term death is applied to both the righteous and the wicked," this "is sufficient of itself to show the absurdity of relying upon the force of the word death, to prove what the punishment of sin is." It is "absurd," then, to rely upon the words, or language, of a penalty, to determine what that penalty is! Mr. Lee certainly does not profess to be wiser than his Maker, for Jehovah has not left it to Mr. Lee, to me, nor to any other man, to *infer* what *death is*. God, Himself, has defined it in the most explicit manner—Dust thou art, *and* UNTO DUST shalt thou RETURN." *This is death.* The simple act of *dying* is not *death*. *Dying* is the *process* of entering into DEATH. Not *dying*, but *death* is the penalty of the divine law.



Mr. Lee quotes Heb. ix. 27.—“And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment,” as though this had anything to do with “eternal torments.” Death was “appointed” before the “judgment;” but Mr. Lee says men never die literally, and, upon the same principle of reasoning, he should do away with the judgment.

3. Mr. Lee affirms that, “there is nothing in the etymology, or common scriptural use of the word, to justify the assumption that it means *annihilation*.” This word “annihilation” haunts Mr. Lee’s brain like his faith in “ghosts!” But let us examine the “etymology and scriptural use of the word,” and see if the *extinction* of life is not found in it as the *primary* and radical meaning.

Mr. Lee quotes Rom. vi. 23.—“The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” The word here rendered death, is, in the greek, *thanatos*, which Mr. Lee’s authority thus defines—“*Death, i. e., THE EXTINCTION OF LIFE*; exposure to danger of death, disease, pestilence, spiritual death,” &c. The reader will observe, that the *first, OR PRIMARY, meaning of thanatos*, is “*The extinction of life.*” This is the literal, unfigurative, common, scriptural, and etymological meaning of the word. Grove’s Lexicon thus defines it: “*To die, fall, perish, expire.*” Here, again, we get the full force of the word *thanatos*, which involves the idea of the extinction of life, or a cessation of the functions of life.

But, reader, what is Mr. Lee’s comment?—“From this it is seen that by going back to the original, we get no nearer the idea of”—what? Death? No, but “*annihilation!*” This really *looks* dishonest; however, I hope better things of Mr. Lee, though he writes thus.

Mr. Lee remarks—“In the text above quoted, it will not be denied that death and eternal life are opposed to each other, and by their different significations, make the difference in the destiny of the

saved and lost." This is true, the penalty, or "wages of sin," and "the gift of God," run parallel with each other. *Death* in its "*dominion*," is the wages of sin—death eternal; and eternal life, unmixed with evil, disease, or death, the reward of the righteous.

Mr. Lee says *thanatos* denotes the death of the *body*; but, then, he has taught us, that the body of itself, being matter, has no life! How then can it die?

Again, he says, the word *zoe* "denotes natural life, the life which we now live." We shall notice this presently. He then professes to give two instances where *thanatos* denotes the death of the body, as though any theologian was so simple as to suppose it was not used in that sense! Truly, Mr. Lee must suppose his readers are very ignorant. The death of the body is the death of the man—the cessation of the functions of life, whether he apply it to men before, or after the resurrection.

Again, what student of the Scriptures does not know, that *zoe* is applied to the present life, and the eternal life of the righteous? But this does not alter the meaning of the word—it has the same primary meaning, whether we apply it to the life that now is, or to that which is to come. The *difference* between them is expressed by another word—*eternal*. Mr. Lee makes a smoke where there was none, and then presumes his readers will not see his mistakes.

It may be true, as Mr. Lee says, that "there is not the least proof that death signifies *annihilation*;" but there is abundant proof that it signifies the extinction of life. And what if these terms are used in a "figurative sense;" does that do away with their *literal sense*? And will Mr. Lee tell me what words are *not*, sometimes, used in a figurative sense?

"The word death," says Mr. Lee, "is often used when loss of existence cannot be meant." Of course it is; and it "is often used when loss of" life

must "be meant." The first text you quote proves this—"Follow me; and let the *dead* bury the *dead*." Here it is used both in a figurative and literal sense, and you cannot put any other construction upon it. Let the *dead, in sin*, bury the *literally dead*, Matt. 8. 22.

In Eph. v. 14, Mr. Lee gives us another example:—"Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light." Here the words *sleep, arise, and dead*, are all used in a *moral*, or figurative, sense; but shall we thence conclude that they are never used in a *literal sense*? That men never literally sleep, arise, or are dead? What sophistry Mr. Lee displays!

When Mr. Lee applies *thanatos* to physical death, he says it means the *death* of the body; *i. e.*, of a part of the man. In what sense will he apply it, when he uses it morally? Will he say, that a man is *half dead* to God? Or *half dead* in sin? I apprehend here is a chasm he did not see through the smoke and fog he raised! I suppose when a man is *dead* in sin, that he is *without the life* of God—he has no moral, or spiritual life. The term *thanatos*, therefore, when used *morally*, must imply the *absence, or extinction* of spiritual life.

The Bible speaks of some who "are twice dead," and then "plucked up by the roots;" but Mr. Lee is so benevolent that he will not suffer himself to believe that any man is more than *half dead*!

Mr. Lee quotes Col. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 6; Rev. iii. 1; but as all these passages speak of death in the sense defined above, we shall not offer any comment upon them. Mr. Lee insists they do not teach "annihilation," and in this we agree.

Mr. Lee's last argument on this point has reference to the "second death." He says there is no "annihilation" in it; and there certainly is no eternal misery in it; and here, for the present, we shall leave it.

Mr. Lee concludes his essay thus—"We trust we have now shown that death does not signify annihilation." Very well, Mr. Lee, now prove it does not signify *extinction of life!*

*This you have never done yet.*

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

The destiny of the wicked, concluded.

IN Mr. Lee's article No. 21, he professes to meet "the assumption," as he is pleased to call it, "that the word destruction means annihilation, or loss of conscious existence." With what success he has done this, remains to be seen.

The principal text examined by Mr. Lee in this article, is 2 Thess. i. 9. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power."

Upon the word destruction, he remarks, it "does not necessarily mean loss of existence." I would ask Mr. Lee, if "*it necessarily means*" any thing? And, if it do, what is it? Does it necessarily mean "eternal torments?" I affirm it "*necessarily*" carries along with it its *primary* meaning; and that, therefore, when applied to the final destiny of men, it "*necessarily means loss of existence,*" or loss of life.

Mr. Lee has given the definitions of lexicographers, one of which is *perdition*. The Greek is *apoleian*, which is another form of *apoluo*, and signifies, among other things, *to dismiss from life, permit to die*. *Olethros* is derived from the verb *oleo*, and so are the words *apolluo* and *apollumi* also derived from *oleo*; so that the meaning and force of *olethros* is found in the word *perdition*, and the force of *perdition* is found in *apolluo*, which signifies to be destroyed, to perish, to render vain, to bring to nought. While, therefore, the text might be rendered—"Who shall be punished

with everlasting perdition," or "everlasting ruin," it could not be rendered "everlasting misery" without discarding its *primary* meaning.

2. The word "tribulation" in the 6th verse is *not* the "same punishment," as that in the 9th, as Mr. Lee has asserted. He also says that "the word everlasting cannot well be applied to any term denoting annihilation." This is an assumption, and a fallacy. For, first, the word "*annihilation*" does not express the condition of the *destroyed*. *They are NOT "ANNIHILATED."* And I cannot help thinking, that Mr. Lee has selected this word for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of his readers, lest they should see the nakedness of his arguments!

But why cannot the word "everlasting" be applied to *destruction*? If a thing be destroyed without the possibility of restoration, why may it not be termed *everlasting*? The word everlasting adds force to the term destruction—a force which is irresistible to you! It shows that it is no temporary destruction which may be repaired, but a never-ending perdition. The word destruction signifies disorganization, and the term "everlasting" prefixed indicates its eternal duration. What an abuse of all logic—all reason, and common sense! According to your argument, the words eternal, everlasting, and immortal, should never be applied to God! He is self-existent, and the word "everlasting" can add no force when applied to him! Of course the term "everlasting" implies that there may be a destruction which is not everlasting," and I will give you an instance; but this is not to "abandon the argument founded on the meaning of the term."

"O Israel, thou hast *destroyed* thyself, but in me is thy help," is an example in point. This destruction is not everlasting.

Mr. Lee remarks, that "God himself cannot restore a person thus destroyed." As a question of power, God could restore even that which he had annihilated, much more could he restore that which was

resolved into its original elements. But he *wills* not to do it, and therefore the destruction is everlasting.

3. Mr. Lee argues that "the *nature* of this punishment called *destruction*, proves it not to be annihilation." This is a very singular sentence, and reads, when divested of its mysticism, "The nature of this punishment called *destruction*, proves it not to be *destruction*!" The punishment is *destruction*, this is its *nature*; and yet its nature proves it not to be *destruction*! Really!

Mr. Lee continues—"It consists in being *banished* from the presence of the Lord," &c. Not "*banished*," Mr. Lee, but "*punished*." Why substitute the word "banishment," for "punishment?" The truth is better expressed without your glosses. The "punishment" is "destruction;" and the "destruction" shuts them out "from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." What can be plainer? "The everlasting destruction," then, is not a "*banishment* from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," as Mr. Lee asserts; but a *punishment* consisting in *destruction*.

4. Mr. Lee introduces several passages for the purpose of showing the use of the word in other senses. His first text, Hosea xiii. 9, is a politico-ecclesiastical destruction, which is a metaphorical use of the word. He quotes 1 Cor. i. 19, where it signifies to render vain, or bring to nothing, the wisdom of the wise. He also refers to Rom. iii. 16, where he says, "destruction means ruin or perdition." Very well! He quotes Matt. xii. 13, where destruction is used to express the destiny of the wicked; he says—"it means to ruin, or perdition." All right!

He refers to Luke xvii. 27, where it is used to express the destruction by the flood. In Acts ix. 21, where it is used to imply physical death. And to Matt. v. 17, where it is used analogically to signify abrogation. Thus we have its *literal* and *metaphorical* use before us, and the reader can judge of their import.

Mr. Lee has certainly failed to prove, that the word *destruction*, when applied to the destiny of the wicked, does not signify absolute destruction, or perishing. Our position remains just as it was before he discharged his artillery.

1. In Mr. Lee's article, No, 22, which is his last effort, he offers a "reply to the assumption" as he terms it, "that the word *perish* signifies annihilation."

He says "the words *perish, perished, perisheth,*" are "nowhere used to describe or express the quality of the punishment of sin." This is a grand *assumption*. These words not only express the *certainty* but the *nature* of the sinner's punishment, as we shall see. Indeed the very passages he has quoted afford proof of this. "Except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise PERISH.*" Luke xiii. 3. Pilate had mingled the blood of the Galatians with their sacrifices; and the tower in Siloam fell and destroyed eighteen persons: they *perished*; and Jesus said—"Except ye repent, ye shall likewise perish," or in like manner, "perish," die—come to nought.

The text in John iii. 15. 16., presents us with the word "*perish*" undeniably expressive of the destiny of the world, apart from the gift of Christ; and it fully expresses the destiny of those, who will not come to Christ that they may have life.

And in Rom. ii. 12, the word *perish* is used in the same sense. So also 1 Cor. xv. 18; 2 Peter ii. 12, and Jude ii. Peter says "shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." McKnight, if any thing, makes it stronger, when he renders it "*by their own corruption, for this expresses the cause of perishing.*"

2. The original words remain to be examined in this place. *Apolluo* and *apollumi*, from the word *Oleo*, signify to destroy, kill; and, intransitively, to be destroyed, perish; to put to death, render vain to bring to nought. *Apolluo*, from *uso*, and compounded of *apo* and *luo*, signifies to loose, to send away, dismiss from life, permit to die.

"If the candid reader can see no certain proof" of destruction here, he must be blinded or greatly infatuated with an antiquated theory.

Mr. Lee blunders seriously over Cor. xv. 18. Does he really believe, that, if Christ had not risen, those who had fallen asleep in him would have suffered eternal misery? If so, I envy him not.

Mr. Lee's "illustrations," so far from proving that *perish* does *not* mean loss of conscious being, fully sustains this position. "Lord, save us, we perish." "Here perishing means only death by drowning," says Mr. Lee. Very well, it means *death!* chap. ix. 17. "The bottles perish." "Here," he says, "to perish is to be rendered *useless* or *worthless.*" Very well! Luke xiii. 33. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." "Here to perish is to *die*, or be put to *death,*" says Mr. Lee. All is well! chap. xv. 17. "I perish with hunger." "Here perishing," says Mr. Lee, "*means to die* of hunger." All right again!

Mr. Lee also refers to Eccles. vii. 15: Isa. lvii. 1: Jer. ix. 12, in the first two instances it means *death*, in a literal sense; and, in the last, *desolation*.

Speaking of 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, he says the "Apostle makes the virtue of the atonement depend upon the fact of the resurrection of Christ," &c. This may be true; for if Christ had remained among the dead, or under the dominion of death, there would have been "no profit in his blood." This the Psalmist teaches.

That the term *perish* means what we have previously defined it to mean, we have the following additional testimony: "If" God "should set his heart upon man, if he should gather to himself his spirit and his breath; *all flesh* would *perish* together, and *man* would turn again to dust." Job. xxxiv. 14, 15. Again, "I will *destroy* the wisdom of the wise and will bring to *nothing* the understanding of the prudent." 1. Cor. x. 19. And so, also, "the preaching of the cross is to them that *perish* foolishness."







