

The Gehenna Controversy

Walter Balfour, Bernard Whitman

1833-1834

Contents

Contents	i
An Inquiry into the Scriptural Import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, translated Hell in the Common English Version, by Walter Balfour	1
Facts stated respecting Gehenna, showing that it does not express a place of endless punishment in the New Testament.	1
All the texts in which Gehenna occurs, considered.	6
Additional facts stated, proving that Gehenna was not used by the sacred writers to express a place of endless misery.	41
Friendly letters to a Universalist on divine rewards and punishments: Letter VI, by Bernard Whitman	59
A letter to the Rev. Bernard Whitman, on the term Gehenna, by Walter Balfour	77
Explanation of Matthew v. 29, 30, and the similar Texts, by Hosea Ballou	139

An Inquiry into the Scriptural Import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, translated Hell in the Common English Version

Walter Balfour

Revised, with essays and notes, by Otis A. Skinner

Boston: published by A. Tompkins. 1854.

SECTION II: Facts stated respecting Gehenna, showing that it does not express a place of endless punishment in the New Testament.

Before we consider the texts, where Gehenna occurs in the New Testament, it is of importance to notice the following facts. They have been altogether overlooked, or but little attended to in discussions on this subject.

1st. The term Gehenna is not used in the Old Testament to designate a place of endless punishment. Dr. Campbell declares positively that it has no such meaning there. All agree with him; and this should lead to careful inquiry whether in the New Testament it can mean a place of endless misery. This has been too long believed without examination. The admitted fact that it has no such sense in the Old Testament ought to create the suspicion that its sense is misunderstood in the New.

2d. Those who believe Gehenna designates a place of endless punishment in the New Testament, entirely overlook its meaning in the Old. All admit its literal original signification to be the valley of Hinnom. But not one of them takes the least notice that Gehenna was used also by Jeremiah, as a source of imagery or emblem, to describe the punishment God threatened to the Jewish nation. But why overlook this sense of it in the Old Testament? Is it not possible, yea, is it not probable, that this may be its sense in the New? All critics admit the language of the New

Testament is derived from the Old, and ought to be interpreted by it.

3d. Those who believe Gehenna in the New Testament designates a place of endless punishment give it this sense on mere human authority. Dr. Campbell, above, says, Gehenna came gradually to assume this sense, and at last came to be confined to it. But no divine authority is referred to for the change. Professor Stuart refers to the later Jews, the Rabbinical writers, as authority: and finally tells us, "Gehenna came to be used as a designation of the infernal regions, because the Hebrews supposed that demons dwelt in this valley." But who can believe the term Gehenna in the New Testament is used in a sense which originated in a silly, superstitious notion?

4th. The word Gehenna only occurs twelve times in the New Testament. The following are all the texts. Matt. 5: 22, 29, 30, and 18: 9; Mark 9: 43-47; Luke 12: 5; Matt. 10: 28, and 23: 15; 33; James 3: 6. The rendering of Gehenna in these texts is uniformly hell in the common version. The fact that Gehenna is only used twelve times in the New Testament deserves notice; for Dr. Campbell and others say, this is the only word in the Bible which designates a place of endless punishment. If this is true, the place of endless punishment is only mentioned twelve times. But, really, Gehenna was not used even twelve times. It occurs eleven times in the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, which all know are only three histories of the same discourses in which Gehenna was used by our Lord. Viewing the subject in this light, few words of such importance occur so seldom in the New Testament as the word Gehenna. I notice this, to show the difference between our Lord and modern preachers as to the frequency of their use of the word hell. Allowing it used twelve times in the New Testament, this is not so often as many preachers use it in a single sermon.

5th. The word Gehenna is used by our Lord, and by James, but by no other person in the New Testament. Any person who can read English may satisfy himself of this fact, by reading the texts referred to above. John wrote the history of our Lord, as well as Matthew, Mark and Luke; but he does not use Gehenna either in his gospel or epistles. What is more remarkable, Luke, though he uses Gehenna once in his gospel, does not use it in Acts, which contains the history of the apostles' preaching for thirty years. Paul, Peter and Jude are entirely silent about Gehenna, which is very strange, if it designated a place of endless punishment. The writings of those persons who do not use it form two thirds of the New Testament. But, surely, it is a very natural expectation, warranted by the frequent mention of other important subjects, that all the writers in the New Testament should often speak of Gehenna, if it means a place of endless misery. And if they believed this, yet were silent about it, they were not so faithful as most modern preachers. But can any man believe that our Lord's disciples understood him to mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, yet most of them never said a word about it in their preaching, or in their letters to the churches? Is it at all probable that they would lay aside the term used by our Lord to designate such a place, and adopt some other language to express it? We strongly doubt this.

6th. All that is said about Gehenna in the New Testament was spoken to Jews, and to Jews only. No Gentile is ever threatened with Gehenna punishment. Any person can satisfy himself of this by simply reading the texts where Gehenna is used, with their respective contexts. It is of no consequence to decide to whom the gospels were originally addressed, for, in the eleven places where our Lord used the term Gehenna, it is certain he was speaking to Jews. And in the only place where it occurs, it is certain James wrote to the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad. James 1: 1, comp. chap. 3: 6. It forms no objection to this fact, "that our Lord's ministry was among the Jews, and not among the Gentiles, hence he could not say to the Gentiles as to the Jews, 'How can ye escape the damnation of hell (Gehenna)?" The apostles' ministry was among the Gentiles; but they never say anything to them about Gehenna in any shape whatever, which shows that the "damnation of Gehenna" only concerned the Jews. This fact is of great importance in the present investigation. Let us, then, attach what sense we please to the term, it is certain that Jews are the only persons concerned in its punishment. As proof of this it may be observed, that Matthew, Mark and Luke, are thought to have written their gospels for the use of the Jews, and in them Gehenna is used. It seems certain that John wrote his gospel for the use of the Gentiles, for he explains Jewish places, names, and customs, altogether unnecessary in writing to Jews. But it deserves especial notice that John does not mention Gehenna, and omits all the discourses of our Lord in which he spoke of it. If the damnation of Gehenna or hell only concerned the Jews, we see a good reason for such an omission; but if it equally concerned the Gentiles, how shall any man account for the omission on rational and scriptural principles? If Jews and Gentiles were alike concerned in the punishment of Gehenna, why were not both alike admonished concerning it? How, I ask, could the Gentiles avoid the punishment of Gehenna, seeing no sacred writer said anything to them about it? Does not this very omission prove that the New Testament writers did not mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, but that it designated the temporal punishment which Jeremiah predicted to the Jewish nation?

To the above it may possibly be objected, "Were not all the Scriptures written for the benefit of mankind? Why, then, make this distinction between Jews and Gentiles?" Answer: "Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our instruction." But notwithstanding this, who does not make this very distinction? As Gentiles, we may derive much instruction from Matt., chaps. 23d and 24th; but all allow that these two chapters had a particular reference to the Jews. In the first, some of the most important things occur which our Lord ever delivered respecting Gehenna. Who denies that the words, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers," had a special reference to the Jews as a nation? By why not also the very next words, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" And as this is the only instance where our Lord ever threatened the unbelieving Jews with the "damnation of Gehenna," and no sacred writer ever threatened the Gentiles with it, who can doubt this punishment only respected Jews? This fact ought to lead all to suspect that our Lord, by Gehenna, meant the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, and not a place of endless punishment. The man who can avoid such a suspicion must have some way of accounting for this and

other facts of which I am ignorant.

7th. Nearly all that our Lord said about Gehenna was spoken to his own disciples. In the twelve places where it occurs, only in two instances is there an allusion to the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. In nine of the other instances our Lord was addressing his own disciples. They are the persons principally warned against Gehenna. In the only other instance James was addressing believing Jews of the twelve tribes scattered abroad. A reference to the texts will satisfy the reader as to the correctness of these statements. I then ask, if our Lord by Gehenna meant a place of endless misery, why was he so solicitous that his few disciples should escape this punishment, yet say so little concerning it to the unbelieving multitude? How is this to be rationally and scripturally accounted for? Besides, he always spoke about Gehenna to his disciples as a thing they might escape; but to the unbelieving Jews he said, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Why warn those so often, who were in the least danger of Gehenna, yet only threaten once those in the greatest danger of it, if the common opinions on the subject are correct? Our Lord's conduct differs very much from that of preachers in the present day. What preacher now shows more solicitude that the few in his church should be saved from Gehenna or hell, than the multitude he considers living in disobedience? Why they act so differently from our Lord, I must leave for others to explain. I am satisfied that this can never be rationally accounted for on the common opinions respecting Gehenna. I may add, either our Lord said a great deal too little about Gehenna, or hell, to the wicked, or modern preachers say a great deal too much. Which of these is the truth must be left for themselves to determine. This, with the other facts above, must create more than a doubt that Gehenna in the New Testament does not mean a place of endless punishment.

8th. Wherever Gehenna is mentioned in the New Testament, the persons addressed are supposed to be perfectly acquainted with its meaning. No explanation is asked by the hearer, none is given by the speaker, nor is it supposed by either to be necessary. The Jews were always the persons addressed about Gehenna. The first time our Lord addressed his disciples about it, Matt. 5: 22, they had no more occasion to ask him what he meant by Gehenna, than what he meant by the judgment and council. And when he said to the unbelieving Jews, "How can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?" they understood as well what punishment he meant, as if he had spoken of stoning to death. If all this be true, and we think it indisputable, the question arises, Did the Jews our Lord addressed understand Gehenna to mean a place of endless misery? As this is generally asserted, I have a right to ask, from what source of information did they learn this sense of the word? I can think of no other sources from which they could possibly derive it, except the following:-

1st. From immediate inspiration. But no evidence of this can be produced; nor is it even alleged by those who contend that Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of endless punishment. No man will assert this, who has considered the subject.

2d. The preaching of John the Baptist. But this cannot be alleged, for John never said a word about Gehenna in his preaching, if a correct account is given of it in the New Testament.

3d. The instructions or explanations of the Saviour. This, no man will aver who has read the four gospels; for our Lord never explained Gehenna to mean the place of endless punishment.

4th. The Old Testament. All admit that Gehenna is not used in the Old Testament to designate a place of endless misery. Dr. Campbell declared that in this sense it is not found there.

5th. The assertions of uninspired men. This is the source whence originated the sense now given to Gehenna. Indeed, no higher authority is quoted than this; no one contends that God first gave it such a sense. Dr. Campbell said, "Gehenna in process of time came to be used in this sense, and at length came to be confined to it." And Professor Stuart refers us to Rabbinical writers as his authority that Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of endless punishment. In fact, he traces the origin of this sense given to Gehenna, to the silly superstition among the Jews, who thought demons dwelt in the valley of Hinnom. Such is the way, the believers in endless hell torments say, Gehenna came to have such a sense attached to it. We presume no man can devise a better.

But let us suppose the Jews understood our Lord, by Gehenna, to mean a place of endless punishment. How were they likely to relish such a threatening? Not very well, for we shall see afterwards, from Dr. Whitby, that the Jews believed no Jew, however wicked, would go to hell. I ask, then, how was it possible for our Lord to say to the unbelieving Jews, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" without exciting their wrath and indignation against him? But nothing is said in the four gospels that this threatening excited their indignation, or that it was ever brought up as an accusation against him.

There is no evidence that the unbelieving Jews understood our Lord in one sense, and the disciples in another. No; nor have we ever seen or heard that this has been alleged by any one. How, then, did both understand him? I answer this question by asking, how ought they to have understood him according to the meaning of Gehenna in their own Scriptures? Certainly either as meaning the literal valley of Hinnom, or symbol of the punishment God had threatened their nation, as seen from Jeremiah. In no other sense was Gehenna used in their Scriptures. In the last of these senses they must have understood him; for when our Lord spoke to them of Gehenna, it was the punishment of Gehenna; and that such a punishment had been threatened by Jeremiah, no Jew could be ignorant who was acquainted with the Scriptures. If the Scriptures were the common source of information, both to believing and unbelieving Jews, none of them could understand our Lord, by Gehenna punishment, to mean endless punishment in a future state; for they contained no such information. Those who contend that the Jews so understood our

Lord, are bound to inform us how they came by this information, seeing it was not found in their Scriptures. Who taught them this doctrine? Was it from heaven or of men? These are the questions at issue. To assume that Gehenna means a place of endless punishment, will not satisfy candid inquirers after truth. And to refer them to Rabbinical authority for this sense of Gehenna, is plainly admitting that it cannot be supported by a fair appeal to the Bible.

We have some additional facts to produce, to show that Gehenna, in the New Testament, does not designate a place of endless misery to the wicked. But these will be more appropriately introduced, after we have considered all the texts in the New Testament where the word occurs.

SECTION III: All the texts in which Gehenna occurs, considered.

THAT the term Gehenna, in the New Testament, designates punishment, all admit, but the question is, What is that punishment? Is it endless punishment, as Dr. Campbell and others assert; or is it God's judgments on the Jewish nation, in the destruction of their city and temple?

Some have alleged that Gehenna in the New Testament might refer to "that dreadful doom of being burned alive in the valley of Hinnom." But this is far from being probable, for burning alive in the valley of Hinnom was not a Roman punishment; and in our Lord's day the Jews had not power to put any man legally to death, by any mode of punishment whatever. Burning alive in the valley of Hinnom was, in our Lord's day, unknown among the Jews. To this horrid practice, then, I think he could not allude when he threatened them with the damnation of Gehenna.

Schleusner observes, that among the Jews "any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna." If this remark is correct, it well agrees with the prediction of Jeremiah. He had used Gehenna as imagery to describe the punishment to be inflicted on the Jewish nation, when on them came all the righteous blood shed on the earth. That this punishment was severe is certain. Our Lord declared, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved." Matt. 24:21, 22. Josephus said, six hundred thousand dead bodies were carried out of Jerusalem and suffered to lie unburied. Their punishment, then, was both severe and shameful, and might well be denominated Gehenna, for no place was more horrible to Jews than the valley of Hinnom. It was a fit emblem to describe their punishment.

It cannot be consistently objected by believers in endless misery, that the inspired writers made Gehenna an emblem of the temporal punishment which came on the Jewish nation, seeing they make it an emblem of endless punishment in a future state. To adopt the words of Mr. Stuart, "What could be a more appropriate

term than this, when we consider the horrid cruelties and diabolical rites which had been there performed," to describe the carnage of the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple? But, let us attend to the passages, and see how they agree to this view of the subject.

Matt. 5:22. "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell (Gehenna) fire." This is the first time Gehenna is mentioned in the New Testament and was addressed by our Lord to his own disciples. If it means hell, the world of woe, I ask, were they in so much more danger of going there than the unbelieving Jews, that he first warned them about it? Yea, was their condition so perilous that the chief thing said about Gehenna was addressed to them? But the passage or its context affords no proof that our Lord, by Gehenna, referred to a place of punishment in a future state. This sense of Gehenna is assumed, and in face of evidence to the contrary, as I shall now show.

1st. In the passage there are three crimes and three punishments mentioned. No one supposes the two first refer to a future state. Why, then, should the third? Is the crime of calling a brother a fool so much worse than the other two that it puts the person "in danger of hell," or endless punishment?

2d. The question then is, what did our Lord mean by Gehenna fire, or, as Mr. Stuart renders it, "the fire of the valley of Hinnom"? He says, "It is employed as a source of imagery, to describe the punishment of a future world, which the Judge of all hearts and intentions will inflict." But this is assuming the question in discussion, and deserves no regard. Schleusner says, "Any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna." Jeremiah, we have seen, describes the punishment of the Jews, as a nation, under the emblem of Gehenna. This punishment was at hand, when our Lord addressed his disciples in this passage. What, then, did he mean by "Gehenna fire"? I answer, nothing can be more obvious from the Bible, than that fire is a common figure to express God's judgments on men for their sins. No man can doubt this who consults the following among other passages: Deut. 32:22-25; Isai. 66:15, 16; 5:24, 25; 30:27-33; 9:18, 19; 10:16-18; Ezek. 22:18-22, 41. See, also, the two first chapters of Amos. I shall only quote one or two examples in proof, respecting the Jews. Jeremiah, Lam. 2:3, says, "God burned against Jacob like a flaming fire, which devoureth round about." And David says, Psal. 89:46, "Shall thy wrath burn like fire?" It is contended, by believers in endless misery, that what is expressed by the word punishment, Matt. 25:46, is described figuratively by the word fire, verse 41. Thus, according to the figurative use of the term fire, and according to Schleusner, "Gehenna fire" means "any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death." And we can be at no loss in determining to what punishment our Lord referred, as Jeremiah, under the emblem of Gehenna, predicted a most severe punishment to the Jewish nation. Where could he have found a more appropriate emblem than Gehenna? It was certainly a more appropriate term to describe God's temporal punishment of the Jews, than to

describe an eternal punishment in a future state of which we know nothing, for no description of it is given in the Bible.

3d. Let us inquire what Gehenna fire our Lord's disciples were in danger of. That they were in danger of the punishment God was about to inflict on their nation, no one will dispute. See how careful our Lord was, Matt. 24, in pointing out to them how they might escape this punishment. He tells them, verse 13, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Saved from what? The context clearly shows; they would be saved from this punishment coming on their nation. But the utmost watchfulness on their part was necessary, for this day of vengeance would come upon the nation unawares, Matt. 24:42–51. Compare 1 Thess. 5:1–10. But where does our Lord show like earnestness in warning his disciples that they might escape Gehenna fire, or endless misery in a future state? The following objection may perhaps be urged against the above view of this passage.

"Allowing Gehenna to refer to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, why did calling a brother a fool subject to this punishment, rather than the other crimes mentioned?" Answer: As Gehenna fire, or God's temporal judgments on the Jews, is the greatest punishment mentioned in the passage, we may expect that the crime of which it is the punishment was also the greatest. The word *moreh*, rendered fool, Dr. Campbell renders miscreant; and in his preface to Matthew's Gospel, says, "The word *moreh*, here used by the evangelist, differs only in number from *morim*, the compellation with which Moses and Aaron addressed the people of Israel when they said, Numb. 20:10, with manifest and indecent passion, as rendered in the English Bible, 'Hear now, ye rebels!' and were, for their punishment, not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. The word, however, as it is oftener used to imply rebellion against God than against any earthly sovereign, and as it includes disbelief of his word as well as disobedience to his command, I think might be better rendered in this place miscreant, which is also, like the original term, expressive of the greatest abhorrence and detestation. In this way translated, the gradation of crimes as well as of punishments is preserved, and the impropriety avoided of delivering a moral precept, of consequence to men of all denominations, in words intelligible only to the learned."

Matt. 5:28, 29. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell (Gehenna). And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell (Gehenna)." Here again our Lord was addressing his own disciples; and whatever was meant by Gehenna in verse 22, the same must be meant here, as all will allow. Let us then inquire, 1st. What our Lord meant by Gehenna. On this text, Mr. Stuart says, "Most certainly this cannot be understood of a literal casting into Gehenna; for who was to execute such a punishment? Not the Jewish courts; for they had no cognizance of the offence which a man's right hand or right eye moved him to commit; that is, they could not call in question and punish a member of the human body, because it tempted its owner to sin. It must, then, be a punishment

which God would inflict. But was this a literal casting into the valley of Hinnom? It may, however, be said that the caution of the Saviour runs thus, 'Avoid all temptation to sin, lest you bring on yourself the terrible punishment of being burned in the valley of Hinnom, in case you give way to any temptation.' This would be a possible interpretation, provided the crimes in question could be shown to be of such a nature as were punishable in this manner by the Jewish courts. But as this cannot be done, this exegesis seems to be fairly incapable of admission." On this quotation I remark,

1st. We perfectly agree with Mr. Stuart that this cannot be understood of "the terrible punishment of being burned in the valley of Hinnom." And we also agree with him that "it must then be a punishment which God would inflict." But, we ask, does God inflict no punishment but that of casting the whole body into hell, the world of woe? But,

2d. What does Gehenna in this passage mean? It is here used twice, but without the word fire being added. It is no doubt understood, however, from verse 22, noticed above, to which I here refer. Our Lord's warning here is more alarming, for he says twice, "And not that thy whole body should be cast into hell (Gehenna)." But to understand him as meaning that their whole body should be cast into a place of endless misery, is inadmissible. This sense of the term is entirely assumed, for nothing in the text or context authorizes such a construction. But it does not accord with the facts of the case; for an instance was never known of an individual having his whole body, or soul and body, cast into a place of endless misery. This is not done surely at any man's death, as every sexton in the world can testify. And to say it shall be done at the resurrection of the dead, is not only an unsupported assertion, but is contrary to all the texts which speak of the resurrection. It does not even accord with modern preaching. Who tells his audience that their whole bodies are to be cast into hell, the world of woe? If it is to be done at the resurrection, then immortal, incorruptible bodies are to be cast into this place of endless misery. Besides, Christians are in great danger of this; for, be it remembered, Christ was not speaking here to wicked people, but to his own disciples. But are modern Christians much afraid that their whole body is to be cast into endless misery? But understand our Lord here to use Gehenna, as Jeremiah did, as a source of imagery to describe the punishment God was about to inflict on the Jewish nation, and all is plain and consistent. When it came upon them, there was even a literal casting into the valley of Hinnom. Did not Jeremiah say the valley of Hinnom was to be to the Jews the valley of slaughter; and that they should bury in Tophet till there was no place? And does not Josephus declare that six hundred thousand of the carcases of the Jews were cast out of Jerusalem and lay unburied? And who will deny that God inflicted this punishment, although he used human agents to accomplish it? Viewing the subject thus, we see good reason for what our Lord here said to his disciples about Gehenna, If anything dear to them as a right eye or right hand proved a temptation to sin or apostasy, they must part with it. This was profitable to them, for only he who endured to the end should be saved. If they continued faithful and obeyed his instructions, they should escape the damnation of Gehenna;

that punishment which the unbelieving part of the nation could not escape. [2]

Matt. 10:28. “Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” The following are all the remarks Mr. Stuart makes on this passage: “The body might, indeed, be literally burned in the valley of Hinnom; but the immaterial, immortal soul—is that to be literally burned there?” We answer, no; for no Universalist holds any such opinion, as Mr. Stuart knows. But we ask him, in turn, How is he to punish the whole body or soul and body in his hell, without fire or some other means of torment? If soul and body are to be tormented there, why not employ fire just as well as anything else to do it? Was not his hell long considered a place of literal fire and brimstone? Do not some still speak of it as such? Is his immaterial, immortal soul to be burned there? But let the punishment of his hell be what he pleases, if it is taught in this text, soul and body, according to his views, are to be destroyed there.

But we ask Mr. Stuart, where the Scriptures speak of an “immaterial, immortal soul”? Has he forgotten that he told us *psuhe*, Acts 2:29, which is the same word for soul in this text, means me? See its corresponding word, *nephish*, Psal. 16:10. Until he proves man has an immaterial, immortal soul, it is premature to speak of it as being burned in any place.

But let us attend to the passage, and see what our Lord taught by it. Here, as in the preceding texts, he addressed his disciples, and taught them how to conduct themselves in preaching the gospel. The text and the context show that he was not speaking of a future state, but fortifying their minds in view of the difficulties they were about to encounter. The passage says, 1st. “Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul (*psuhe*).” By the body (*soma*), all allow is meant the fleshly part of man, which is here and in other places distinguished from his *psuhe*, soul or life. The persons who might kill the body were many, and are designated by the plural word, them. The term here rendered kill, means to slay, to put to death, as its scripture usage shows. It is here said men can kill the body, “but are not able to kill the soul.” What, then, is meant by the soul? Mr. Stuart and others say the immaterial, immortal soul which, after death, is susceptible of happiness or misery in a disembodied state. But this must not be assumed. No proof is offered. That *psuhe*, here rendered soul, often means the life, is evident. It is rendered life in verse 39 of the context. But it may be objected, if soul only means here the life, is not it killed, when men kill the body? We answer no, for this is most expressly denied in the passage. They “are not able to kill the soul.” In one sense they do kill it, namely, the soul or life is no longer in the body. But it is not killed, for at death the soul or spirit returns to God who gave it. Eccl. 3:19–22. It returns to the fountain of life, and is to be restored to man, an immortal life, in the resurrection. After this, man shall not die any more, but shall be equal unto the angels which are in heaven. Until this period, man’s life is hid with Christ in God. It is laid up for him, and will then be restored to him. So far as I can find from Scripture, man is now mortal, but is to be constituted immortal in the resurrection. Indeed, if he was

now immortal, neither God nor man could kill him; for can that which is immortal die? But we are told in the next part of the verse that God is “able to destroy both soul and body.” This God can do, for if it pleased him he could blot man forever out of existence.

2d. “But rather fear him, who can destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” The word *him*, in this part of the passage, refers to some one who is placed in contrast to them in the first part of the verse. This is obvious. The question is, to what one did our Lord refer? If it is said, it refers to man, the question returns—what man? I also ask, how could this one man do what more than one are said, in the former part of the verse, not to be able to do? If it is said, the civil magistrate is the man referred to, I then ask, could he kill the soul or life, which others could not do? Could he “destroy both soul and body”? If so, then God himself could do no more than this. But unless it can be shown that destroying “both soul and body in Gehenna” was a punishment inflicted by the civil magistrate in our Lord’s day, it is not at all probable that our Lord referred to him. Besides, why should his disciples fear the civil magistrate in this case, yet be commanded not to fear them who kill the body? Were his disciples to have no fear of others who killed them, yet to fear the civil magistrate, whose power could not go much beyond this? Perhaps it may be said, according to Schleusner, “Any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna. This the civil magistrate could inflict on Christ’s disciples, and hence they are here exhorted to fear him.” But if this was our Lord’s meaning, his disciples paid little regard to his words, as their future history shows. In the execution of their mission, they do not seem to have feared even the civil authority, so as to be deterred from their duty.

Who, then, is referred to by the word *him*, whom the disciples were commanded to fear? God, we think, is the being spoken of. He “is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” It will not, I presume, be questioned that the terms rendered kill and destroy are, in this verse, used as in the other part of the text. As the word kill cannot mean merely to hurt or punish the body in the first clause of the first part of the verse, so neither can it mean to hurt or punish the soul in the second clause. And, in the second part of the verse, the word destroy is used as an equivalent to the word kill in the first; and what man in the first part is not able to do, God, in the second, is able to do. God “is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” That the terms rendered kill and destroy, are used to express the same thing will appear from the following:—

1st. Let us notice the word *apokteino*, here rendered kill. Its general usage is to slay, kill, or put to death. Mark 3:4, is the only text where it is used to express the killing of the soul or life. “Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? To save life (*psuhen*), or to kill (*apokteino*)?” “But in the parallel text, Luke 6:9, the word rendered destroy is used to express the same idea. “Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? To save life (*psuhen*), or to destroy (*apolesai*) it?” Let the reader notice the same term, *psuhe*, soul, in the text in question, is in these texts rendered life, and it is said can be killed or destroyed. But can this *psuhe*, soul,

mean an immortal soul? And can it be killed or destroyed? We should think not. No sacred writer mentions an immortal soul. Why, then, should it be contended that this is the sense of the passage before us? See Rom. 7:11; Eph. 2:16; 2 Cor. 3:6, where *apokteino* is used, but without any relation to our present subject. Let us now notice,

2d. The word *apollumi*, here rendered destroy. This term, we have just seen, is used by Luke, in chap. 6:9, as equivalent to *apokteino*, kill, in Mark 3:4; and both words are in these texts applied to killing or destroying the *psuhe*, soul, or life. The term *apollumi* is also used in the following texts to express destroying the *psuhe*, soul or life. Matt. 10:39, "He that findeth his life (*psuhen*), shall lose (*apolesei*) it; and he that loseth (*apolesas*) his life (*psuhen*), shall find it." But must a man lose his immortal soul before he can find it? Again, Luke 17:38, "Whosoever shall seek to save his life (*psuhen*), shall lose (*apolesei*) it; and whosoever shall lose (*apolesei*) his life, shall preserve it." Is it then true that the man who seeks to save his immortal soul is sure to lose it; and he who shall lose it is certain to save it? This is reversing what is said about immortal souls and their salvation in the present day. But again, John 12:25: "He that loveth his life (*psuhen*), shall lose (*apolesei*) it; and he that hateth his life (*psuhen*) in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." If *psuhe*, soul, means an immortal soul, then the true way to secure its salvation is not to love it, but to hate it in this world. Again, Matt. 16:24, 26, "For whosoever will save his life (*psuhen*), shall lose (*apolesei*) it; and whosoever will lose (*apolesei*) his life (*psuhen*), for my sake, shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul (*psuhen*)?" See the same thing stated, Mark 8:35–37, also in Luke 9:24, 25, with this variation, "and lose (*apolesas*) himself, or be cast away." How cast away? it may be asked. I answer, just as the unbelieving Jews were, Rom. 11:15. Comp. 1 Cor. 9:27; Luke 9:56. "For the Son of man is not come to destroy (*apolesai*) men's lives (*psuhas*), but to save them."

It is now obvious that, in a considerable number of texts, the soul or life is said to be destroyed. But who supposes (unless grossly ignorant of the terms *psuhe* and *apollumi*, and, still worse, shutting his eyes to the context) that soul means anything more than life or person in the texts which have just been quoted? Let life or person be read instead of soul in them all, let their contexts be attended to, and no man can think an immortal soul is meant in any one of them. Or, let immortal soul be read instead of life, where the word is so rendered, and the absurdity of the supposition that this was the writers' meaning, is at once manifest.

But the question will probably be asked, Why does Matthew in this text make a distinction between soul and body, if soul does not mean an immaterial, immortal soul? Attention to the following remarks will place this subject in its true light. It is admitted by all that in scripture style a part is sometimes put for the whole, and sometimes the whole is put for a part, of the thing spoken about. Man, considered as a whole, is one individual person. But this person is in Scripture divided into three parts, *soma*, body; *psuhe* soul or life; and *pneuma*, spirit. It is with the two first of these distinctions we are principally concerned in the passage before us. No-

tice, then, that the *psuhe*, or life, is often put for the whole man, or person. So is its corresponding word, *nephish*, in the Old Testament. Take the following texts as examples, where *nephish* is rendered soul, and is used to express the whole man, or the person himself. Gen. 12:13; 19:20; Exod. 12:16; Levit. 5:2; 20: 11; Numb. 11:6; 31:28. Take the following texts as a specimen, where *psuhe* is rendered soul, and is used to express the whole man, or the person himself. Acts 27:37; 1 Peter 3:20; Rom. 13: 1; Acts 3:23. *Psuhe* is also rendered life, and used to express the whole man, or person, in Matt. 2:20; John 10:15, and other texts. Take, now, the following texts, as a specimen, where the *soma*, body, and the *psuhe*, soul or life, are both mentioned together, and distinguished from each other, Luke 12:22; Matt. 7:25, and the passage now before us. Such being the modes of speaking used in the Scriptures, it is plain, if a writer only mentions the *psuhe*, soul or life, he designates the whole man or person, by putting a part for the whole. The same is the case if he only mentions the *soma*, body, or *pneuma*, spirit. But sometimes the sacred writers designate the whole man or person by enumerating all the three parts into which man is divided, body, soul, and spirit. See 1 Thess. 5:23. But to come more particularly to the passage in question. Sometimes the sacred writers designate the whole man or person by only enumerating two of the three parts into which he is divided. This is evidently the case with Matthew, in the passage we are now considering. He says, God “is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” Or, he can destroy the whole man or person. That this is his meaning, is obvious from chap. 5:29, 30, considered above, where he twice uses the expression, “thy whole body,” to express precisely the same thing. No man we think will dispute this.

It is obvious, from this examination, that soul, when used alone, designates the whole man, or the person himself. The body, also, when used alone, likewise designates the person or whole man. And when soul and body are both mentioned, as in the passage in question, it designates no more than the man or person himself. Now, men who were able to kill the body, could not kill the whole man or person, for this would be to blot the man forever out of existence. God only was able to do this. He gave man life; it returns to him at death; and he has promised to restore it again when this corruptible puts on incorruption. But, on this view of the subject, there is no immaterial, immortal soul which lives in a conspicuous state of happiness or misery, in a disembodied condition. This doctrine has been the fertile source of much error and human misery. It also makes void the doctrine of the resurrection. In confirmation of these remarks, it may be observed that though the words of the New Testament are Greek, the idiom is Hebrew. Besides, it is thought Matthew wrote his gospel originally in Hebrew, which accounts for his using more of the Hebrew idiom, as noticed above, than Luke does, chap. 12:4, 5, where the same discourse of our Lord is recorded.

What did our Lord mean by Gehenna? Whatever may be meant by “soul and body,” or destroying them, it is very plain this destruction of them is said to be “in hell,” or Gehenna. This hell, or Gehenna, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Stuart, and others, take for granted is a place of endless punishment in a future state. We shall here give a condensed view of our reasons why we think this a mistake.

1st. Such a view of the term Gehenna is contrary to its admitted original signification. It is a compound, *gia* a valley, and *onm* the name of its owner, *Hinnom*. The valley of Hinnom. All admit this.

2d. This sense given to Gehenna is contrary to its usage in the Old Testament. Dr. Campbell frankly declares it does not mean there a place of endless punishment. No man will allege it has such a sense in the Old Testament.

3d. Such a sense attached to the term Gehenna is at variance with all the facts stated in the preceding section. If Gehenna means a place of endless misery, they ought all to agree with this meaning.

4th. This sense attached to the term Gehenna is also at variance with a large number of facts to be stated in the next section. If this was its true sense in the New Testament, it ought to harmonize with them.

5th. In no instance, where Gehenna is used in the New Testament, is the writer speaking on the subject of a future state. The connection of the texts where it occurs gives no countenance to such a sense attached to it. But if this was its true sense, the context of some of them would point it out.

6th. In the contexts of some of the passages where Gehenna occurs, the writers show clearly that by Gehenna punishment they referred to the punishment of God about to be inflicted on the Jewish nation. See particularly Matt. 23:33.

7th. Those who say Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of endless punishment, entirely assume this to be its meaning, without any authority from the Old. The Rabbinical writers are their authority, which on other subjects they reject as of no value. Mr. Stuart traces the origin of this sense of Gehenna to a superstitious notion among the Jews that demons dwelt in the valley of Hinnom. He would smile, at least, if I traced my sense of Gehenna to such an origin. He does not pretend that the meaning he attaches to it was of divine origin.

8th. Giving to Gehenna the sense of a place of endless punishment in the New Testament does not harmonize with the phraseology used in the places where it occurs. Take, for example, the passage before us. Who believes the whole body, or soul and body, are cast into, or are to be destroyed in, a place of endless punishment? This is not done at death, as facts show. And to say it shall be done at the resurrection is a gratuitous assertion, never made in the Scriptures.

Such are some of my reasons for thinking Gehenna does not signify a place of endless punishment. They apply to all the texts where it is used in the New Testament. We have introduced them here, because this is considered the strongest text to designate this place of misery. In view of these reasons, let us look for a moment at this passage: "But rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in

Gehenna.” To say our Lord meant by Gehenna here a place of endless punishment, and call on others to believe it, is,

1st. Calling on them to believe not only without evidence, but contrary to evidence. To believe this, is not only implicit faith, but a man must shut his eyes to evidence before he can say he believes it.

2d. Those who believe our Lord here taught that Gehenna means a place of endless punishment seem to suppose God cannot “destroy both soul and body,” or a person, except in hell. But is not this a very silly supposition? Pray, what can prevent God from doing this anywhere? He certainly could do this in Gehenna, the literal valley of Hinnom. And could he not do it also by the punishment which he brought on the Jewish nation, described by Jeremiah under the symbol of Gehenna? But I ask,

3d. How were our Lord’s disciples likely to understand these words? If God had previously spoken of a place of endless punishment by the name Gehenna, we allow in this sense our Lord’s disciples might understand them. But even this would not be certain; for, as the prophet Jeremiah had also spoken of a temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation under the symbol of Gehenna, it might be doubtful if the words did not refer to it. But, as God had never before spoken of Gehenna as a place of endless punishment, or our Lord explained it in this sense to his disciples, how could they possibly understand him to use it in a new sense? They could be at no loss to understand his meaning, if it signified the punishment of God on the nation of the Jews. This sense of the term they had learned from their own Scriptures. No other Gehenna punishment was taught there. And no other sense can be rationally and scripturally given to our Lord’s words.

4th. The phraseology of the passage, when correctly understood, accords with this view. The phrase, “both soul and body,” is a mere Hebrew idiom, to express the whole man or person. Our Lord, then, warns his disciples of their danger, in being killed or destroyed by the punishment to be inflicted on the Jewish nation; a punishment which Jeremiah predicted under the imagery of Gehenna. He does not say, “they could not escape this damnation of Gehenna,” like the unbelieving Jews, Matt. 23:33. No; here, and in other places, he showed his solicitude that they might escape it. To rouse them to watchfulness and obedience, he exhorts them to fear him, who is able, or has power, to bring such a punishment on them, as well as the whole nation of the Jews. To affirm, because it is said, God “is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna,” that he actually did it, is surely incorrect. It is contrary to the fact, whatever sense we give to Gehenna. If it means a place of endless misery, I ask, did God destroy both the souls and bodies of Christ’s disciples there? Surely not. If it means the terrible punishment God brought on the Jewish nation, I ask, did God destroy them with it? No; for we shall see that they escaped this punishment. It is a very false conclusion to say, because God is able to do a thing, that it is actually done. It is said, Matt. 3:9, “God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” But according to this reasoning he has actually

done this. No one, however, believes this true. It was sufficient to alarm the fears of the disciples to say, God was able to inflict on them the same punishment as on the unbelieving Jews.

5th. If our Lord's words, "is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna," designated their punishment in a future world, his threatenings to his own disciples were far worse than his threatenings to the unbelieving Jews. In Matt. 23:33, the only place where he threatened them with Gehenna punishment, he only says to them, "How can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?" There, we shall show from the context, he meant, by Gehenna, the punishment coming on the Jewish nation. But can any man think our Lord only threatened the unbelieving Jews with a severe temporal punishment, and threatened his own disciples with endless torments in a future state? Who can believe the disciples were nine times solemnly warned about hell, Gehenna, in the world to come, and the wicked Jews only once about hell, Gehenna, or temporal punishment in this world? If Gehenna had the same sense when our Lord spoke about it to both, it is beyond all reasonable question that it merely refers to the punishment of God on the Jewish nation.

6th. If Gehenna refers to punishment in a future state, the passage in question rather teaches the doctrine of annihilation than endless misery. If to kill the body is to put it out of all pain and even conscious existence, to destroy soul and body, or the whole man, must be to put them out of all pain and conscious existence. But did Christ threaten his own disciples with annihilation? And was God to cast them into Gehenna in another world to accomplish this? Excuse me from believing that he threatened them either with annihilation or endless misery, until the evidence I have produced is destroyed, and good evidence adduced to prove that this is true.

We have said enough, and perhaps more than was necessary, on this passage. We have discussed it repeatedly. See my Answer to Mr. Sabine, Letters to Mr. Hudson, and Reply to Professor Stuart. See, also, on Luke 12:4, 5.

Matt. 18: 9. "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell (Gehenna) fire." Mr. Stuart considers this text "an instance of the same nature as Matt 5:29, 30, excepting that the phrase here is *Gehenna tou puros*, a fiery Gehenna, which one cannot doubt has the same meaning as unquenchable fire, Mark 9:43, 45, inasmuch as this very phrase is there used to explain Gehenna; the same meaning also as the lake of fire, Rev. 20:14, 15; 21:8, which is 'the second death,' Rev. 21:9." To say the lake of fire, which is the second death, means Mr. Stuart's hell, we think a great mistake. But it would be too great a digression from our present subject to examine this here. As the phrase *Gehenna tou puros*, a fiery Gehenna, is considered the same as unquenchable fire, Mark 9:43–45, we refer the reader to our remarks on that passage. See Matt. 5:22, 29, 30, for an explanation of some things in this verse. There we have shown what is meant by a hand or foot offending. Also, the figurative use of the term fire has been noticed; and on the texts already considered, we have seen that Gehenna and casting into Gehenna do

not refer to punishment in a future state, but to the infliction of punishment on the Jewish nation. On this text, however, with its context, we observe,

1st. Here, as in all the preceding texts, our Lord addressed his own disciples. It is also obvious from the context that he was not speaking to them on the subject of a future state. In no text where he speaks of Gehenna was this the subject of his discourse; which circumstance, together with the fact that his disciples were chiefly addressed about Gehenna, shows it did not refer to punishment in a future world.

2d. The Greek phrase "*Gehenna tou puros*," which Mr. Stuart renders "a fiery Gehenna," instead of meaning "the lake of fire," or hell, in another world, he has explained correctly in his Essays, p. 141. He says, in Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, "perpetual fires were kept up, in order to consume the offal which was deposited there. And as the same offal would breed worms, hence came the expression, 'Where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.'" The allusion is to the fire in the valley of Hinnom; and this only increases the strength of the figurative use of the term fire in describing the terrible judgments of God on the nation of the Jews.

3d. In verse 8 it is said, "Wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire." It will be said, Is not everlasting fire, in verse 8, the same as the fiery Gehenna, verse 9? and to be cast into everlasting fire the same as to be cast into this fiery Gehenna? And is this not a strong objection to your views of Gehenna? We admit all this, and to strengthen the objection will add the following. The Greek phrase, *pur to aionion*, here rendered "everlasting fire," is the same in Matt. 25:41, and rendered by the same words. I also admit that both passages refer to the same punishment, and that what in these texts is called everlasting fire, is called everlasting punishment verse 46. I have no occasion to dispute this. I admit, also, that the same punishment is called the damnation of hell, or Gehenna, Matt. 23:33; eternal damnation, Mark 3:29; and is also designated by other terrific expressions too numerous to detail. See my Second Inquiry, on these and all the texts in the Bible where eternal, everlasting, etc., occur. But so far from these admissions being against my views of Gehenna, they strongly confirm them, as I shall now attempt to show. I observe, then,

1st. That the phrases Gehenna fire, everlasting fire, damnation of hell, or Gehenna, and eternal damnation, were used by Jews, and addressed to Jews who were familiar with the language of the Old Testament. Certainly our Lord was a Jew, and his disciples were Jews, whom, in the passage before us, he addressed about everlasting fire, and hell, or Gehenna fire; or, in plain words, everlasting punishment. No persons except Jews were ever threatened with Gehenna fire, either by Christ or his apostles. Nothing is ever said to Gentiles about Gehenna, as shown in another place. As it is, then, contended that Gehenna fire, in verse 9, and everlasting fire, in verse 8, express the same punishment, let us consider,

2d. If an everlasting fire or punishment was threatened the Jews in their Scrip-

tures, and what that fire or punishment was. Was it in another world? When and how did this punishment come upon them? These questions will be noticed in what follows. Our fear is we cannot spare room to say all we wish on this subject, for it has an important bearing on the question before us about Gehenna. The first passage I produce in proof that an everlasting fire or punishment was threatened the Jews in their own Scriptures, and was not in a future state, is Isai. 33:14. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" This passage has been often quoted to prove the endless duration of future punishment. A great mistake; for, 1st. It is manifest the hypocritical Jews are the persons designated in the passage. They are termed sinners, sinners in Zion, and hypocrites, which agrees with our Lord's words, Matt. 23, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." Notice those called "sinners in Zion," in the first part of the verse, answer, according to the Jewish parallelism, to "hypocrites" in the second; and their being "afraid" in the first, answers to "fearfulness" seizing them in the second. A doubt cannot be entertained that the prophet speaks particularly of Jews, and of them only. The question is, did the prophet refer to the Jews in our Lord's day? The very language of the passage seems to determine that he did. This is confirmed by the context, for the days of the gospel dispensation seem to be alluded to. For example, verse 18 seems to be quoted by the apostle, 1 Cor. 1:20. The Roman people are spoken of, verse 19, who were to come against the Jews, and destroy their city and temple. And their condition at that period is described, verses 11, 12. The Messiah and his times are alluded to, verses 5, 6. The condition of our Lord's disciples is referred to verses 15-17; and from verse 20 to the end of the chapter, the peace and prosperity of the Christian church are described.

2d. Let us now notice the punishment of the Jews described in this passage. It is not doubted it speaks of punishment; for it is alleged it teaches endless punishment. This is drawn, we presume, 1st. From the words fire and burnings. But it has been shown in a preceding passage, that fire or burning is a common figure to describe temporal punishment. Nor are we aware that fire is ever used as a figure to designate punishment in another world. The expression here is, "devouring fire," and the parallelism to it is "everlasting burnings." After examining the usage of the phrase, "devouring fire," I cannot find it is ever employed to designate punishment in hell. But it is used to express temporal calamities. See Isai. 19:6; 30:30.

2d. The word everlasting is here joined with burnings. But who does not know that the word everlasting often expresses a limited period of time? Yea, who does not know that it is even applied to punishment when it does not express the endless duration of it? That it is so applied to the temporal punishment of the Jews in this very passage the above observations show. But if there should be any doubt in the reader's mind about this passage, we introduce another, about which there can be no dispute. It is Jer. 23:39, 40. "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence. And I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." On this passage let it be noticed,

1st. The same Hebrew word, *olim*, is here rendered “everlasting” and “perpetual.” The passage says, “I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and an everlasting shame, which shall not be forgotten.” It is well known that *olim* is rendered perpetual, everlasting, eternal, forever, and is often used to express a limited duration.

2d. Let it be noticed, the Jews are the persons of whom the prophet here speaks. He is speaking of them as a nation, and what the Lord would do towards them at some future period. It is not a narrative of what was already past, but a prediction of events.

3d. Notice, further, the passage predicts a punishment to the Jewish nation. God was utterly to forget and forsake them, and the city he gave to them and their fathers. He was also to cast them out of his presence, or out of Judea, where the Jews believed God’s presence was. Moreover, he was to bring on them an everlasting reproach, and an everlasting shame, which should not be forgotten. This punishment of the Jews could not be their seventy years’ captivity in Babylon. This does not answer to the strong language of the passage. Besides, the Babylonian captivity was just at hand, or had already commenced, as the chronology shows.

The prediction is concerning a punishment which was future and of long duration. The language only answers in its full force to God’s punishment on the Jews at the destruction of their city and temple, and their dispersion among all nations over since. God seems utterly to have forsaken them and the city he gave them. He has cast them out of his presence and brought upon them an everlasting reproach, and an everlasting shame, which have lasted eighteen hundred years, and are not yet forgotten.

4th. But does any man think, do the Jews think, that the punishment here mentioned is in another world, or is of endless duration? No; not an individual will assert either of these things. The context, all the circumstances of the case, show the punishment is a national one, and is of a temporal nature. And if any one should ask, why this punishment of the Jews is called perpetual, everlasting, the answer is easy. All know *olim*, in the Hebrew, and *aion* and *aionion* in Greek, are used to express a limited duration, and express a longer or shorter duration as the subjects to which they are applied require. See my Second Inquiry and Reply to Professor Stuart’s Essays, where this subject is discussed. The present punishment of the Jewish nation may well be called everlasting. It is the longest punishment they ever endured as a people. It has lasted already eighteen hundred years, and is a much longer everlasting than some mentioned in the Bible, as could easily be shown. Neither their seventy years’ captivity in Babylon, nor any other punishment that I have observed, is ever called everlasting, like the one they are now suffering. But even their present punishment is to end, for the Lord is yet to have mercy on Israel. They, as a people, are beloved for the fathers’ sake. It is then put out of all question that the term everlasting is applied to temporal punishment, punishment which all admit is to end.

But let us suppose the term everlasting was applied to punishment in a future state, this would not conclusively prove it to be endless. Why? Because we find it applied to punishment in this world. It might, also, be limited if applied to punishment in another world, for anything I can find in the Bible to the contrary. But after very mature examination, I must say I cannot find a single instance where everlasting is applied to punishment in another world. It is chiefly from overlooking the scripture usage of the words, rendered everlasting, etc., that people are led to conclude that in the Bible punishment is taught in a future world, and that it is endless in its duration. So far, then, from the phrase "everlasting fire," in verse 8, being any objection to my views of Gehenna, in verse 9, it strongly confirms them. Gehenna fire, and everlasting fire, in both verses, plainly refer to the punishment which came on the Jewish nation at the close of the Mosaic dispensation. I think prejudice itself will allow this.

Matt. 23:15. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell (Gehenna) than yourselves." This is the first place in the New Testament where anything is said about Gehenna to wicked men. The scribes and Pharisees were the persons addressed, as the passage states. Dr. Campbell says, "This is one of the places where the term Gehenna is used figuratively." And Parkhurst remarks that "Son of Gehenna or hell is one deserving of or liable to hell." He considers, and justly, the expression an Hebraism. See Professor Stuart's letters to Dr. Millar, where this is shown at length. The words plainly imply that our Lord considered the persons addressed children of hell or Gehenna. This, according to Parkhurst, means "deserving of or liable to hell or Gehenna." Their making their proselyte two-fold more the child of hell than themselves, of course, means they made him two-fold more deserving of or liable to hell than themselves. The question then is, what hell or Gehenna were both deserving of or liable to? If it is said, eternal misery, the sense evidently is the Pharisees made their proselyte two-fold more deserving of or liable to eternal misery than themselves. But to assume this as the sense of Gehenna is taking for granted the question in discussion. No proof of this is offered, no evidence of it can be given. Mr. Stuart, after quoting this passage, simply adds the following assertion, "that is, he is doubly deserving of the punishment of hell. Surely the Saviour does not mean to say that he will suffer double the punishment literally to be inflicted on them, in the literal valley of Hinnom." But this assertion determines nothing. I might return it thus, surely the Saviour does not mean to say that he will suffer double endless torments in Mr. Stuart's hell.

The simple question to be decided is, what was the sense our Lord attached to the word Gehenna? Was it a place of endless punishment in a future state? Not a word in the context favors such an opinion, for our Lord was not discoursing on the subject of a future state, but on the judgments of God coming on the nation of the Jews, as we shall see from verse 33, to be considered immediately. If our Lord, in verse 33, by Gehenna, meant the temporal punishment of the Jewish nation, no one will allege that in verse 15, he meant by Gehenna endless punishment in the world to come. Indeed, this sense would be contrary to its meaning in all the other

passages, and no ingenuity could reconcile it with the facts we have adduced, and still have to produce in the next section.

Matt. 23:33. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell (Gehenna)?" This is the only other text in the New Testament where anything is said about Gehenna to wicked men; and the solitary text where the phrase, "damnation of hell," occurs;—a very singular fact, if it means endless misery in a future state. The only remark which Mr. Stuart makes on this text, is, "Does the Saviour mean here to ask, How can ye escape being burned alive in the valley of Hinnom? Were they in danger of this? "We answer his question very promptly and pleasantly,—no. They were in no danger of this, for Mr. Stuart has shown that burning alive in the valley of Hinnom was not a punishment inflicted in the days of our Lord, either by Jews or Romans. To balance this account with Mr. Stuart, I ask, and in his own words, "Does the Saviour mean here to ask, How can ye escape being burned in hell, the world of woe? Were they in any danger of this?" Having balanced this short account, we may now inquire, what our Lord meant to teach in this passage? Let us,

1st. Examine the import of the word *kriseos*, here rendered damnation. This word means judgment or punishment. Dr. Campbell and others render it punishment. See his note on Matt. 12:40. It is so rendered in some places in our common version. But, as I have examined its scripture usage in my Second Inquiry, to it I refer the reader for what I have there advanced. It would be useless to discuss it here, as there is no dispute respecting the sense of the word in the passage in question. The sense, all admit, is, "How can you escape the punishment of hell, or Gehenna?" I may just notice, what must be obvious to every one, that the word damnation, or punishment, determines nothing about the place, the nature, or duration of the punishment alluded to. It expresses punishment to the persons addressed; but all these things must be determined from other sources of evidence than the word rendered damnation. But the word in most people's ears has a much more terrific sound than either the word judgment or punishment. It carries their minds into a future state for that damnation or punishment. Let us inquire,

2d. What sense did our Lord attach to the term Gehenna? The correct understanding of the passage depends on ascertaining this. If it means, as Mr. Stuart and others assert, the place of eternal misery to all the wicked, then, beyond all question, our Lord's meaning is, How can ye escape the punishment of endless misery? But this sense of the term must not be assumed; it must be established on scripture authority. How, then, it will be asked, shall we determine in what sense our Lord used the word Gehenna in this passage? I answer, there are three ways at least in which this may be determined; for no scripture question can be determined without them. These are, the original meaning of the term Gehenna; its scripture usage; and the context of the passages in question. Let us notice,

1st. The original meaning of the term Gehenna. Did it originally mean hell, world of woe, the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in

a future state, as Mr. Stuart and Dr. Campbell both assert? No; far from it, as their own testimony already cited shows. I need only very briefly advert to it here. What do they say was the original meaning of the term Gehenna? Dr. Campbell says, "It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words, *ge Hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua, 15:8," etc. Mr. Stuart makes the same confession in his *Essays*, p. 140. To this all agree, except Dr. Allen. Speaking of Gehenna and its punishment, he says in his lecture on my *First Inquiry*, "Indeed the word seems to have been formed, and is used in Scripture, for the express and sole purpose of denoting future punishment." Reader, cast the mantle of your charity over this statement, made no doubt without consideration.

2d. The scriptural usage of the term Gehenna. Does Gehenna occur in the Old Testament, where it designates a place of future punishment for the wicked? Hear Dr. Campbell: "In the Old Testament we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned. Accordingly, the word Gehenna does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and consequently not found in the Grecian classics." This statement we have examined, Section 1. We have also laid before the reader all the texts in the Old Testament where the word Gehenna is found. Not in a single instance has it the least allusion to a place of future punishment. We have seen it is only used there in two senses. First, for the literal valley of Hinnom. Second, as a symbol or source of imagery to describe the temporal punishment God was to bring on the Jewish nation. In this last sense we have shown it is used in the New Testament in all the passages already considered. And those yet to be noticed we think strongly confirm all we have advanced respecting the sense given to this term. The passage before us deserves particular attention. It is considered one of the strongest texts in proof that Gehenna means a place of future punishment for the wicked; and yet, the context of this very passage shows that the sense I have attached to it, taken from Jeremiah, is the true one,

3d. The context of the passage in question. Does the context teach that our Lord used the word Gehenna to designate a place of endless torment, reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state? Let us examine and see. That our Lord speaks on the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem, in this and the two following chapters, none will question. But let us examine the more immediate context of the passage. It is manifest, from verse 1 of the chapter, that what is said in it was addressed to the multitude and to the disciples. From verse 3 to 13, our Lord spoke to his disciples concerning the scribes and Pharisees, and warned them against certain evils in those wicked men. At verse 13 he begins a direct address to the scribes and Pharisees, and continues it to the end of the chapter. Some of them were present, for the discourse seems a very pointed address to them. No man can read from verse 13 to 32, without noticing in what a plain and pointed manner our Lord exposed their wickedness and hypocrisy, and how often he said to them, "Woe, or alas! unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." But at verse 32 he says to them, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers."

The words in question immediately follow: “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell (Gehenna)?” Two questions here are presented for consideration. How were these men to fill up the measure of their fathers? And, what is the damnation of hell, which they could not escape?

1st. Let us consider how these men were to fill up the measure of their fathers. If we consult the context, it gives us the following answer to this question. Verse 34, “Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city.” That in this way the scribes and Pharisees were to fill up the measure of their fathers, no man will question. Their fathers had killed the prophets sent to them, verses 30, 31. And they were a generation of vipers, proving themselves to be the children of such fathers. The measure of their fathers they did fill up by crucifying the Lord of glory, and persecuting his apostles and followers. See Acts 2d, where Peter charges them with this crime. Comp. John 16:1–3, 1 Thess. 2:16.

2d. Let us now examine what the damnation of Gehenna was, which those men could not escape. If verse 34 answered the first question, verse 35 as certainly answers the second. It runs thus: “That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.” When it is said here, “That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth,” all allow that punishment is meant. This punishment coming on them was near, for our Lord added in the next words, “Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation.” The context, then, clearly decides, that our Lord, by the damnation of hell, referred to the punishment God was to bring on the Jewish nation during that generation. Indeed, if ever the context of a passage can decide in what sense the writer uses a word or phrase, it is decided in the case before us. But is there a vestige of evidence in the context, which shows that our Lord, by the damnation of hell, meant a place of punishment reserved for the wicked in a future state? No, nothing which bears the most distant resemblance to this. Let any one attempt to make out proof of this from the context, and nothing is so likely to convince him that the interpretation I have given is correct. It was in making such an attempt I was led to this very view of the words “damnation of hell.” The only thing which leads people to conclude that these words refer to punishment after death, is the false and entirely gratuitous sense affixed to the word hell or Gehenna. But all candid men will allow, that if we affix what sense we please to the words of the Holy Spirit, an end is put to all correct interpretation of the Scriptures. To recur to the context in ascertaining the sense of any word or phrase used by a writer, is allowed by all a first rule in explaining his meaning.

But some things in the context strongly confirm the sense given to the words, damnation of hell. 1st. The expression, damnation of hell, or Gehenna, occurs in this discourse of our Lord’s about the destruction of Jerusalem, but in no other discourse he ever delivered. Had he used it when preaching the gospel, when enforcing

repentance on his hearers, or in speaking on the subject of a future state, one might be led to suppose he did mean a place of punishment there. But being used in such a discourse as this, and in no other, seems to put it out of all question that I have rightly interpreted the words, damnation of hell, or Gehenna.

2d. The persons to whom the words, damnation of hell, were addressed, confirm my views of this passage. They were Jews. To no other person except them is a word said about Gehenna in the whole Bible. Jews, and they only, were concerned in the damnation of hell, for not a word is said about Gehenna or its punishment to any Gentile, whether a believer in Christ or an unbeliever.

3d. No man will dispute that verse 35 refers to the punishment inflicted on the Jews at the destruction of their city and temple. See chapter 24th. Well, when our Lord said, verse 36, "All these things shall come upon this generation," was not the damnation of hell, verse 33, and explained verse 35, the very thing referred to? And as the case of the Jews was past all remedy, and could not escape the impending judgments of God, our Lord laments over their condition, verses 37–39. To this view of the damnation of hell, I am aware, it is objected,

1st. Prophecies have a double meaning; and though our Lord referred to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, in the same expression he might include the endless punishment of the wicked in another world; and in Matt. chap. 24, he blends, in one description, the end of the Jewish state and the end of this material world." To this objection several answers might be given. 1st. If prophecies have a double meaning, why not twenty or a hundred meanings? And if it is said, our Lord might include both the above meanings in the phrase, damnation of hell, let us see the proof of this supposition from the context or some other quarter. What is it which we may not suppose and say is taught in the Bible, if never called on to establish our suppositions? But,

2d. Giving prophecies a double meaning exposes the Scriptures to ridicule, and is abandoned by all rational commentators. Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing, p. 126, gives up a double sense to Matt. 24th. Commenting on verse 36, he says, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' The day and hour, according to some, is the day of judgment; but as I apprehend (from comparing the context), the day of vengeance to the Jews is meant." But if he, by comparing the context, sets aside a double view of this text, comparing the context sets aside a double view of the words, damnation of hell. It does more, it sets aside the common idea that these words mean a place of endless misery to the wicked.

3d. Let it be noticed, the words, damnation of hell, are not a prophecy. No; they are a very plain declaration put in the form of a question, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" But had they occurred in Matt. 24th, and were they a prophecy, we see, from the quotation just made from Mr. Stuart, that only one sense could be attached to them, and the context must decide, yea, has decided,

their true sense. Their sense is, How can ye escape the impending vengeance coming on your nation? So long as an examination of the context and scripture usage of words are deemed safe rules in determining the sense of any scripture writer, so long shall we feel confident that our Lord, by the damnation of hell, did mean this, and had no reference to endless misery in another world.

4th. But this double view of the words, damnation of hell, does not deserve notice, for it is only a mere assumption made in face of evidence to the contrary. This evidence has been stated. Here, I add, since people take the liberty to give a double sense to the words, damnation of hell, why not use the same liberty and give a double meaning to every phrase our Lord ever used? For example, with the same breath he said, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell," and "All these things shall come upon this generation." But why not give a double meaning to the last words, and say he meant also, All these things shall come upon this generation in a future world—and all these things shall come on the generation in which we live in the present day? Why not this, as well as that the damnation of Gehenna shall come upon us?

It was shown at some length, Sect. 1, that Jeremiah made Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, a source of imagery to describe the punishment God would bring on the Jews for their sins. Let the reader now take into view what was there said in connection with the passage before us, and notice the following things. Jeremiah and our Lord evidently addressed the same people, the Jews. Both speak of a punishment, a dreadful punishment, to this people, and they use the term Gehenna to describe it. Both speak of it as punishment in this world, without giving the least hint that it extended to a future state of existence. Both confine this Gehenna punishment to the Jews, without intimating that it belonged to the Gentile nations, or must be suffered by other wicked men. Jeremiah foretold, some hundred years before, a punishment to the Jews, to the fathers of the very men our Lord addressed. Our Lord points them to that prediction, and solemnly warns them, "All these things shall come upon this generation." But there are two things which the reader ought distinctly to notice, in which Jeremiah's prophecy agrees with what our Lord says respecting Gehenna.

1st. The prediction of a punishment to the Jews, under the emblem of Gehenna, was a national one; one in which all classes of the nation were to be involved. Such is exactly the punishment of which our Lord speaks in the passage in question, as we have seen from the context. This rationally accounts for the fact, why our Lord said so much to his own disciples about the punishment of Gehenna, and mentioned it only once to the unbelieving Jews. They could not escape the damnation of Gehenna, but his own disciples might; hence he shows his solicitude in warning them respecting it, and in instructing them how to escape the severity of the vengeance which came on the unbelieving part of the nation. On no other view of the term Gehenna can it ever be rationally and scripturally accounted for, why our Lord should say so much to the disciples and so little to the unbelieving Jews respecting the punishment of Gehenna.

2d. The time referred to by Jeremiah when his prediction should be fulfilled, and the time referred to by our Lord, exactly agree. No year or date is mentioned by either of them, but there is a fact or circumstance which answers the same purpose. Jeremiah, in his prophecy, said, chap. 19:15, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will bring upon this city, and upon all her towns, all the evil that I have pronounced against it." Notice now what our Lord says, Luke 21:22. "For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." Jeremiah could refer to no other period of time, nor to any other punishment of the Jews, except the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. All the evil the Lord had pronounced against it did not come upon it until this event took place.

I may add, if by Gehenna punishment our Lord did not refer to the punishment predicted by Jeremiah, in no other way did he remind the Jews that such a punishment was threatened them. All allow that our Lord, in Matthew, chapters 23 and 24, and in other places, spoke of punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Is it then in the least probable that he should entirely overlook so plain and pointed a prediction as that in Jeremiah? And if it is denied that, by the damnation of Gehenna, he did refer to the punishment predicted by Jeremiah,— that he meant endless misery in a future world,—how happened he to tell the Jews about this in a discourse where he is certainly speaking of temporal punishment, yet not say a word about endless punishment in Gehenna on any other occasion? If, really, the damnation of Gehenna means hell, the world of woe, why should he introduce it in such a discourse to the unbelieving Jews? Why speak of it only once to them; and why speak of it as a thing they could not escape? The great object of modern preachers, in warning people about hell, is to tell them they can easily escape it by obeying their directions. But our Lord had no directions to give the unbelieving Jews how they might escape the damnation of Gehenna. The cup of their iniquity was nearly filled up, and the wrath of God was coming upon them to the uttermost. Before I dismiss this passage, permit me to bring the prophecy of Jeremiah a little more into view in connection with it. See this prophecy considered, Chap. 2, Sect. 1, which ought to be consulted and compared with the passage under consideration. On both, taken together, I submit the following remarks:—

1st. Who does not see that the prediction of Jeremiah and the discourse of our Lord, Matt. chapters 23 and 24, speak of the same events? Comparing both with that part of Josephus' history of the siege of Jerusalem, we see both minutely and affectingly fulfilled.

2d. It could not appear strange to the Jews that our Lord should speak to them of the damnation or punishment of Gehenna, for under this very emblem the prophet Jeremiah had foretold great and dreadful calamities to this people. With the prophet's language the Jews were familiar, so that they had no occasion to ask what he meant by the damnation of hell. Nor could they find fault with him in calling to their remembrance a punishment to which they were exposed, so long ago foretold, but which was now near, even unto the doors. Indeed, nothing but blind-

ness of mind could have prevented them from fearful anticipations of such dreadful calamities. Accordingly, they asked no explanation, and seemed not to be surprised at our Lord's saying, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Is this likely to have been the case, if by this expression the Jews understood him to threaten them with eternal misery in the world to come? No sentiment our Lord ever uttered was more calculated to shock their feelings and rouse their indignation against him. To understand him in this sense, was entirely at variance with their pride, prejudices and religious opinions; for the Jews had no idea that any of their nation should ever suffer eternal misery. See Whitby's note on Rom. 2.

3d. Let us for a moment suppose that any of the declarations concerning Gehenna in the New Testament had occurred in the above prediction of Jeremiah. For example, let us take the words of our Lord before us, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" I ask any candid man, how the Jews would have understood these words, had they been uttered by the prophet, or how we would understand them? It will, I presume, be readily answered, that the prophet would be understood as threatening the temporal punishment which he had been predicting. Must the words, damnation of hell, then, only mean temporal punishment, in the mouth of Jeremiah, but, in our Lord's, eternal misery? If these words would have conveyed no such idea in the days of Jeremiah, why should they in the days of our Lord, and, especially, as he not only seems to allude to Jeremiah's prophecy, but introduces them in a discourse to the same people, and in treating of the same temporal punishment? It will not be said that our Lord was discoursing about a future state of existence, or even a different subject from that of the prophet, when he used this expression. No; the subjects are precisely the same, and the same people were addressed.

4th. I ask, was the expression, "damnation of hell," understood when our Lord used it, or was it without any meaning? If the latter, then the idea of eternal misery is given up, at least from this expression. Besides, it is not very honorable to the Lord, to say he used this expression without any meaning. If the former is contended for, in what way was our Lord understood by his hearers? Nothing is said in the Old Testament intimating that Gehenna was to have a different meaning under the gospel dispensation. Nor, in the New Testament, is anything said showing that Gehenna was used there in a different sense from that which it had in the Old. By whose authority, and upon what rational and scriptural ground, do we, then, interpret Gehenna, in the passage before us, so differently from its allowed sense in the Old Testament? Our Lord was a Jew, and he spoke to Jews, who had the Old Testament in their hands. Until it is proved to the contrary, we conclude that the Jews must have understood Gehenna as their Scriptures taught them. We think all will allow that this is at least a rational conclusion. That it is a correct one, ought not to be denied, unless it is shown our Lord laid aside the sense in which Jeremiah had used the word Gehenna, and adopted a new sense on mere human authority. If our Lord did this as to the word Gehenna, we doubt if another instance of the kind can be produced from the New Testament. If it were proved that he did so, it follows that, instead of calling the attention of the Jews to the true sense of Scripture, he

rather encouraged them in a sense put on scripture words of men's own invention. We have seen that Dr. Campbell avers that our Lord spoke to the Jews in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used words to which their reading of the law and the prophets had accustomed them; and yet he contends for a sense given to Gehenna in the New Testament which it never had either in the law or the prophets.

5th. If we are to learn from the Targums¹ how to understand the word Gehenna or hell, but few people could ever understand the New Testament on this subject. Is there one in a thousand who ever saw the Targums? and is there one in ten thousand who ever read them? But until we have learned from such writings the sense of the word Gehenna, we must either remain ignorant, or take this sense at second hand from others. But put the Bible into a man's hands, let him search it on this subject, and compare the New with the Old Testament, and would he ever conclude that the New Testament sense of Gehenna was so different from that of the Old? No; he would soon perceive that there is an agreement, and a very striking agreement, between both Testaments in the sense and application of the word Gehenna. Scripture usage and the context, safe rules in all other cases, would soon lead such a person to the same conclusion to which I have come, that our Lord, by "the damnation of hell," did not mean punishment in a place of endless misery. But it seems these safe rules of interpretation must all be laid aside, and that we must sit at the feet of the writers of the Targums, to learn the meaning of Gehenna. But it is well known how little confidence most people place in those writings in other cases, though their authority is considered good by many in the one before us.

6th. That Gehenna was made an emblem of temporal punishment to the Jews, rests on divine authority. But that it was made an emblem of eternal misery, rests merely on human authority. Let us state a case where, system and preconceived opinion being out of sight, we would give a just decision which of these authorities ought to be preferred. Suppose this case, then, reversed. In the Old Testament, let us suppose the word Gehenna to mean the place of eternal punishment for all the wicked; that this was its allowed sense, by critics and commentators, and that it never, in a single instance, meant temporal punishment. Suppose, further, that the term Gehenna occurred twelve times in the New Testament; that, upon examining one of the texts in which it occurred, say the passage before us, it evidently had the same sense as in the Old Testament; that the text and context clearly decided this to be its meaning; but a Universalist informs us from the Targums that Gehenna, in the Old Testament, in process of time, came to be used as an emblem of temporal punishment, and at last came to be confined to it; and that this was always and indisputably its meaning in the New Testament, which he roundly asserts, without any attempt at proof on the subject. I ask what decision we should form in this case? Let candor decide if we would not say that the doctrine of eternal punishment was put beyond all debate. And would not every man agree to condemn the Universalist? Happy, then, is the man who condemneth not himself in the thing

¹See the argument, drawn from the Jewish Targums, in favor of Gehenna being the place of endless punishment, considered, Sect. 5.

which he alloweth. But what would be the decision in favor of eternal punishment and against the Universalist, if, upon examining all the other eleven places in the New Testament, it was found that Gehenna had the same or a similar sense as it had in the Old Testament, and in the one in the New Testament where the context so clearly decided? The triumph of the doctrine of eternal misery would be complete. We shall leave it for every man of candor what to say, if it is proved that all the remaining passages which speak of Gehenna corroborate the views I have advanced on the passage we have been considering. But all this is strongly confirmed by a number of facts, showing that no other sense could be rationally attached to the term Gehenna. We have adduced a few facts already, and have yet some more to produce, proving that Gehenna cannot mean a place of endless misery for the wicked, but that it referred to the temporal vengeance coming on the Jewish nation. We should like to see an equal number of such facts produced, showing that Gehenna does not mean this temporal vengeance, but eternal misery, before we are condemned for refusing to believe that this is its meaning.

7th. Supposing that the term Gehenna, in this passage, was equivocal, though it certainly is not, still, according to Dr. Campbell, my interpretation of the passage is correct. In his third Dissertation, Sect. 11, he says: "Nothing can be more pertinent, or better founded, than the remark of M. Le Clerc, that 'a word which is equivocal by itself, is often so clearly limited to a particular signification by the strain of the discourse, as to leave no room for doubt.'" The strain of our Lord's discourse in this chapter fixes the sense of Gehenna to be what I have stated so clearly and decisively that no room is left for doubt. But let us hear Dr. Campbell further. In his ninth Dissertation, Part 1, Sect. 13, he says: "When a word in a sentence of Holy Writ is susceptible of two interpretations, so that the sentence, whichever of the two ways the word be interpreted, conveys a distinct meaning suitable to the scope of the place; and when one of these interpretations expresses the common import of the word in Holy Writ, and the other assigns it a meaning which it plainly has not in any other passage of Scripture, the rules of criticism manifestly require that we recur to the common acceptance of the term." This is just what I have done with the term Gehenna, in the passage before us. I have given it a meaning, "suitable to the scope of the place." The sense I have given it also "expresses the common import of the word in Holy Writ," where it is used as an emblem of punishment in the Old Testament. We shall see that it agrees, also, with all the places where it occurs in the New. The interpretation commonly given to Gehenna, "assigns it a meaning which it plainly has not in any other passage of Scripture." "The rules of criticism manifestly require," then, the interpretation which I have given this passage. The commonly received sense of this word is, therefore, contrary to the rules of criticism, as declared by Dr. Campbell himself.

I am aware that I have dwelt longer on this passage than was absolutely necessary. This I have done for several reasons. It is one of the principal texts supposed to teach the doctrine of hell torments. It is also the only text where a punishment of Gehenna or hell is threatened wicked men in the New Testament, whether Jew or Gentile. It is also a text, the context of which decides clearly what our Lord meant

by the punishment of Gehenna. It serves as a key to unlock the meaning of other places, where the circumstances in the context may not so clearly determine the sense of Gehenna. If our Lord, in this passage, did not mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, there is no probability that in any other this was his meaning; for here he spoke to men who, Josephus says, were the most wicked race that ever lived on the earth. Since, by the damnation of hell, he did not threaten them with eternal punishment, it is not to be supposed that in any of the other texts he did this; for what is said in them is addressed to his disciples. It is not likely he used Gehenna to express both a place of temporal and eternal punishment; and it is less likely that he should threaten the unbelieving Jews with the former, and his own disciples with the latter.

Mark 9:43–49. “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell (Gehenna), into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell (Gehenna), into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell (Gehenna) fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Concerning these verses, Professor Stuart simply says, “The like cases with Matt. 5:29; 18:9, and where, in both instances, *pur to asbeston*, unquenchable fire, is added, in order to explain the tremendous nature of the Gehenna in question.” What, then, is the Gehenna in question?

This being the most terrific and full description of Gehenna fire, given in the New Testament, we shall give it a careful consideration. It ought to settle the question that Gehenna does not refer to a place of endless punishment in a future state. Let it then be observed, several things are mentioned in this passage which have been noticed already. For example, we have seen what is meant by cutting off a right hand, or plucking out a right eye; that the term fire is a common figure in Scripture to express punishment, and punishment in this world. The question in dispute is, does Gehenna fire, in this and other texts, express punishment in a future state? We have also noticed the expression “to be cast into hell fire.” In this passage, we have the expression “to go into hell” once, and “to be cast into hell” twice, which express the same thing. Let us first notice the things contrasted in this passage.

1st. To “enter into life,” or “into the kingdom of God,” is contrasted with “going into or being cast into hell or Gehenna.” If it can be shown, then, that to enter into life, or into the kingdom of God, does not mean to enter into heaven above, it will follow that to be cast into Gehenna, or go into it, does not mean to go into or be cast into hell beneath. If kingdom of God, or life, refers to the heavenly world, I am willing to admit Gehenna refers to a world of woe. Congruity in the contrast demands this. But we are confident this never can be proved.

2d. Entering into life, or into the kingdom of God, with the loss of a hand, a foot, or an eye, is contrasted with going into, or being cast into Gehenna, without the loss of any of these. But who ever speaks of entering into the heavenly state with the loss of their bodily members; or of sending sinners to hell with their members mutilated? Let it be admitted our Lord only meant that his disciples, in order to enter into life, or the kingdom of God, must part with things as dear to them as a right hand or eye. What then? This may suit the one side of the contrast, but it does not suit the other; for, I ask, do those who go to hell carry with them there things the other parted with in order to get to heaven? As this will not be pretended, something else than heaven and hell must be meant by kingdom of God and Gehenna in this passage. What, then, is the true meaning of this language?

1st. We have the phrase, "to enter into life," twice; and "to enter into the kingdom of God," once. Dr. Campbell, in his fifth Dissertation, conclusively shows that these two phrases are used by the writers of the New Testament to express the same thing. This must be obvious enough to any person who reads the four gospels with attention. But to enter into the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, does not mean entering into heaven in a future state, as many suppose, but entering into the reign or kingdom of the Messiah in this world. See Dr. C.'s Dissertation. John, Jesus, and his disciples, preached this kingdom as coming, as at hand. Christ's reign or kingdom did not, properly speaking, commence until after his resurrection from the dead, when God exalted him to his right hand, saying, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." Indeed, in one sense, his kingdom did not come until the destruction of Jerusalem. Respecting this, Dr. Campbell, in his note on Matt. 19:28, says, "We are accustomed to apply the term regeneration solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate the creation *genesis*, a remarkable restoration or renovation of the face of things was very suitably termed *palingenesia*. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said in verse 23, holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a renovation or regeneration of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit in judgment that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted."

It is very evident our Lord did not think his kingdom had come during his lifetime. He said to his disciples, Matt. 18:3, "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." It may be said, were not the disciples already in this kingdom? No; for our Lord's words plainly imply that they were not; nor could they afterwards enter it except they were converted. On this text Dr. Campbell says, "They must lay aside their ambition and worldly pursuits before they be honored to be members, much more the ministers, of that new establishment or kingdom he was about to

erect." See, also, Dr. Macknight, who gives a similar view of it. It is evident, from Luke 22: 18, and other texts, that our Lord's kingdom was not come just before his death. But the very passage in question fairly implies, that, in some sense, our Lord's disciples were not in his kingdom. If they were, why is it said to them, "It is better for thee to enter halt into life," and "It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye," etc.? Those who wish to see further proof that the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, was not come when our Lord spoke the passage in question, may consult Luke 21: 31, 32; Mark 9: 1. Comp. Matt. 16: 28.

2d. We shall now examine what our Lord meant by Gehenna fire, the contrast to life, and the kingdom of God, in this passage. Gehenna fire is here mentioned three times. What, then, did our Lord mean by it? He explains what he meant thus, "Into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." As Gehenna fire is three times mentioned, so the explanation is three times repeated. Mr. Stuart, p. 144, admits that this is our Lord's explanation of Gehenna fire. All, then, we have to do is to ascertain correctly the true sense of this explanation. It divides itself into two parts, which I shall now examine. Our Lord says,

1st. "Into the fire that never shall be quenched." Do the Scriptures then speak of "a fire that never shall be quenched," in a future state of existence? No. I find an "unquenchable fire," or "a fire that never shall be quenched," often mentioned there. It is said, in Matt. 3: 12, "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge the floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire." The same is repeated Luke 3: 17. Fire, we have seen on a former passage, is a figure for punishment. Jesus was to separate the good from the bad of the Jewish nation; the former he should gather into his garner, the church; but the latter he should punish, or burn with unquenchable fire. This he did at the end of the age. Their fire or punishment is not yet ended.

But, let us now see whence the language used is borrowed, "a fire that never shall be quenched," or an unquenchable fire." It is from the Old Testament. The reader may consult the following places where a fire that shall not be quenched is mentioned. Amos 5: 6; Isai. 34: 10, and 1: 31; Ezek. 20: 47, 48. But I quote the following passages which are directly to our purpose. 2 Kings 22: 16, 17. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read, because they have forsaken me, and have burnt incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore my wrath shall be kindled against this place and shall not be quenched." The same is repeated, 2 Chron. 34: 24, 25. Again, it is said, Jer. 4: 4, "Circumcise yourself to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." Again, Jer. 7: 20, "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall

burn, and shall not be quenched." Again, Jer. 17: 27, "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Once more, it is said, Jer. 21: 12, "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it." Such are the texts which speak of an "unquenchable fire," or "a fire that never shall be quenched;" and upon them I submit the following remarks in connection with the passage before us.

1st. God's wrath is said to be kindled, and shall not be quenched. So is his fury. It is said to "burn, and shall not be quenched." God's wrath and fury are compared to fire, for it is said, "Lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it." But God has no such evil passions as anger and fury, nor do these burn like literal fire. No; the above passages sufficiently explain what is meant by his anger and fury, namely, his judgments or the punishments he inflicts on men "because of the evil of their doings." Perhaps no figure could be more appropriate than fire to describe this. And a Gehenna fire is peculiarly appropriate to describe God's judgments on the Jewish nation; for no fire was so terrible to Jews as the fires which had existed in the valley of Hinnom, whether we view them as used to consume the human sacrifices made there, to burn persons alive, or to consume the offal of the city of Jerusalem. As the punishment God inflicted on the Jewish nation exceeded all the punishments which had ever been or will be inflicted on men, so no figurative use of the term fire could so well apply to it as the fire of Gehenna.

2d. Let it be specially noticed, that all said in the above passages about an unquenchable fire, or a fire that never shall be quenched, was spoken concerning the Jews as a nation. The punishment thus described under the figure of fire was to come on them for sins. Some of these sins are particularly specified, one of which is, they had "burnt incense unto other gods." It is called an unquenchable fire, not on account of its endless duration, but its long continuance. No such unquenchable fire was threatened to the Gentiles. Jews, and the Jews as a nation, are the persons threatened with this punishment, which exactly agrees to what is said about Gehenna. Jews, and Jews only, are threatened with Gehenna punishment in the New Testament.

3d. The anger, and wrath, and fury of the Lord, described in the above passages under the figure of a fire that should not be quenched, do not extend to another world. On the contrary, it is particularly specified in what God's anger, wrath, and fury consisted, and where the Jews were to suffer them. His anger and fury were not to be poured out in hell, but "upon this place and upon the inhabitants thereof," which was the land of Judea and Jerusalem. His anger was to "be poured out upon man and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground." It was to be "kindled in the gates of Jerusalem," and was to "devour the palaces of Jerusalem," etc. If a single drop of God's wrath was to be poured

out upon the Jews in a future state, it is very strange the above passages are silent about it. And that the expression, "an unquenchable fire," does not mean endless in duration, is manifest, for this is spoken concerning the trees of the field, fruits of the ground, the gates and palaces of Jerusalem, as well as the Jews themselves. The dispersed condition of the Jews, and the waste condition of Judea and Jerusalem, afford a plain comment on the above passages.

4th. Our Lord still further explains what he meant by Gehenna fire, thus, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." But where is the fire not quenched? Answer, "where their worm dieth not." But where is this? In Gehenna, as the connection shows. But is this Gehenna in a future state? Mr. Parkhurst says, "Our Lord seems to allude to the worms which continually preyed on the dead carcasses that were cast out into the valley of Hinnom, Gehenna, and to the perpetual fire kept up to consume them. Comp. Eccles. 7: 17, Judith 16: 17; and see the learned Joseph Mede's Works, fol. p. 31." Mr. Stuart says, in the valley of Hinnom, Gehenna, "perpetual fires were kept up, in order to consume the offal which was deposited there; and, as the same offal would breed worms, hence came the expression, 'where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'" Here, then, is the place "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," stated by Drs. Parkhurst and Stuart, both believers in endless misery. It is not in hell, the world of woe, but in the valley of Hinnom. Here there were worms; here there was a fire not quenched, by their own showing. But are these things in hell, their world of woe? It was long believed hell was a place of literal fire, but now this is discarded by most intelligent men. The idea of literal worms being in hell no one ever believed; hence the worm that never dies is interpreted to mean conscience, which is to torment the damned forever. But this is a private interpretation, for conscience is not spoken of under the figure of a worm by any sacred writer. There is nothing in this passage or its context which intimates that our Lord was speaking on the subject of a future state, or that by Gehenna he referred to a place of endless punishment.

How, then, shall we decide with certainty what our Lord meant by the words, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched"? As this is his own explanation of what he meant by Gehenna, it must be decided by the passage our Lord here quoted from the Old Testament. It is the following, Isai. 66: 24: "And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing, p. 69, makes the following remark, which well applies here. "It will be remembered that the passage in question is a quotation from the Old Testament; and that to quote the language of the Old Testament, therefore, in order to explain it, is peculiarly appropriate and necessary." Let us see how peculiarly appropriate this passage from the Old Testament is in explaining the words of our Lord before us.

1st. When Isaiah said, "for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched," did he mean to describe hell, the world of woe? No man, we think, will

affirm this. But this must be affirmed unless it is alleged our Lord altered the sense of this passage in quoting it. Jesus gives no intimation that these words spoken by Isaiah had one sense, and when quoted by him another; that Isaiah only referred to temporal punishment, but he to endless torments.

2d. When the Jews read the words in the prophet, “for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched,” if they did not understand them as describing hell, the world of woe, how could our Lord’s disciples understand them so when he quoted them? To say these words, when quoted by him, had such a sense affixed to them, and were so understood by the disciples, implicates both in perverting the Old Testament Scriptures.

3d. What, then, is the meaning of the words in Isaiah, “for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched”? Let it be noticed, generally, the chapter in which this passage stands relates to events under the gospel dispensation. The new heavens and new earth, mentioned in verse 22, all allow, refer to this period; and the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles is repeatedly adverted to in the course of the chapter. With this in view, let us now notice what is said in the passage. 1st. “And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me.” What men are referred to, who transgressed against the Lord? The context shows they were the unbelieving Jews. The next question is, what men are referred to who should go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the Lord? The preceding verses show that he refers to the persons who worship and obey the Lord. The third question is, to what place shall the men who worship and obey the Lord go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who transgressed against the Lord? The passage itself answers, to the place “where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” But are the carcasses of men who have transgressed against the Lord, in hell, the world of woe? And who goes forth there to look on such carcasses? Who ever heard of carcasses in hell? And does any rational man think persons go forth, either from heaven or this world, to look on them there? The idea is as absurd as it is contrary to common opinion on the subject.

What, then, is meant? I answer, let the reader recollect what was shown from the prophet Jeremiah. The Lord was to make the city of Jerusalem as Tophet, and he was to make the carcasses of the wicked Jews meat for the beasts of the earth, and they should bury in Tophet until there should be no place to bury. Josephus, the Jewish historian, relates that six hundred thousand of their carcasses were carried out of the city and left unburied. The disciples of our Lord, or those who worshipped and obeyed him, could not go forth into the very streets of Jerusalem without looking upon the carcasses of those men, for the streets were filled with their carcasses. And when the disciples left the city, according to our Lord’s directions, Matt. 24, they must have looked on the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the Lord, if six hundred thousand of them lay unburied. They could not help looking at them, unless they were blindfolded.

But the passage adds, "and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." This is said of the men who had transgressed against the Lord, mentioned in the former part of the passage. The Jews had greatly transgressed against the Lord, and filled up the cup of their iniquity in crucifying the Lord of glory, and persecuting his disciples. They pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. The former part of the passage fully applies to them. Let us see how this last part applies, "and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Whoever will take the trouble to examine the phrase, "all flesh," easily found by a concordance, will see it is used to designate the Gentile nations. In the unbelieving Jewish nation who survived the destruction of their city and temple by Titus, and in their posterity, this part of the passage has been literally fulfilled. From that day to this, the Jews have been an abhorring to all the Gentile nations. They have been a by-word and a reproach among all the nations of the earth. The Roman empire, at the time Jerusalem was destroyed, was considered the whole world, and is so denominated in Scripture. The army of Titus which besieged it was made up of men from the various nations which composed this empire. The carcasses of the Jews who had transgressed against the Lord were an abhorring sight to the army, as Josephus testifies. On this view of the words, they were literally and awfully fulfilled.

Let us now return to the passage in question. It is evident our Lord quoted from Isaiah the words, and three times repeats them, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." If we ask, whose worm shall not die? whose fire is not quenched? the answer to these questions must be drawn from verse 42. The persons who offended those who believed in Jesus, is the antecedent to the word *their*. Now, all allow the unbelieving Jews were not only the greatest opposers of Jesus, but hated and persecuted such as believed on him. This exactly answers to the persons Isaiah referred to in the words which our Lord quotes, and three times repeats. They were the men who transgressed against the Lord, or the unbelieving, wicked Jews. Is it objected, Have you not said our Lord in this passage was addressing his own disciples? We answer, yes; but it is obvious enough he does not refer to his own disciples by the word *their*, when he says, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." On the contrary, he is warning them against a punishment others were to suffer, which he describes by Gehenna fire, the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. Our Lord told his disciples it was better, or profitable for them, to enter into life, into the kingdom of God, maimed in their bodily members, than, having all these, to go or be cast into Gehenna or hell fire. And what he meant by this we have seen from the above examination of the language of the passage.

Luke 12: 4, 5. "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell (Gehenna)." Here our Lord was also addressing his own disciples. "It is," says Mr. Stuart, "a passage parallel with Matt. 10: 28, above, and of the same import." To my remarks there I then refer the reader. Some light may be shed on both passages by comparing Matthew and Luke's account of our Lord's discourse.

Matthew says, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Luke's statement of the same thing is, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." The words of Luke, "after that have no more that they can do," express what Matthew meant by the words, "but are not able to kill the soul."

2d. Matthew says, "But rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna)." To express the same thing, Luke says, "Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell (Gehenna)." We notice the following agreement and difference between Matthew and Luke in expressing the same thing. 1st. Both mention Gehenna, and no one can doubt both mean the same thing by it. 2d. What Matthew expresses by the words, "destroy in Gehenna," Luke expresses by the words, "cast into Gehenna." But Matthew used the same language, "cast into Gehenna," twice, chap. 5: 29, 30, and in chap. 18: 9, once. To be destroyed, or to be cast into Gehenna, then, means the same thing with the same writer and with both writers. But, 3d. Matthew says "both soul and body" God is able to destroy in Gehenna. But Luke mentions neither soul nor body. The words "after he hath killed," used by Luke, or "after he hath killed, hath power to cast into Gehenna," answer to the words of Matthew. They suggest the question, after he hath killed what? If we supply the answer to this question from Matthew's account, it will be, after he hath killed or destroyed both soul and body, he hath power to cast into Gehenna. 4th. Matthew says God is able to do all this. Luke says God has power to do it, which is the same. But it is rather a hasty conclusion to say because he is able, or hath power to do all this, it was done, as noticed on Matt. 10: 28. From this comparison of Matthew and Luke's language, I would remark,

1st. Luke does not use the distinction made by Matthew between soul and body. He only mentions the body, in the first part of his statement, when he speaks of men killing it. In the last, when he speaks of God's killing, he does not mention soul or body. If he thought man had an immortal soul, and if, by soul, Matthew meant this, it was a great omission in Luke not to mention it, if God was to destroy or kill the immortal soul as well as the body in Gehenna. But,

2d. Luke's not using the distinction between soul and body confirms what was noticed on Matt. 10: 28, that, this distinction between soul and body is a mere Hebrew idiom. It simply means, as noticed already, the whole body or the person. That soul is used for the person himself, we have seen above. But that it is ever used to designate an immortal soul, in distinction from the body, and which is to be happy or miserable in a disembodied state, I am unable to find in Scripture. This doctrine is assumed from this text, and Matt. 10: 28, which give no countenance to the opinion. Do these texts say the soul is immortal? No. Do they say the soul or body is alive in happiness or misery after being killed or destroyed in Gehenna? No. Not the slightest intimation of this.

3d. Both Matthew and Luke say our Lord enjoined on his disciples not to fear men. Why? Because they could only put them to death. This they did, and was

all they could do. See Acts 12: 1–3. The apostles were above the fear of man in fulfilling their mission, as the whole book of the Acts shows.

4th. Both Matthew and Luke say our Lord enjoined on his disciples to fear God. This is often enjoined on Christians in Scripture. Why, on this occasion, did Jesus enjoin the fear of God on his disciples? Because, though man could kill the body, none but God could bring upon them that tremendous punishment predicted by Jeremiah under the emblem of Gehenna. This was a much severer punishment than that inflicted upon the men who died without mercy under the law of Moses. The like had never been before, and would never be again. In this our Lord's disciples might be involved, for nothing but fidelity to him, and obedience to his instructions, could save them from it.

5th. It is objected, "To destroy both soul and body in Gehenna seems to intimate something more than this." But if it does, it intimates annihilation, or the total destruction of the whole man. But, surely, no one thinks that by destroying both soul and body in Gehenna, more can be meant than "the damnation of hell, Gehenna," Matt. 23: 33, which was threatened the unbelieving Jews. Did this mean annihilation? No. Did it mean endless punishment in a future state? No; for we have shown from the context it evidently meant the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Who can suppose that our Lord threatened his own disciples with a worse punishment than the unbelieving Jews? James 3: 6. "And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell (Gehenna)." Dr. Campbell thinks the term Gehenna is here used figuratively. He observes, "It is the intention of the writer to draw an illustration of the subject from that state of perfect wretchedness." But why forget, that before any illustration could be drawn from Gehenna, as a place of endless misery, by a Jew or any one else, it must first be known as a place of perfect misery? But, by Dr. Campbell's own showing, no Jew could learn this from the Old Testament. The term Gehenna is not used in the Old Testament to designate a place of endless punishment. Nor are the words Sheol or Hades used in this sense. James could not draw an illustration of any subject, then, from such a place of future punishment, nor ought this to be asserted until it is proved he knew of such a place as a place of wretchedness.

James was a Jew and wrote to believing Jews. Now, no place, to a Jew, conveyed an idea of more perfect wretchedness than the valley of Hinnom. Professor Stuart says, "We cannot wonder, then, at the severe terms in which the worship of Moloch is everywhere denounced in the Scriptures. Nor can we wonder that the place itself should have been called Tophet, that is, abomination, detestation (from *tup*, to vomit with loathing)." Such a place of perfect wretchedness was Gehenna, that he and others allege, it was made a source of imagery to designate hell or the world of woe. Hence he says, "What could be a more appropriate term than this, when we consider the horrid cruelties and diabolical rites which had been there performed?" Which, then, is most likely the truth, that James drew an illustration

from hell in another world, a place unknown, or from the valley of Hinnom, a place well known as a place of perfect wretchedness? He is here speaking of the evils arising from an improper use of the tongue; and to draw an illustration from the valley of Hinnom was both natural and proper, as it was the most abominable place known to Jews. Surely, it is as difficult to conceive how the tongue could be set on fire from hell in another world, as from the valley of Hinnom in the present world.

We have now considered all the texts in the New Testament which speak of Gehenna punishment. We have two or three additional remarks to make on the whole of them.

1st. If these texts do not refer to the same punishment predicted by Jeremiah to the Jewish nation, then our Lord never reminded the Jews that such a punishment had been threatened them. If he spoke of this punishment at all to them, it must have been under the imagery of Gehenna, for under this imagery it was described by the prophet. It will not be pretended that this punishment had been inflicted on the Jewish nation previous to the days of our Lord. Fidelity to the unbelieving Jews, and love to his own disciples, required he should frequently speak of it, for this punishment was nigh even at the door. The texts which speak of Gehenna punishment agree to this view of the subject. Their contexts, the persons addressed about Gehenna, and the phraseology used, are all in unison with it.

2d. It is asserted, Gehenna was such an abominable place that in process of time it was made an emblem of the endless punishment of the wicked in a future state. But if it was so abominable as to be made an emblem of this, it ought to have been made so in the days of the Old Testament writers; for it was then the most cruel sacrifices were made in the valley of Hinnom, and the most horrid abominations were committed. After the Babylonian captivity the Jews were cured of idolatry. But during the days of the prophets, no one ever thought of making Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom, an emblem of hell, the world of woe. And yet, during this period, the prophet Jeremiah did make Gehenna an emblem of temporal punishment to the Jewish nation. If Gehenna, in the days of its greatest abomination, was not made an emblem of the world of woe by inspired writers, but of temporal punishment to the Jews, why should it be made an emblem of this when it was far less abominable, and that too by uninspired writers? If God did not see fit to make it an emblem of hell, the world of woe, when at its height of abomination, who had a right, on their own authority, to make it so afterwards?

3d. But it must first be proved that God, in the Old Testament, had revealed such a hell, such a world of woe, before we ought to believe Gehenna was made an emblem of it. I demand, then, that the texts be produced, which teach such a world. Where is it described by the name Gehenna, or by any other name? Mr. Stuart tried to find it under the name Sheol; but his attempt was a total failure. I ask, then, how could any Old Testament writer make Gehenna an emblem of a world of woe, when no such world was known to him? 4th. The Jews, in after ages, derived their notions of punishment in a world of woe from the heathen, and to this the term Gehenna was

applied. But both the place and the sense given to Gehenna are of human invention.

Such are all the texts in which the word Gehenna is used by the New Testament writers. According to every just rule of Scripture interpretation, I do not see how they can be interpreted differently. Indeed, to me it is surprising how the doctrine of eternal misery was ever founded on any of the texts which speak of Gehenna or hell. If I am correct, it also affords a striking example how far we may be misled, in a proper understanding of the Scriptures, by attaching to a single word a sense different from that given by the inspired writers. How far I am correct, my readers must judge. I hope they will, on the one hand, guard against receiving my error if it be one, and on the other, beware of rejecting my view, if true, from prejudices of education. Under the influence of these prejudices I began to examine this subject, and have been obliged to relinquish my former views of Gehenna, from the force of the evidence I have already stated, and which I have yet to state. If my views of Gehenna are found correct, it is also a striking proof how far we may be misled in a proper understanding of the New Testament, from our inattention to the Old. If the word Gehenna in the New is used in a similar sense as in the Old Testament, all the false views we have had of the texts in which it occurs in the former, have arisen from our inattention to its usage in the latter.

Before closing this section, it is proper to notice any objections which have occurred against the sense given to Gehenna in the passages we have been considering. 1st. One of the most popular objections likely to be urged, is that it is contrary to the long established ecclesiastical use of this word. This is frankly admitted; but, certainly, this is no certain evidence that my views are incorrect. In the present case, I have done no more than what is done by Presbyterians, Hopkinsians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, yea, by all sects in religion. That the ecclesiastical use of some words is very different from the scripture usage of them, few will deny. I have as much regard for the ecclesiastical use of words as Dr. Campbell. He says, p. 416, of his Dissertations, "Ecclesiastical use is no security that the word, though it be understood, conveys to us the same idea which the original term did to those to whom the gospels were first promulgated. In a former dissertation, the fullest evidence has been given that, in regard to several words, the meaning which has been long established by ecclesiastical use is very different from that which they have in the writings of the New Testament."

It is easily seen from this quotation, and more fully from the other dissertation to which he refers, that he did not scruple to disclaim the ecclesiastical use of words if it did not agree with the New Testament. We have examined the scripture usage of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, and if ecclesiastical usage makes them signify a place of endless misery, we must say that it is not supported by the Bible.

2d. Another objection closely connected with the former is that my views of Gehenna are contrary to the opinions of almost all the learned in the present day, in ages past of the Christian Church, and to its sense in the Apocrypha and Jewish Targums. This may be true, yet my view of Gehenna be the correct and scriptural

one notwithstanding. Dr. Campbell says, p. 91 of his Dissertations, "The opinion of Grotius and some learned Rabbis, unsupported by either argument or example, nay, in manifest contradiction to both, is here of no weight. Scriptural usage alone must decide the question. These commentators (with all deference to their erudition and abilities be it spoken), being comparatively modern, cannot be considered as ultimate judges in a question depending entirely on an ancient use, whereof all the evidences that were remaining in their time remain still, and are as open to our examination as they were to theirs. In other points where there may happen to be in Scripture an allusion to customs or ceremonies retained by the Jews, but unknown to us, the case is different. But nothing of this kind is pretended here." We have attempted to decide the question, what is the meaning of the term Gehenna, by an appeal to the scripture usage of this word, and we must say it is our present opinion that it is not once used either in the Old or New Testament to express a place of endless misery for the wicked.

We conclude this section with two brief quotations from Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Mr. (now Dr.) Channing, which we wish were engraven on every man's heart, never to be effaced. In page 14, he says, "The claims of the Bible to be authoritative being once admitted, the simple question, in respect to it, is, what does it teach in regard to any particular passage; what idea did the original writer mean to convey? When this is ascertained by the legitimate rules of interpretation, it is authoritative. This is orthodoxy in the highest and best sense of the word; and everything which is opposed to it, which modifies it, which fritters its meaning away, is heterodoxy, is heresy; to whatever name or party it is attached." He adds, p. 109, "After all, it is a principle, by which, if I have any knowledge of my own heart, I desire forever to be guided, to 'call no man master, on earth.' I would place the decision of Scripture, fairly made out, IMMEASURABLY ABOVE all human opinions. I regard the one as the decision of an unerring God; the other as the opinions of fallible men."

SECTION IV: Additional facts stated, proving that Gehenna was not used by the sacred writers to express a place of endless misery.

THE facts which have been stated in Section 2d, are certainly very singular, if Gehenna in the New Testament signifies a place of endless misery for the wicked. Those I am now to adduce are to me also strange, upon such a view of this subject. Some of them have been slightly hinted at in the course of our remarks, but deserve, a more distinct statement.

1st. If Gehenna means a place of endless misery for the wicked, it is a fact that the apostles never preached it, either to Jews or Gentiles. The history of the Acts of the Apostles contains an account of their preaching for thirty years, but not once is the subject of Gehenna torments mentioned by them. They were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did so; but to no creature under

heaven did they preach this doctrine, or threaten its punishment? They addressed the worst of characters, but to none of them did they say, "How can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna, hell?" They threatened men sometimes with punishment, but never with eternal punishment in hell. Paul said to Elymas, the sorcerer, "O! full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" But he does not threaten him with the damnation of hell. He says, "And now, behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season." Acts 13: 10, 11. In the same chapter, verses 40, 41, he says, "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish." In this last text the word perish occurs, and perhaps some may think it means eternal punishment. But it should be observed that Paul was here addressing himself to Jews, concerning whom our Lord had said, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," referring to the temporal destruction of the Jewish nation. Now, how can we account for this silence, if the apostles believed hell to be a place of endless misery? Their ministry continued thirty years, and yet they do not once use Gehenna! What would we say of a man in these days who should preach thirty years, yet never say a word about hell to those whom he addressed? Should we not say he was a Universalist? He would be an outlaw from orthodoxy. If my veracity in this statement is doubted by any, let them read the book of Acts. It is silent on the subject of hell torments. If preachers should take the apostles for their models, we should hear no more about hell. We respectfully ask, then, from what source ministers learn that they should preach Gehenna or hell torments to us Gentiles? To what chapter or verse, in any book of the New Testament, can they refer us where an inspired apostle ever did so? Let every one, who preaches this doctrine, consider if he did not learn it from his catechism when a child, from books he has read, and from the preaching he has heard, since he became a man, and not from his Bible. Let him also ask whether he has ever given this subject a thorough and impartial examination. We are all too prone to condemn opinions contrary to our own, before we have duly considered the evidence brought in support of them.

To the above it may be objected, "Gehenna was a Jewish figurative mode of speaking of future eternal punishment, and had it been used by the apostles in preaching to the Gentiles, they could not have been understood; for the Gentiles knew nothing about Gehenna as a place of future punishment." To this I reply,

1st. This objection would have some force if it was found that the apostles ever said to the wicked Gentiles, "How can ye escape the damnation of Hades, or Tartarus?" Had they done thus, the objection would have force; but they did not, and it is fair, therefore, to infer their silence concerning Gehenna, in preaching to Gentiles, was not because it was a Jewish figure which they could not understand. But,

2d. Admitting the term Gehenna was one which the Gentiles did not understand, the apostles could have explained it to them, as they have done other things less important. Let any one read John's gospel, and he will see that he explains Jew-

ish names and customs; some examples of which we have given in another place. But,

3d. The above objection assumes that the Gentiles were unacquainted with the term Gehenna. But is there not as good reason to think that the heathen, in their intercourse with the Jews, should imbibe their notions of Gehenna, as that the Jews should imbibe the heathen notions concerning Hades or Tartarus? Their mutual intercourse would produce a mutual interchange of opinions. This being the case, if the Spirit of God recognized either the Jewish notions of Gehenna, or the Pagan notions of Hades, as truth, we might expect that the apostles would have preached the doctrine to both Jews and Gentiles. Had both been recognized, we might expect Hades and Gehenna to be used indiscriminately by the apostles in speaking of future eternal misery. But this was not done, if we may judge of their preaching from what is contained in the New Testament. If they believed both to be true, they would have spoken at least of Gehenna to Jews, and of Hades to Gentiles, as a place of eternal punishment in a future state.

4th. But this objection assumes that the Jews in our Lord's day used Gehenna to signify a place of endless misery, and that this was its exclusive sense. That this could not be its exclusive sense we have proved; for in reading the Old Testament they could not understand it so; or, if they did, they must have perverted it to an extent I am unwilling to believe, even of the Jews. The objector must then prove that the Jews in our Lord's day used the term Gehenna exclusively to express a place of endless misery. The apostles preached to the Jews as well as the Gentiles, but they did not even name it to them. Will any man affirm, then, that the apostles of our Lord understood him to mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, and yet never preached it, to either Jews or Gentiles, in the whole course of their ministry? Whatever excuse we may make for them, in regard to the Gentiles not understanding the term, none can be made for them respecting the Jews.

2d. The salvation revealed by the gospel, is never spoken of as a salvation from hell or endless misery. No such was ever promised or predicted in the Old Testament, and no such salvation was ever preached by Christ or his apostles. Our Lord received the name Jesus, because he should save his people from their sins, not because he should save them from hell. Our Lord and his apostles, in preaching, proposed by it to turn men from darkness to light; from the power of satan unto God; from idols to serve the living God; from the course of this world, and from all sin, to holiness; but where do we ever read of their saving them from hell? No such salvation was preached by our Lord. In all the texts where he speaks of hell, he was not preaching the gospel, but addressing the Jews about the temporal calamities coming on them as a people. In no instance did he ever exhort men to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, because they were exposed to hell torments in a future state. So far from this, in nine instances out of eleven, where Gehenna is used by him, he was addressing his disciples. Nothing is said in our Lord's commission to his apostles about hell, and as little by them in their execution of it. James is the only exception, though he uses it figuratively. To Jew and Gentile, bond and free, all the rest are silent about it. This silence of the apostles could not be because the people in those

days were so good that they did not need pungent preaching. No; the whole world lay in wickedness, yet they did not declaim upon the torments of hell to alarm their fears, and turn them from sin to God. No calculations were made, as in our day, of the number daily and hourly going to eternal misery. Nor were any schemes adopted by the apostles to raise funds to save men from such a fate. As they expressed no alarms about the vast crowds going to hell, so we do not find them expressing their joy because any were saved from it. They were deeply grieved to see men living in sin, and their spirit was stirred within them to see whole cities given to idolatry; but they never assert that all such were on the road to eternal woe. They had great joy to see men walking in the truth, and often congratulated them on account of their being saved from their former course of life, but not a syllable escapes them that such persons have been saved from ceaseless misery. You search the Scriptures in vain to find a single instance where the apostles made any attempt to work on the fears and feelings of men by giving terrific descriptions of hell, or the horrors and howlings of the damned. As they never held up the torments of hell to make men Christians, so we never find them using it as an argument to induce Christians to love and to good works. The latter were often reminded that they formerly were idolaters, working all uncleanness with greediness, to induce them to holiness; but we do not find a word said about their being saved from hell, as any inducement to it. In view of these things, how are we to explain their conduct, if they believed as many do now respecting the wicked? Is it possible they believed this, yet preserved such a dead silence on the subject?

But I may be told, that though none are said to be saved from hell, they are said to be delivered from the wrath to come, and to be saved from wrath through Jesus. True; but it is not said that this wrath was in a future state, or of eternal duration, which is the point to be proved. I can show that the expression “wrath to come” does not refer to a future state. To do it here would be too great a digression from our present subject.

3d. Supposing that Gehenna is a place of endless misery, who can vindicate the character of our Lord or his apostles for faithfulness, compassion or zeal? It is certain that our Lord was faithful to him who appointed him. The apostles were also faithful in declaring the whole counsel of God. But can all this be true, if they knew that hell was a place of eternal misery, and that all the world stood exposed to it, yet said nothing about it? It is true the Saviour mentions Gehenna nine times to his disciples, and twice to the unbelieving Jews. But neither he nor his apostles use the word in speaking to the Gentiles. Now, I ask, is this being faithful? Is this being half so faithful as most preachers are in our day? Every candid man must say no; it is rather being very unfaithful, if they believed this doctrine as it is commonly received among us. How can preaching hell as a place of endless misery now be a duty, since it was not done by the apostles or our Lord? The fidelity of preachers in these days, both to God and the souls of men, in preaching the doctrine of endless misery, far exceeds that of the apostles or of Christ. But how is their compassion to the souls of men to be vindicated, if by hell is meant a place of such misery? The case stands thus. The Saviour knew about this place of endless torment. He

had compassion on the multitude when they needed food, and wrought a miracle to supply their wants. His compassion made him weep over Jerusalem, in view of the temporal calamities coming upon its inhabitants, and faithfully warn them of their danger. In reference to those calamities, he once said to the unbelieving Jews, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" In reference to the same calamities, he uses the word hell in addressing his disciples. But he sheds no tears, he gives no warnings, he works no miracles to save from endless misery. But can any man think this of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world? Can any man believe that he whose heart was wrung with anguish at foreseeing temporal evils, and who could shed tears at the grave of Lazarus, was so devoid of all compassion as never to warn men of endless misery? But suppose we admit that in all the places where our Lord mentions hell such a place of misery is meant. In that case he had a little compassion for the Jews. But neither he nor his apostles had any for the Gentiles. The apostles did shed tears, but not a tear falls from their eyes on account of men's being in danger of hell torments. On this subject, their bowels of compassion were entirely shut up, for they say not a word about hell to them. Either then we must allow these men to be devoid of compassion, or admit that they did not know the torment that awaited the wicked. How different from modern preachers! Solemnly, and seriously, and frequently, do they warn men of hell torment. What deep compassion they pretend to feel for the multitudes of poor souls on the brink of hell, and going down to suffer its torments forever! In what loud and frightful tones do we hear them describe the horrors of this place! Their compassionate hearts they represent as bleeding, because men will thus rush down to ruin in crowds. But where do we find such things in the preaching of our Lord and his apostles? Were they to return to the earth, every pulpit would be shut against them, and they represented as unfaithful and unfeeling men. But how is their zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of men to be vindicated? Our Lord said, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." But surely his zeal was not spent in warning men against endless misery. The apostles had also great zeal, and zeal according to knowledge, but they never spent it in enforcing such a doctrine. The topic of hell torments, on which so much zeal is spent in the present day, is one which they never introduced.

I do not blame the zeal of any in the present day in urging this doctrine on mankind, if it be true; I contend that their zeal is not ardent enough. So far from condemning the greatest zeal which can be manifested, I have some doubts, from the indifference of many persons, whether they believe their own doctrine. If they do, how can they live in such wealth and splendor, yet do so little to save men from hell? I have serious doubts whether many of the preachers, most active and zealous in rousing the people to give money to save the heathen from hell, believe this doctrine. If they believed it, would they live at home in comparative ease and affluence, and send raw, inexperienced youths abroad, to encounter the difficulties and dangers of such a work? No; they would rush into the hottest place of the battle, and suffer every privation in such a conflict. One thing is certain, that, in saving others from hell, they seem determined to do it with as little self-denial and personal risk as possible. How often does it happen that all the zeal for the doctrine in question evaporates in the pulpit, and nothing more is heard of it until the preacher

returns to it again! In the common intercourse of life, he speaks and acts to the same people as if all his threatenings of eternal torment were not true. Yea, some of the very persons whom he threatens with hell are his most intimate companions through the week. He visits in their families, he feasts at their table, and his salary is chiefly paid by them; but not a word escapes him, perhaps the whole week, in warning them of their danger. Can such a man be said truly to believe this doctrine? We must be allowed to doubt it, so long as such unfaithfulness is so apparent.

4th. The Old Testament is often quoted in the New, but it is an indisputable fact, that though quoted by our Lord, when speaking about hell or Gehenna, it is not quoted to show that hell was a place of eternal misery, but in reference to temporal punishment. Indeed, it was impossible for him or his apostles to quote the Old Testament for such a purpose; for we have seen, from Dr. Campbell and others, that it did not afford them anything to quote. Well, permit me to ask why our Lord quoted the Old Testament, and in the very texts in which hell or Gehenna is spoken of? In Mark 9, our Lord expressly quotes a passage from Isaiah, when speaking concerning hell to his disciples. In other places he seems to allude to other prophets. Had our Lord then meant to use Gehenna in a different sense from that in the Old Testament, was it not calculated to mislead his hearers thus to quote it? Is it rational to suppose that he quoted texts which speak of a temporal punishment, when he intended that what he said about Gehenna, or hell, should be understood of eternal punishment? I think this would be imputing to our Lord a want of correctness of judgment, and even of common propriety, which we seldom have occasion to impute to our fellow-men. The man would be looked on as insane, or something worse, who, in the present day, if he intended to prove the doctrine of hell torments, should quote from the Old Testament the passage about the three persons thrown into the fiery furnace. But this is just what our Lord did, if Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of eternal misery. See on Matt. 23: 33, and Mark 9: 42, considered in the preceding section.

5th. If there is a place of endless misery for the wicked, it is a most remarkable fact that the Hebrew, Greek and English languages originally had no name for it. We have seen, from Dr. Campbell, that Gehenna does not occur in this sense in the Old Testament: Let us also see what he says about our English word hell. Speaking of Hades in his sixth Dissertation, he says, "To this the word hell in its primitive signification perfectly corresponded; for, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects. But though our word hell in its original signification was more adapted to express the sense of Hades than of Gehenna, it is not so now. When we speak as Christians, we always express by it the place of the punishment of the wicked after the general judgment, as opposed to heaven, the place of the reward of the righteous." It is very evident, from this, that the word hell did not originally signify a place of endless misery. In confirmation of what Dr. Campbell says, I shall quote the following from Parkhurst, on the word Hades. He says, "Our English or rather Saxon word hell, in its original signification (though it is now understood in a more limited sense), exactly answers to the word Hades, and

denotes a concealed or unseen place; and this sense of the word is still retained in the eastern, and especially in the western counties of England; to hele over a thing, is to cover it." These statements are above suspicion; for the fidelity of their authors has led them to say things at variance with their professed creed as Christians. It is very evident, then, that our English word hell did not originally signify a place of endless misery, but, like Hades or Sheol, signified the unseen or concealed place; and that it now has this meaning in some of the counties in England. It is then evident, that for this place of endless misery, the Hebrew, Greek, and English languages originally furnished no name. We have then to ask, had the inspired writers any idea of such a place? If they had, it is evident they wanted a name to express it. If they have not expressed it by any word, how does any man know that they entertained such an idea? We have seen persons use words to which they attached no distinct ideas. And we have also seen persons having ideas which they could not very easily express in appropriate language. But it would be singular to suppose that the Bible reveals a place of endless misery for which its inspired writers had no name. It is surely, then, a very proper question to be asked, who changed the words Gehenna and hell from their original signification to their present one? We shall see, in the next section, that the writers of the Targums and the Apocrypha are adduced to show that this change was gradually produced, and that, finally, Gehenna was used exclusively to mean a place of endless suffering; but it will be found that these authorities do not establish the point for which they are brought forward.

After these statements from such eminent critics relative to Gehenna and our English word hell, it is very natural to put something like the following questions: 1st. Were these words changed from their original signification by divine authority, or was it on the authority of men? None of the above authors insinuate that such a change in the meaning of these words was made by divine authority. It has never been noticed in the course of our reading, that any one ventured to prove or even assert this. We have seen what Dr. Campbell says respecting this change in the use of Gehenna. 2d. By whom, and in what period of time, did this change in the sense of these two words take place? Here we are left to conjecture; for neither Dr. Campbell, nor any other writer of whom we have any knowledge, gives us any information. That a change in the sense of these two words has taken place is certain, but when or where, or by whom it was made, no information is afforded. 3d. By what name was this place of endless misery called before the Jews gave it the name of Gehenna? And what was its name in the English or rather Saxon language, before the word hell was changed from its original signification and applied to it? Or was it without a name before these words were altered? 4th. If it had a name before Gehenna and hell were changed and applied to it, why was it laid aside? And what were the reasons which induced men to make such an alteration on their own authority? Why were they not content to speak of this place as the Scriptures teach, if indeed they reveal such a place? 5th. If Gehenna and hell have undergone such a change of sense on mere human authority, ought we not to change them again to their original signification, on the same authority? Such are a few of the questions which may be put relative to the change in the sense of these two words. We leave our reader to determine how they are to be answered. The last is easily answered,

but all the others, we think, must remain unanswered.

6th. Another fact deserving our consideration is, that Christians, when they speak of hell, adopt the phraseology used about Sheol and Hades rather than Gehenna, though it is contended that Gehenna is the word which signifies the place of endless misery. I shall explain what I mean. For example, it is evident, from an inspection of the passages in which Sheol, Hades, and Gehenna occur, that Gehenna for depth is never contrasted with heaven for height, like Sheol and Hades. Nor do we read of persons going down to Gehenna; of the depths of Gehenna, or of the lowest Gehenna. Neither do we read of the gates of Gehenna, nor of the pains of Gehenna. All these things are said of Sheol and Hades, as we have seen in a former part of this Inquiry. Besides, no representations are given of Gehenna, as of Sheol and Hades, that all the dead, or even the wicked, are there. No persons are ever represented as alive in Gehenna, as speaking out of Gehenna, or as tormented in its flames. It is never, like Sheol and Hades, represented as a dark, concealed place, under the earth. No; it is represented as on a level with the persons addressed concerning it. These facts show a remarkable difference in the scripture representations of the two places. Such a marked difference must strike every man's mind with great force, who takes the trouble to examine this subject. An examination of the twelve places in which Gehenna occurs in the New Testament will show that what I have stated is strictly correct. In them we read of the damnation of Gehenna or hell; persons are there said to be in danger of it; they are threatened with going into it, or being cast into it; but we never read that any one was alive in it, and lifted up his eyes in its torments. Now, comparing all these different forms of speech, about Sheol and Hades, with those of Gehenna, the difference is not only manifest, but very significant.

Let us now compare these statements with the way in which Christians speak about hell, or the place of future punishment. They seldom use the language employed in the Bible about Gehenna, but, generally, that used in speaking of Sheol and Hades. Thus, for example, when a preacher describes hell to his hearers, and threatens the wicked with its punishment, he speaks of it as a deep place, as the lowest hell, and as a place to which they are going down; and of some already there, lifting up their eyes in torments. Permit me, then, to ask, why this is done? For what reason is the scripture language about Gehenna laid aside, and that of Sheol and Hades substituted in its place; when it is allowed on all sides that Sheol or Hades do not mean a place of endless misery? It must be confessed, that this is, at least, handling the word of God ignorantly, if not deceitfully; and, under the mask of scripture phraseology, imposing on the ignorance and credulity of mankind. If such persons will have Gehenna to be the place of endless misery, let them use the language of Scripture about it, and not the language allowed to have no reference to such a subject. We cannot help thinking that the reason of this change of phraseology is from necessity. It would be contrary to fact, and even common belief, to speak to people of hell in the language used about Gehenna. To tell them that their whole body should be cast into hell would not do. A case of this kind was never known. The change of the language from Gehenna to that of Sheol and Hades is therefore

necessary, to be in unison with the common belief on this subject. If men were obliged to confine themselves to the language of Scripture about Gehenna, when they speak of hell, it would probably lead them to see that all was not correctly understood respecting it. I may add, here, that this change is not altogether in agreement with the popular ideas entertained of hell. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is not in unison with the common belief. No man believes that the body is tormented, at least till after the resurrection of the dead; but how often do preachers represent the body after death as in hell, lifting up its eyes there, and as tormented in its flames! Fondness for a popular sentiment often blinds our eyes to the contradictions and absurdities of our language in speaking about it.

7th. Another fact deserving some notice, is, that the punishment of Gehenna is never once spoken of as a punishment for the spirit separate from the body in an intermediate state, nor as a punishment for both body and spirit after the resurrection of the dead. As to the first part of this statement, let the texts in which Gehenna occurs be ever so rigidly examined, and it will be found that they do not afford a particle of evidence that Gehenna is an intermediate place of punishment for the spirit after the death of the body. The text, and we believe the only text, quoted to prove this intermediate place of punishment, is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But supposing this account to be literally understood, it should be remembered that the rich man was not in Gehenna, but in Hades. Admitting, then, that Hades is an intermediate place of punishment for the separate spirit, Gehenna must be given up as such a place. But ask any common Christian, who believes the doctrine of eternal misery, if he thinks that we are punished before and after the resurrection, in two different places, and he would regard you as a heretic. He has always believed, as taught by his parents, his catechism, and his sect, that there is only one hell for all the wicked. It is high time that common Christians, in distinction from learned Christians, should be told that this is very far from being the true state of the case, as they would soon see, if the learned would only speak their minds freely on this subject. Dr. Campbell has dared to speak of Gehenna and Hades as two places of punishment for the wicked, and it is somewhat surprising that orthodox Christians have not before now denounced him as a heretic.¹

But the punishment of hell or Gehenna, say Dr. Campbell and others, comes after the judgment, for Hades is to be destroyed. But let the texts which speak of Gehenna be again examined, and it will be seen that as little is said about its being a place of punishment after the resurrection as before it. No; we never find it once mentioned in connection with the resurrection of the dead, but always in connection with the temporal miseries coming on the Jews. Without making myself liable to the charge of arrogance, I think I may challenge the whole world to produce a single text which speaks of Gehenna, either as an intermediate place of punishment for the spirit, or for both body and spirit after the resurrection of the dead. We think that all the passages have been shown to have a totally different meaning, and therefore

¹Professor Stuart admits that Sheol, or Hades, is not the place of endless punishment, but, like Dr. Campbell, contends that Gehenna is this place. He has two hells, like many others.

people must have been led into such mistaken ideas on this subject by confounding Sheol, Hades and Gehenna together, as one place, and supposing that the word hell, by which all these words are translated, means the place of endless punishment. The endless duration of this punishment has been believed from Mark 9: 43, 44, considered above, and from a few other passages, in which the word everlasting is used and applied to punishment.

It has been shown, from a consideration of the passages which speak of Gehenna, that it referred to the punishment of the Jews, and we think we have proved that this punishment was called an everlasting punishment. But where do we ever read of an everlasting punishment in hell, either in an intermediate state or after the resurrection? Let something like proof of this be produced. It is granted that we read in books, and hear in sermons, of an eternal hell, and of the howlings of the damned, and of infants a span long in this place. But, in the name of common humanity, and in vindication of the character of God, we demand in what part of the Bible such statements are to be found. Do the Scriptures ever give such statements? Certainly not. Is it not, then, daring presumption in any man to speak thus? Shall we never be done with attempts to supply what we deem God's deficiencies?

Dr. Campbell, and we presume all critics, object to the doctrine that Hades is to be a place of punishment after the resurrection. It is evident from Scripture that it is to be destroyed and be no more. But why should this be objected to, and why should it be contended for, that Gehenna is to be a place of punishment after this period, and of eternal duration? Certainly as little is said about Gehenna as about Hades being a place of punishment after the resurrection. From no text in which Gehenna is mentioned could this be inferred. Gehenna is never spoken of as a place of punishment after the resurrection of the dead; nor is it ever mentioned in connection with this subject.

8th. Closely connected with the last fact is another, that the learned seem to believe in two places of future punishment, and the common people only in one. We have seen what Dr. Campbell declares respecting Gehenna as the place of eternal punishment, and what he thinks about Hades as an intermediate place of punishment until the resurrection. If it be true, then, that Hades is one place of punishment and Gehenna another, it is beyond all doubt true that there are two places of future punishment, the one temporary and the other to be eternal in its duration; the one before and the other after the resurrection. The first, punishment for the soul, separate from the body, until the resurrection; and the other after, for both soul and body forever. This is indisputable, unless it can be proved that Hades and Gehenna are only two names for the same place, or, which is much the same, that Hades is a part of Gehenna, or Gehenna a part of Hades. But no man who has paid the slightest attention to the passages in which these two words occur can for a moment think so. So far from this, no two places could be more distinctly marked as separate places. The various modes of speaking about them which we have noticed clearly decide this. Which of these is the place of endless misery? Not Gehenna, for it cannot have such a sense; not Sheol or Hades, for, admitting it to

be a place of punishment in the intermediate state, it is to be destroyed, therefore cannot be of endless duration. If such a place of misery is taught us under any other name in the Bible, I am willing to consider it. But this is not pretended, I believe, by the most zealous friends of the doctrine of endless misery.

The common opinion of the unlearned is, that there is but one place of future misery, and this place they call hell, whether this word be the translation of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna. They always speak about it as one place of punishment, and consider this punishment as endless. The same hell to which the spirits of the wicked are sent at death is the hell to which they send all the wicked forever. If this be a mistaken notion of the vulgar, it is certain most orthodox preachers do not attempt to correct it, for what they say about hell tends to confirm them in this opinion. They always speak about one hell as certainly as about one God; nor do they take any notice of the distinction, so clearly marked in Scripture, between Hades and Gehenna.

9th. Another fact is, we read of the sea, death, and Hades, delivering up the dead which are in them, yet we never read of Gehenna delivering up anything dead or alive. Now, let us suppose that at death the body goes to Hades, the grave, or state of the dead, and the spirit goes to Gehenna or hell, to suffer punishment until the resurrection. If this commonly received doctrine be true, is it not as rational to think that we should read in Scripture of Gehenna or hell delivering up the spirits of the wicked at the resurrection, as that Hades or the grave should deliver up their bodies? In order to have a reunion at this period, it is just as necessary that the spirits should come forth from the one place as their bodies from the other. But nothing like this is to be found in the Bible.

If heaven be, as is generally believed, the place of happiness after death for the spirits of the righteous, and Gehenna or hell be the place of punishment for the spirits of the wicked, must not the spirits of the last, in order for a reunion with their bodies, come forth from hell as certainly as the first from heaven? But I do not find that at this period a word is said about hell, or any spirits coming forth from it. But how is this accounted for, if the generally received doctrine be correct? The only possible way to account for it is that suggested by Dr. Campbell, that Gehenna is not the place of punishment for the wicked until after the resurrection. But this, we think, will not bear examination. In all the texts where Gehenna occurs, nothing is said of the resurrection of the dead. It will not be disputed that when our Lord spoke to the unbelieving Jews, and to his disciples, of Gehenna, that he referred to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Why introduce Gehenna on a subject like this, if it be true that the punishment of Gehenna is that suffered by the wicked after the resurrection? If it is, why is it never introduced by the inspired writers, when speaking of the resurrection? It is natural to think it would be always spoken of in connection with it. We find Hades follows death, and these two are spoken of as connected. But do we ever find it said that Gehenna follows the resurrection of the dead; or that there is any connection between these two things? No; this is not hinted at in the most distant way. Let any one read all the passages

where this subject is treated of, and he will find that not a word is said by the sacred writers concerning Gehenna or hell. In 1 Cor. 15, the fullest account is given of the resurrection, of any place in the Bible; but neither the punishment of hell nor any other punishment is there spoken of. We think it incumbent on those who believe that the punishment of hell succeeds the resurrection of the dead, to show that the Spirit of God speaks of it in such a connection. If what is said about this be true, this ought to be its uniform connection. But no man will assert that this is the case, who has paid any attention to the subject.

10th. Another important fact deserving our notice is, that none of the original words translated in the common version eternal, everlasting and forever, are connected with Gehenna, or hell. No; though we often hear preachers, in our day, speak of an eternal hell, such language never was used by any inspired writer. The phrase "everlasting fire" occurs in the Bible, and this has been shown to be the same as "everlasting punishment," and the "fire that shall never be quenched." But we have seen that none of these expressions refer to a place in a future state, called Gehenna or hell; or that the punishment referred to is endless in its duration. But an eternal hell is often heard of from the pulpit, and perhaps many believe it to be a scripture expression. This, and many other terrific expressions, which are the chief ornaments of modern sermons, and often uttered without much feeling by the preacher, are not found in the Bible. They are bugbears of his own creating, which no man, who regards the Scriptures and has considered this subject, will be frightened at. Children, ignorant, weak, nervous people, may be, and indeed often are, powerfully wrought upon by the terrific descriptions which are given of hell. And after this is effected to a great extent, it is called a revival of religion. But is this the work of the Spirit of God? If it be, I demand that some part of the New Testament be produced, showing that similar revivals were effected by terrific descriptions of hell under the ministry of Christ or his apostles. Did they paint, in glowing colors, the horrors of the damned in hell to make men Christians? No man will say so. All such language is coined at the mint of modern divinity, and may do well for increasing a sect, but riot for making Christians. When many of these people get over their fright, they return like the dog to his vomit and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire. The reader may ask, are not everlasting life and ever-lasting punishment contrasted in Matt. 25: 46, and some other places? Yes, but this contrast is not between heaven as a place of eternal blessedness and Gehenna as a place of endless punishment, as is generally believed.¹

11th. In the common language of Christians, you hear heaven as the place of blessedness for the righteous spoken of in contrast with hell for the wicked. I shall illustrate what I mean by an example or two. In the Bible we find persons expressing their hopes of going to heaven; but do we ever read of one expressing his fears of going to hell? We, indeed, find persons speaking familiarly of Sheol and Hades, and expressing both their fears and feelings in regard to this place; but we never read

¹See this passage, and every other passage where everlasting, etc., occurs in the Bible, fully considered in my Second Inquiry.

of one who expressed his fears or feelings about going to Gehenna. Again; we read of an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven; but do we ever read of endless punishment reserved for any one in hell or Gehenna? Again; Paul, we are told, was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter; but do we read of any one that was sent to Gehenna and there heard or saw anything? No. But why should not one be sent to hear the unutterable misery of the one place, as well as the unutterable blessedness of the other? But, again; we have some instances of persons mentioned in Scripture who were taken up into heaven. Such were Enoch and Elijah. But do you ever find one individual abandoned for wickedness, on whom God displayed his signal vengeance by sending him to hell or Gehenna? We indeed read of Korah and his company, who went down quick into the pit; but we have shown that this pit was not Gehenna or hell, but only the grave or state of the dead. Again; Moses and Elias made their appearance on the mount at our Lord's transfiguration; but do we find any of the wicked characters mentioned in the Scripture ever making their appearance from hell? We have heard idle stories of wicked persons coming from hell to warn others, and describing the awful misery of that place. But is anything like this stated in the Scriptures? All know that they are silent about such ridiculous fables.

12th. It is common with orthodox preachers to represent hell as the place of endless torment for the wicked, and speak of persons being there tormented by the devil and his angels. Indeed, it is common to speak of devils and wicked men as being in the same place of punishment. But how they came by their information I know not. It is indisputable, that whatever the Scriptures mean by the devil and his angels, they are not once represented as in Hades, or tormenting any persons there. Even Dr. Campbell, though he considers Hades as an intermediate place of punishment, says, "That Gehenna is employed in the New Testament to denote the place of future punishment, prepared for the Devil and his angels, is indisputable." If the Devil and his angels are in this place, which Dr. Campbell says was prepared for them, they are not then in Hades, the intermediate place of punishment for the wicked. We ask, then, how it can be said with truth that the Devil and his angels are the tormentors of the wicked in Hades? But some have thought, that though Gehenna is the place prepared for the Devil and his angels, they are not sent there until the day of judgment, when they and all the wicked are to go there together, to suffer its punishment forever. If the devil and his angels are not in Gehenna, and are never said to be in Hades, it seems they, for the present, are not in either place of punishment, whilst wicked men are all sent to Hades to be punished from death until the resurrection. Besides, it is certain that such preachers, who represent the Devil and his angels as the tormentors of wicked men in Hades, greatly misrepresent them; a thing which ought not to be done in regard to real devils. But how often has it been heard from the pulpit, and published to the world, that wicked men at death go to hell, to be the companions of devils and damned spirits forever. And have not books been put into the hands of children describing in words, and representing in cuts, the Devil tossing about the wicked there with pitchforks? The truth is, whether my views of Gehenna be right or wrong, it is evident that the common

opinions entertained on the subject cannot all be true.

The evidence which has already been stated, proving that Gehenna does not signify a place of endless misery, is sufficient. But there are yet some things which ought not to be passed over, of a circumstantial nature, which very much confirm this evidence.

1st. Why did not John in his gospel mention Gehenna, and why did he omit all the discourses recorded by the other evangelists, in which our Lord spoke of Gehenna? It has been noticed, already, that John wrote his gospel for the use of the Gentiles. This is generally admitted. Such being the case, it may be thought there was no occasion to say anything about Gehenna to the Gentiles. If our Lord, as I have stated, meant by Gehenna the temporal punishment coming on the Jews, this is readily admitted; but if the damnation of hell was an eternal punishment for all the wicked, whether Jews or Gentiles, how could John omit all mention of it? How can it ever be rationally accounted for, that he believed the damnation of hell was an eternal punishment, yet say nothing about it to them? Was it a matter of more importance to tell them that Messiah being interpreted signifies the Christ, or that there was at Jerusalem a pool, in the Hebrew language called Bethesda, having five porches? Or that the water-pots, chap. 2, contained two or three firkins apiece? Can any man think that if John believed Gehenna a place of endless misery, he would be silent about it, yet mention to his Gentile readers these things, comparatively of small importance? But why did John omit all these discourses in which our Lord spoke of Gehenna? A very good reason can be assigned for this, and it shows in what light John viewed the discourses of our Lord, alluded to. It was after the destruction of Jerusalem he wrote his gospel. Whitby, in his preface to the gospel of John, thus writes: "The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries do all agree, that he wrote it either in that isle (Patmos), or after his return from it; when he was ninety years old, says Epiphanius; when he was an hundred, says Chrysostom. So that, according to the account of all these ecclesiastical writers, John must have written this gospel a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem." Here we see a very good reason why John says nothing about Gehenna, yea, omits all our Lord's discourses in which it is mentioned. The event was past. To have related those discourses would have been to deliver predictions after they were fulfilled, and warn men of evils to be endured after they had been suffered. John's conduct is not only excusable, but highly proper. Does not this very omission strongly confirm the view which I have given of Gehenna? And, is not this omission irreconcilable with the common ideas entertained on this subject?

2d. Why does not Luke mention Gehenna in his history of the Acts of the Apostles? This is the more surprising, as he mentions it in his gospel. On my view of Gehenna, this can be rationally accounted for, but on the common view it cannot. In his gospel he relates our Lord's discourses to the Jews, in which he spoke to them concerning Gehenna, in the punishment of which they were alone concerned. But in his history of the Acts of the Apostles, he gives us an account of the preaching of the gospel, and its success among the Gentiles, who were not concerned in the

punishment of Gehenna, and therefore had no need to have it mentioned to them. But if it was a punishment in common to Jews and Gentiles, who died wicked, let it be satisfactorily accounted for why the apostles did not preach it to the Gentile nations. If they ever preached this doctrine, it is certain Luke does not give a faithful history. To say they did preach it is a gratuitous assertion, and impeaches the fidelity of Luke. What historian would omit mentioning the doctrine of universal salvation as preached by the Universalists, if he undertook to write an account of their preaching for thirty years?

But, if it was right in the apostles to say nothing of Gehenna or hell, it must be right in us, for they are models to copy after. Supposing, then, that all preachers among the Gentile nations should, in imitation of the apostles, say nothing of hell to their hearers, who could blame them? They could urge the example of the apostles in their defence. Here they might take their stand and bid defiance to the whole world.

3d. Why did the apostles never mention anything about hell in any of their epistles to the churches? Not one of them, James excepted, ever introduces it. The reason of this is equally obvious. The epistles, for the most part, were written to Gentile believers, who were not concerned in the national punishment of the Jews. James wrote to believing Jews, and hence used this word. Now, can any one suppose that if the Gentiles had been exposed to hell, the apostles never would, in any of their epistles, have reminded those to whom they wrote, that they had been saved from it? They are often reminded that they were idolaters, and wicked, before they believed the gospel, and had been saved from such things; but they are not reminded that any of them had ever been saved from Gehenna. From the consideration of their being saved they are often exhorted to love and good works; but never from the consideration of their being saved from endless misery. As it is never said that they were once exposed to such a punishment, so they are never reminded that they were now delivered from it. No self-complaisant remarks are made that they were now safe from the torments of hell, nor any whining complaints that their friends and neighbors, yea, the whole unbelieving Gentile world, were every moment exposed to this punishment. We find the apostles and primitive Christians expressing the most heartfelt gratitude that they had been saved from this present evil world; that they were translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son; and using all proper means that their fellow-men might believe the gospel and enjoy like blessings. The New Testament abounds with evidence of this. But we never find them intimating that their exertions in diffusing the gospel were for the purpose of saving the heathen from everlasting torments. We leave it with every candid man to say, if the apostles and first Christians believed as people do now on this subject, whether they could have been thus silent.

Further; no instance is left on record where an unbeliever or backslider was told, as now they frequently are, that they had sinned away their day of grace, and that everlasting torments in hell would be their unavoidable fate. Nor is an instance recorded of a person being driven to distraction by the horrors of hell, produced by apostolic preaching. No example is given in Scripture of a person ending his days by

suicide to get rid of his present terrors of hell torments. Some instances of suicide are recorded; see the cases of Ahitophel, Judas, etc. But do we find a single hint dropped that the terror of hell torments drove them to this? Even of Judas it is not said that he went to hell, which ought to teach some persons modesty and caution, who, in the heat of their zeal, affirm that he did. If such persons had the Bible to make, they would express many things very differently from what it has pleased God to do in the revelation of his will to mankind.

It will be allowed that from the gospel of John, the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles, we learn what were the doctrines taught to the Gentiles. But can we learn from them that the doctrine of eternal punishment in hell was one of these doctrines? Certainly we cannot. Suppose that such writings were published in our day, omitting all mention of hell or its endless punishment, should we not say that they did not teach the doctrine? We have not stated this as an argument conclusive in itself. But we think that if none of the other New Testament writers teach it, the argument is conclusive. We have seen what all admit in regard to the Old Testament, and have endeavored to show that the New does not differ from it; and, therefore, do not hesitate to say that their silence in regard to a place of endless woe is full proof against it.

Sometimes we learn what doctrines are held by persons from the accusations of their enemies. If we bring the doctrine before us to this test, we shall find some additional confirmation that endless misery was not taught by our Lord or his apostles.

1st. Let us inquire what accusations the Jews brought against the Saviour. They accused him of many things; such as his being an enemy to Cæsar, in league with Beelzebub, and a blasphemer. At his trial Pilate said to him, "Behold how many things they witness against thee." The principal of these were, that he called himself the Son of God, and said he was able to destroy their temple. But did the Jews ever accuse him of having threatened them with endless misery? No; bad as they were, they never preferred this charge. If he had done it, they would have brought it forward against him. The Jews had no idea of going to hell; and if the Saviour had threatened any such fate, they would have indignantly resented it. But this formed no ground of accusation, notwithstanding their unwearied opposition to him.

2d. Let us see what accusations were brought against his followers. They also were accused of being enemies to Cæsar. But passing over other accusations, we shall fix on what Stephen was accused of as a fair specimen of what they were all charged with. "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law; for we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." Enemies as the Jews were to the disciples of our Lord, they did not even insinuate the charge that they ever threatened Jews with endless torments. They say that Stephen said, "Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place;" but they do not say that either Jesus or Stephen said that he would destroy them with everlasting misery in Gehenna. No; let me advocate, for once, the cause of the Jews; they never brought such a charge

against Christ or any of his followers. On this occasion, let it be remembered, that the accusers of Stephen were false witnesses, procured for the very purpose of finding him guilty. Now, can any man suppose that they would have failed to prefer the worst charges that could have been founded upon the truth? Those who can believe this must be prepared to believe anything. But they could not bring such an accusation against him, or any of the first preachers; for none of them ever made such a threatening. All who had heard them preach could have been called as witnesses to prove that it was a false accusation. Such a charge would have been confronted by public opinion.

Again; let us see what accusations the Gentiles brought against the followers of Christ. They accused him of turning the world upside down; of turning away much people, saying that "they were no gods which were made with hands." In consequence of this they were accounted atheists, enemies to the gods, and deserving to be abhorred of men. Now, give me leave to ask, was the charge ever brought against them in any shape, by any person, that they threatened men with endless punishment? No; all the jesuitical ingenuity in the world cannot find a word said which has such an appearance. But had the apostles ever threatened the Gentiles with punishment in hell, would they have failed to bring this accusation against them? The objector may say, You show that the heathen nations all believed in the doctrine of endless punishment, and that the Jews learned it from their intercourse with them; therefore, the heathen could not be offended with the apostles for teaching one of the tenets of their religion. To this I answer, that the heathen believed in a future punishment in Hades; but observe that the apostles neither taught such a punishment there nor in Gehenna. This is a fact we think beyond all fair discussion. If they had preached future punishment in Gehenna to them, they might have said, We have heard of it in Hades, but why preach this new doctrine, a punishment in Gehenna? They did not preach it in Hades, which shows that they did not believe this heathen notion; and, as they are never accused of threatening Gentiles with endless punishment in Gehenna, it is clear that no such doctrine was taught by them.

Another circumstance, corroborative of the views I have advanced concerning Gehenna, is the following. According to my views, the conduct of our Lord and his apostles is just what might be expected; but if by Gehenna is understood a place of endless misery, it is strange and unaccountable. What I refer to will be best seen by,

1st. Considering our Lord's conduct. We have seen, from a consideration of all the passages in which he speaks of Gehenna, that nine times out of twelve all he says concerning it was addressed to his disciples. In only one instance did he ever say to the unbelieving Jews, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23: 33. Now, notice, that at verses 38, 39, he adds, Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." After this, he never said a word to them about the damnation of hell. Now, let it be supposed that by this expression he

meant endless misery in a future state. I ask, is it possible he should only mention it once? I ask again, can it be believed that he who said on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," should have ceased but with his dying breath to warn these men that such a place of misery awaited them? I ask once more, is it possible that he, who, when he beheld the city, wept over it, on account of temporal calamities in which it was soon to be involved, should shed no tears in anticipating the endless misery of its wicked inhabitants? On the supposition that Gehenna is such a place, our Lord's conduct is unaccountable. But on my views of the damnation of hell, his conduct excites no surprise; all is rational, and what the circumstances of the case warrant us to expect. They had rejected their promised Messiah, the measure of their iniquity they were soon to fill up, and they could not escape the damnation of hell.

2d. The conduct of his apostles. This was in perfect agreement with that of their Master. They are silent about Gehenna to the Gentiles. If it should be objected here, "Why did not the apostles continue to speak to the unbelieving Jews about the damnation of hell, allowing it to mean the temporal miseries coming on that generation? Why should they not have continued to warn them of this, as their Lord had done before them?" The answer to this is easy. In Luke 19: 42, our Lord told the Jews that the things which belonged to their peace were now hid from their eyes. Their doom was fixed, their punishment was unavoidable. Accordingly our Lord said, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Soon the wrath of God was to come on them to the uttermost. This came in the destruction of their city and temple, when such calamities were experienced, that unless the Lord had shortened the days no flesh could have been saved.

In many places of the epistles, written to believers, allusions are made to the judgments of God coming on the Jewish nation, though not mentioned under the name Gehenna. The event is not only alluded to, but spoken of as near; and Christians are exhorted to patience and holiness, in view of it. But these very parts of the epistles are by many, like the texts which speak of Gehenna, all applied to punishment in a future state of existence. See, for example, 1 Peter 4: 17–19, and other texts, considered in my Second Inquiry.

Friendly letters to a Universalist on divine rewards and punishments

Bernard Whitman
Brown, Shattuck, 1833
p. 163-195
LETTER VI.

My Dear Sir,

I have selected and arranged eight classes of passages which distinctly teach or plainly imply future punishishment. My limits will not permit me to give even a brief exposition of but one of the number. This I regret the less since my next communication will contain some other texts which inculcate the same doctrine. The question at issue is not to be decided by the number of times a future retribution is recognised in the scriptures. A few undoubted instances must be as satisfactory to every sincere believer as many hundreds. In my present article then I shall confine myself to that class of passages in which the greek word gehenna occurs. A few preliminary remarks seem necessary to illustrate the nature of my arguments.

In the first place, you probably know that gehenna is a word of exclusively hebrew origin. It is made up of two other words which signify when united the valley of Hinnom. This valley was originally a delightful spot. It was shady and well watered. It was situated on the east of Jerusalem. At an early period the idolatrous Jews set up the brazen image of their god Moloch. To this deity they offered children in sacrifice. The name Tophet was afterwards given to the valley. This is also a hebrew word and signifies a drum, because the wicked priests beat drums to prevent the cries of the dying children from being heard. Josiah abolished this horrid practice. He caused the place to be polluted. All the filth of the city was deposited there, and a fire kept burning so that the air might not be rendered impure and unhealthy; worms also were generated in the offal, and hence arose the phrases of unquenchable fire, and undying worms. So far there is no disagreement.

Now the learned commentators of all denominations contend, that the name of this loathsome, and fiery, and wormy valley, was afterwards used as an emblem of

the future punishment of the wicked. They contend that our Savior used gehenna to signify the torment which awaited the sinful in another existence. This opinion was generally received as true until one who is now a member of your body denied its correctness. He endeavored to show that no such change had taken place in the meaning of the word. He aimed to prove that gehenna must be taken in its literal sense, as a place of temporal punishment near Jerusalem. Unitarians considered the doctrine of future retribution firmly established without a reference to this class of passages; they took little or no notice of the work, and very few of the denomination have perused it even to this day. Those who examined for themselves stated that the investigation of the subject was superficial, the reasoning inconclusive and many of the arguments irrelevant, and deemed it unworthy of any public notice. When I commenced my preparation for the present letters I did not think much space could be allotted to this part of the discussion. On examination however I became convinced that your view of the word was altogether erroneous, and concluded to bring forward such evidence as seemed to settle this controversy beyond all doubt. The results of a thorough investigation will now be submitted to your candid consideration.

I. In the first place, I will state some of my reasons for rejecting your definition of the greek term gehenna. You know that this word was used eleven times by our Savior and once by the apostle James. All valuable commentators affirm that Jesus employed the word as an emblem of the spiritual punishment of the wicked both in this world and the next existence. This is the view I take of the subject and the one which I shall attempt to defend. You contend that gehenna was used to denote a place of literal punishment, in this world alone, out of the city of Jerusalem. Some of the arguments for rejecting your meaning of the word I will now mention.

1. I reject your definition of gehenna because it makes our blessed Savior utter nonsense and falsehood. Look at the several passages in which he employs the word. The following is the first instance. "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, *raca*, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of the gehenna of fire." Here you perceive that our Savior mentions three degrees of punishment, the judgment, the council, the gehenna. Now the question is simply this. Did our Savior mean literal and temporal punishment as you contend, or did he mean figurative and spiritual as I believe? He could not mean literal punishment. For the Jews had no law for punishing a person for unreasonable anger; and I defy you or any other man to produce a single case in which such an offence was ever punished by the Jewish tribunal called the judgment; consequently no disciple was in any danger of a literal punishment by this court on account of anger. The Jews had no law for punishing a person for calling another *raca*; and I challenge you or any other individual to mention a single instance in which such a crime was ever punished by the Jewish tribunal called the council; and consequently no hearer of our Savior was in the least danger of a literal punishment by this court for using such words. The Jews had no law for punishing a man for calling his brother fool;

and I defy you to produce a single example in which they punished any breach of their laws by burning in the valley of Hinnom; and consequently no one of those our Savior addressed were in danger of being thus punished for any crime whatever. Now is it likely he was totally ignorant of the jurisprudence of his own nation? Is it not probable that his hearers would have ridiculed him to his face for manifesting such ignorance had they understood him to mean literal punishment. Not only so. Your definition of gehenna makes our Savior contradict himself in the same sentence. He first avers that the Jews consider nothing to be murder but the outward act; and that this offence was condemned to no heavier penalty than what the judgment could inflict. Had he then declared that whoever cherished unreasonable anger would be exposed to the literal judgment, or literal council, or literal fire, would he not have contradicted his former assertion? But this is not all. You make our Savior threaten his hearers with punishments of which they were in no possible danger, and this must have been perfectly well understood by all present. Consequently they must have received his meaning according to my exposition. He meant that the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings must be as severe as the punishments which could be inflicted in three several methods. And when he used the word gehenna he extended the sufferings beyond the grave, as this word was then employed to denote the future misery of the wicked, which I shall soon prove. Thus you see your definition of gehenna makes our Savior utter nonsense and falsehood. Matthew 5.22.

Take a second class of passages. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into gehenna. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and east it from thee; for k is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into gehenna." How can you reconcile this sentence with your view of gehenna? What connexion would the cutting off an offending member have with being burnt in the valley of Hinnom? What court had authority to inflict this kind of punishment on account of a person's being led into sin by his right eye? Can you possibly understand this in a literal sense? Surely not. The Jews had no laws relating to such offences. There was no manner of danger from a literal burning. And this must have been known both to the preacher and hearers. Now my definition of the word makes our Savior consistent, wise and benevolent. Matthew 5.29, 30; 18.9; Mark 9.43, 45.

Take a third class of passages. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in gehenna." What can you make of this verse on your system? What more than the body could be destroyed by burning in the valley of Hinnom? Call the soul what you please, still it must mean something which no human tribunal could destroy, in order to make our Savior utter any truth or wisdom. If then you say that gehenna here means the valley of Hinnom, the meaning of the sentence amounts to nothing more than this. Fear not him who can kill you in one way, but fear him who can destroy you in another. Could such nonsense proceed from the inspired Jesus? Not only so. He had been exhorting his disciples to boldness and perseverance in

proclaiming the gospel; and if your definition of gehenna be the true one, he exhorted them to take the most direct course to incur the hatred of the jewish rulers, and the highest punishment which they could inflict. His language then amounts simply to this. Leap into danger of gehenna with your eyes open, yet entertain the greatest dread of him who has the power of casting you in thither. Make it morally certain that you shall suffer the punishment of gehenna, and yet do all you can to avoid it. Did the Savior preach such nonsense and falsehood? Surely not. Give the true exposition of the passage and his instructions appear clear, striking, rational and consistent. Matthew 10.28; Luke 12.5.

Take a fourth class of passages. "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of gehenna than yourselves." The scribes and pharisees use great zeal to make proselytes. When they have made one he is doubly deserving the punishment of gehenna. Then according to your definition he ought to be burned twice in the valley of Hinnom. You will recollect, however, that these words were addressed directly to the scribes and pharisees. Now the scribes were magistrates and the pharisees the ruling party; consequently they had in their own power all the punishment. If the burning of criminals was then practised they would be the last to incur such a judgment. This rendering then will not bear in this particular instance surely; so that you must give another meaning to gehenna in order to make any sense or truth of our Savior's words. Matthew 23.15.

Take a fifth example. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of gehenna." Will your definition bear in this sentence? Not at all. It was utterly impossible for the scribes and pharisees to incur any punishment which the jewish nation would inflict, let them be ever so guilty. Consequently they were in no more danger of being burned in the valley of Hinnom than of being drowned in the then unknown valley of the Mississippi. But this verse is manifestly addressed to men in real danger of gehenna, whatever it might be. The scribes and pharisees were then at the summit of whatever temporal power the Jews at that time possessed. Is it to be supposed that in all these instances our Savior either meant nothing at all, or mentioned a fire of which they were not in the least possible danger? Matthew 23.33.

Look also at the passage from James. "And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of gehenna." Does the writer mean to declare, that the human tongue is literally set on fire of the valley of Hinnom? Surely not. A passage from one of the jewish writers will illustrate the meaning of this verse. "A crafty tongue with coals of juniper, which were lighted in the infernal gehenna." Another author has this sentence. "I above, thou beneath. I from above will scatter arrows upon evil tongues, thou from beneath shall cast up coals upon them." James 3.6.

I have thus briefly noticed the passages in which the word gehenna is contained. Do you not clearly perceive that your definition makes our Savior utter nonsense

and falsehood in almost every instance? Is it not perfectly plain that your exposition does not bear in a single instance? I ask you to look for yourself. I could have made my remarks much more prolix, but the several cases seemed so perfectly clear that I could not feel willing to occupy your time with more objections. Believing as I do that Jesus spoke nothing but the most important truth, I must reject an interpretation which renders many of his solemn sayings so ridiculous and absurd.

Perhaps you may now say, that our Savior alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem; that those who were not converted to christianity would then be burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom. If he uttered such an idea he declared what never took place. I am not willing therefore to accuse him of falsehood. Many of those he addressed were dead long before the calamity befel the city. And those who perished at the time were not taken and burned outside its walls. So that there is not the least shadow of evidence for such a definition. Give your meaning in the passages in which gehenna occurs, and it destroys all the sense and connexion, makes our Savior a fool or a liar; and surely this is a sufficient reason for rejecting your exposition.

2. My second reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. The word evidently denotes some kind of punishment in all the instances in which our Savior used it. Now we have no evidence that the valley of Hinnom was a place of punishment in the time of our Savior and his apostles. We have satisfactory proof to the contrary. No instance of punishment in that place and at that period is recorded in the New Testament or any other book. You never find any persons but Christ and his apostle using the word. Our Savior mentions various kinds of trial to which his apostles would be liable; but he mentions gehenna in this connexion but once; and he then uses the word in such a manner that you plainly perceive he could not mean corporal punishment, since he had just spoken of killing the body as a matter of no consequence. The apostles never speak of themselves as in any danger of being burned in the valley of Hinnom; and the Jews never threaten either them or their master with such punishment. Consequently I cannot possibly believe that our Savior meant a literal, temporal punishment in the valley of Hinnom when he used the word gehenna.

3. My third reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. You have no evidence that a perpetual fire was kept up in the valley of Hinnom at the time our Savior was on earth. I know that a statement of this kind has been often repeated. I have often done it myself. I supposed the authors in which I found the account were to be trusted. I find this is not the case in this instance. An assertion to this effect was made by Rabbi Kimchi who flourished about the fourteenth century. If there is any other evidence for the truth of the story I have not discovered it; and surely this is not sufficient to satisfy any reasoning mind. Until further proof is produced I shall therefore strenuously deny that any perpetual fire existed in the valley of Hinnom in the time of our Savior. And if this be the fact, then he could not possibly have used the word gehenna in the sense you suppose.

4. My fourth reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. All the

truly qualified biblical critics from the earliest days of research to the present time have given a different exposition. They have investigated the subject thoroughly. They have had no interest whatever to deceive. If the evidence had been sufficient to convince them that gehenna meant a literal, temporal punishment, they would have declared this opinion with all readiness. I cannot therefore believe that such numbers of honest men could have been so long and so universally mistaken on this question. I might advance many more reasons for my rejection of your definition of gehenna did my limits permit. I have however said sufficient for all present purposes. I hope you will give them a candid consideration.

II. In the second place, I will mention a few reasons for believing that our Savior used gehenna to mean spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come.

1. This is the testimony of the Jewish writers of antiquity. I go to their writings to ascertain the exact meaning of a hebrew word in their day, and for no other purpose. I have nothing to do with their theology or religious sentiments. There is no other sure method of arriving at the truth on this question, as every biblical critic will admit. What works then have we to which reference can be made in this controversy. We have the Targums and the Talmuds. As you may not know much about these writings I will give you a brief but accurate statement respecting their origin and history.

What then are the Targums? They are chaldee paraphrases on different portions of the Old Testament. In the first place there is the Targum Ben Uzziel. This is a paraphrastic commentary on the prophets. The author was the chief disciple of Hillel the elder, who flourished in Jerusalem within thirty years of Christ. There can be no doubt of the genuineness and authenticity of this work. In proof of these we have first the testimony of all the later Jewish writers. We have second the entire absence of all anachronisms; that is, there is nothing which bears the stamp of a later date; there is no reference to names or events of a subsequent period; and this is a very strong ground of evidence, especially when you consider that the names of contemporary persons, of places, of allusions to local circumstances, are constantly occurring in all the Targums. I know a certain writer has asserted that this Targum was not quoted by the christian fathers for the first four centuries. Admit the fact for the sake of argument, and this objection is readily answered. First, these christian writers did not understand the chaldee, with the exception of Jerome. Second, Jerome learned it late in life, and complains that his knowledge of it was very superficial and imperfect. Third, the Jews were exceedingly backward in communicating any of their learning to christians. This is evident from the fact that the Rabbins whom Jerome hired to assist him in his hebrew studies came by night to avoid offending their brethren. Fourth, the Jews had special reasons for caution in communicating the contents of this book to the christians; for it explains many of the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the Messiah in the same way in which believers then did and now do. There is no reasonable doubt in the minds of those who have had time and ability to investigate this subject, that Jonathan, the author of the Targum on the prophets, was either a few years prior to Christ, or

contemporary with him. Of course his writings furnish the very best authority we could desire or can possibly have, for ascertaining the meaning of the word gehenna in the time of our Savior.

In the second place, there is the Targum of Joseph the blind. This author flourished about three hundred years after Christ. He was a teacher of the law at Babylon. He was peculiarly skilled in the Hagiography. Many disciples resorted to his school. They wrote down his explanations and remarks. The Targum which bears his name is probably a collection of extracts from their manuscripts with their comments. Its style shows it to be the work of several different hands. Now this work has a peculiar value in our present inquiry on this very account; for it shows not merely the opinion of the teacher but the views of his pupils in relation to the meaning of gehenna.

In the third place, there is the Jerusalem Targum. This must have been written as late as the sixth century, because events are referred to, and geographical names are inserted, which could not have had an earlier date; but it could not have been composed at a much later period. Its authority however may be regarded as great, for it consists principally of extracts from earlier Targums and other Jewish writings. In fact there is such a coincidence between many passages of this Targum and passages in the New Testament, that some critics have supposed it was extant in the time of Christ. There is of course not the least shadow of probability in supposing that the compilers of this Targum quoted from the Christian scriptures, a book which they utterly detested. We must then allow this Targum an authority on this question equal to the New Testament, or else suppose it to have been compiled in part from documents extant in the time of Christ, which is the same thing for my argument. On either hypothesis this Targum is of great value in determining the meaning that was given to Hebrew words in the days of our Savior. I have said sufficient on the Targums for all present purposes.

Let me now offer a few explanatory remarks respecting the Talmuds. In the first place there is the Jerusalem Talmud. Rabbi Judah Hakkadesh resided at Tiberias in Palestine about the year two hundred. He made or published a collection of the traditions of the Jewish doctors, in order to preserve them from being lost in the dispersion of the Jews and the interruption of the schools. This collection was termed the mishna, or second law. About a century afterwards Rabbi Jochanan lived in Palestine. He prepared a gemara, that is a filling up or completion of the mishna. This is at once a commentary on the mishna and also a supplement to it. The mishna and the gemara constitute the Jerusalem Talmud.

In the second place there is the Babylonish Talmud. This is much larger than the other. It is also much more known, and much more commonly used. It is composed of Rabbi Judah's mishna, and a gemara prepared at Babylon, perhaps as early as the year four hundred, and certainly not more than a century later. But as both these Talmuds are composed chiefly of sayings and writings much older than the date of their compilation, they are good authority for ascertaining the meaning of

hebrew words at a much earlier period. I think these notices are sufficient for all present purposes.

Now I wish you to understand distinctly the use I am about to make of these hebrew writings of antiquity. I do not search them to ascertain what the Jews believed concerning future retribution. No. Their opinions weigh nothing with me in this controversy. I go to them for the express purpose of learning what meaning the Jewish nation gave to the word gehenna in the days of our Savior and immediately after. He was born of jewish parents, and would use language as understood by his brethren according to the flesh, unless he signified to the contrary. This he has not done in the present instance. Now this is the only true and sure way of coming at the real meaning of words in any language. Let me give you an illustration. You find the word atonement but once in our English translation of the christian scriptures. You wish to know what meaning was attached to this term in the time of the translators. How can you determine this question? By examining other books which were written near that period. You take the plays of Shakspeare. You there find the word thus divided, at-one-ment. This shows you that the people of that day meant by the word atonement, reconciliation, bringing together those who were at variance, making them one. Now I am about to pursue a similar course in relation to the word gehenna; and all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.

In the first place, take a few extracts from the Targum of Jonathan. Read the following declaration. "Abram saw gehenna belching forth smoke and burning coals, and sending up sparks to punish the wicked therein." Surely he did not see the valley of Hinnom, for this would make him witness what no one pretends took place until a thousand years after his time. Hear the following remark. "The wicked are to be judged, that they may be delivered to eternal burning in gehenna." This surely cannot refer to the valley of Hinnom. Very many passages occur in which the wicked are threatened with the punishment of gehenna. But you want only those which clearly prove that future punishment was intended. Listen then to the three following sentences. "Like embers in the fire of gehenna which God created the second day of the creation of the world." "The earth from which springs forth food, and beneath which is gehenna, the cold of whose snow is changed so as to become like fire." "Thou shalt see them descending into the earth to gehenna." Thus have I given you five extracts from this Jewish writer who lived about twenty or thirty years before Christ. They plainly prove that he considered gehenna a place or state of future punishment for the wicked. They are comments on the following passages of scripture. Isa., 33.14, 17. Cant. 8.6. Job. 38.5. Wolf's Bibliotheca Hebraea, Part II. pp. 1159 – 60. Wetstein's N. T. on Matthew 5.22. Bartoloccus Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Part II. p. 136.

In the second place, take an example from Medrasch Thillium, an allegorical exposition of the Psalms ascribed to Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, who was born the first year of the Christian era. These are his words. "Circumcision is regarded with favor; for the holy and blessed swear to Abram that no one who was circumcised

should descend into gehenna." This cannot mean the valley of Hinnom. Wetstein Mat. 3. 9. Bartoloccus Part IV. pp. 272, 320.

In the third place, take a few specimens from the Pierche Eliezer, written by Eliezer the great, whose wife was great grand-daughter to that Simeon who took the infant Jesus in his arms. He flourished about the year seventy-three. These are his sayings. "On account of the sabbath Adam was delivered from the condemnation of gehenna." "Whosoever confesses his transgressions and forsakes them is delivered from the condemnation of gehenna." "The holy and blessed God has dealt with me in truth and goodness, and delivered me from the condemnation of gehenna." "All angels and seraphim shall not deliver the wicked from the condemnation of gehenna." You see that in all these cases gehenna is evidently used to denote future punishment. Bartoloccus. Part I. pp. 184, 6. Part IV. Chronological Index. Wetstein. Mat. 23, 33.

In the fourth place, take a few instances from Beraschitk Rabba, which was written by Rabbi Hoschiakia. He flourished about the year ninety five. These are the sayings. "Hereafter Abram will sit at the gates of gehenna, and will suffer no circumcised Israelite to descend thither; but what will he do with those who have sinned beyond measure? He will restore to them their foreskin, and they will descend into gehenna." "Before paradise gehenna was created; gehenna on the second day, paradise on the third day. This is the edge of the sword which turns every way, and which being directed towards them hereafter sets them on fire." "In that hour gehenna ascends upon the wicked. Woe to the world on account of the judgments thereof." Wetstein. Mat. 3.9; 5.22; 23.33. Luke 16.22. Bartoloccus, Part II. pp. 778, 82, 134.

In the fifth place, take one example from Maase Thorn, ascribed to Rabbi Hakkodesh who was born about the year one hundred and twenty. These are the words. "God admitted Hiram king of Tyre into paradise, because he had built the temple, and had been from the first a pious man; and he lived in paradise a thousand years; but when afterwards he began to be filled with pride and made himself a deity, he was expelled from paradise and descended into gehenna." Wetstein. Luke 23. 43. Wolf. Biblioth. Heb. Part II. p. 839. Bartoloccus Part III. p. 773.

In the sixth place, take a few passages from the Talmuds. I will give them in the order they occur in the original works. Look then to the following examples. "For those who observe the law, Paradise is prepared, but for transgressors, gehenna." Does this refer to this world or the next. "While you apply yourselves with the greatest labor and trouble to the study of the law, and yet neglect to fulfil it, you will become heirs of gehenna at your death, while you have enjoyed no pleasure in this life." This admits of no doubt. "Heretics, traitors, apostates, epicurians, those who deny the law, and those who deny the resurrection of the dead, those who separate themselves from the doctrines of the congregation, and those who cause terror among the dwellers upon earth, and those who have sinned and caused many to sin, as Jeroboam the son of Nebat and his companions; these all descend into

gehenna and are punished therein ages of ages, as it is written. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." This surely extends the meaning to a future world. "That ungodly man, Turnus Rufus, asked Rabbi Akiba, if your God loves the poor, why does he not feed them? He replied, in order that we may be delivered through them from the judgment of gehenna." "Whoever carefully celebrates the three feasts to be instituted every sabbath is delivered from three calamities, namely, from the distress at the coming of the Messiah, from the judgment of gehenna, and from the war of gog and magog." "God will redeem my soul from condemnation to gehenna, and he has delivered my body from condemnation to gehenna." "God hath set the one against the other, that is, gehenna and paradise." "You will escape the judgment of gehenna, and your portion will be with Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel and Leah." "The fire of gehenna does not prevail against the sinners of Israel so as to consume them, but they are sent down into it to be frightened and scorched awhile on account of their evil deeds; afterwards Abraham, who kept all the commandments and went down into the fire of the Chaldeans to sanctify the name of God, descends thither, and through his merits brings them forth from thence that he may establish the promise of the covenant." I could extend my quotations to an indefinite number; but sufficient have been presented for all necessary purposes. Wetstein. Mat. 3.9; 5.22; 28.15, 33; Luke 23. 43; Bartoloccius Part I. p. 143, 148, 138, 133.

You learn from these various quotations that gehenna was used by the Jews at and after the times of our Savior to mean future punishment for the wicked. That he used the word in the same sense there can be no doubt in the minds of sound critics. The only objection you will be likely to make to this conclusion may be thus stated. You may ask if there is any degree of probability that our Lord and his apostles knew any thing about the Targums? I have already furnished you some evidence on this question; and I may remark that those scholars who have given this subject a thorough investigation have a firm belief that some of these hebrew writings were then in existence. I will present one or two considerations which seem satisfactory to my mind.

In the first place, it appears that the Jews had lost their national language, the Hebrew, after the return from the captivity, since you find that Ezra was obliged to employ interpreters, while he read the law to the people. Their original language had become so corrupted during their residence in Babylon, and so intermingled with the Chaldaic, which was the language in common use in that region, that they could not understand the Hebrew scriptures without interpreters. From this period the Syro Chaldaic continued to be the established national language of the Jews. Of course, none but the learned would be able to understand the Hebrew scriptures, without the constant aid of interpreters. To the common people therefore the scriptures would be a sealed book, except on holydays when they might hear them expounded by those who had studied the hebrew. But the great multiplication of synagogues throughout Judea and Galilee would render necessary a correspondence in the number of interpreters, unless some translation was made of the scriptures into

the vulgar tongue. What more natural than that such translations should be made for the benefit both of the synagogue and of private families, and that they should be generally used? We certainly should expect it. Suppose there were no copies of the bible to be had in our country, except in the hebrew and greek languages in which they were originally written. Suppose that none but a few learned men were able to read the scriptures and that the people were obliged to content themselves with hearing a short passage translated from the pulpit on sundays. Would this satisfy the people? Would they not be likely to get some man of education to write a translation and commentary which they could read for themselves? Now the Jews regarded it as being much more important to be thoroughly acquainted with the scriptures than we do. It was the practice to commit them to memory, so that Josephus says, "For our people, if any body do but ask any one of them about our laws, he will more readily tell them all, than he will tell his own name; and this in consequence of our having learned them immediately as soon as ever we became sensible of any thing; and of our having them as it were engraven on our souls." Seeing then that the Jews regarded the scriptures as being of such importance that they committed them to memory, is it not altogether probable that they would generally wish to have a copy of them in a language which they could understand? Is it at all probable that they would be content merely to hear a passage read from them occasionally in the synagogue?

But in the second place, we have positive evidence that there were translations of the scriptures in common use among the Jews in our Savior's time. In addition to the books of the Old Testament, the Jews had a collection, oral, of laws or traditions, as they were called, which had been handed down for many ages from father to son, until finally, about one hundred and ninety years after the time of Christ, they were committed to writing, and received the name of mischna, under which name they have come down to us. Now on turning to the mischna, we find it plainly intimated that there were translations, or Targums, of the scriptures in common use among the Jews, at least as early as the time when the mischna was composed, (Targum is a chaldee word meaning translation,) and that is, even before the time of Christ, since Christ himself often speaks of the traditions of the Jews, and it is of these traditions, as has been remarked, that the mischna is made up. You will keep in mind that I never refer to these traditions for proof of a religious doctrine, but simply to ascertain the use of a hebrew word at that period. It was one of these traditions, as laid down in the mischna that "all sacred books ought to be preserved from fire, whether they are read in or not; and whatsoever language they are writ in, they ought to be laid up carefully." This plainly implies that the Jews had their sacred books in more languages than one, in at least one other language besides the hebrew. But no one pretends that at this time there were any translations of the hebrew scriptures in existence besides the greek and chaldaic. The greek translation, or the Septuagint, was used by those Jews who lived in foreign countries, and by them the traditions were never received nor acknowledged to be of any sort of authority. It is evident then that in the passage which has been referred to the chaldaic Targums must have been meant. I can see no room for further doubt on this subject. Here then you have one grand reason for my definition of the word gehenna. It was uniformly used by the

Jews in the time of our Savior and in succeeding ages to mean future punishment. I know of no other way of arriving at the true meaning of hebrew words and phrases.

I have not room to mention at length other reasons for my belief, many of which might be stated if the argument required. I will however observe, that my definition of gehenna seems absolutely necessary in almost every passage in which the word occurs to make our Savior utter either sense or truth, or be consistent with himself. This you can readily ascertain by an examination of the several verses already quoted. I would further remark, that I cannot believe all commentators of note, of every denomination, who have had no special interests to serve, could have been mistaken in the meaning of this hebrew word. They have spent months and even years in studies connected with this question; they had no cause at heart but truth; they were qualified for such investigations; and on the common grounds of judging their conclusions are not to be shaken without preponderating evidence on the other side. This never has and never can be produced. Not only so. The common meaning of gehenna makes our Savior's instructions consistent with themselves. He has spoken of a heaven for the righteous. Now the mode of interpretation which makes gehenna mean the valley of Hinnom would require that we look either to the garden of Eden or to the starry firmament for heaven, and confine the meaning of heavenly felicity to the present life. I think enough has been said to satisfy all candid inquirers that the common definition of this word is altogether the correct one; and consequently that our Savior threatened future punishment to the wicked.

III. In the third place, I will answer the objections which may be made to my definition of the word gehenna. I shall notice all which I think can have the least weight with candid inquirers after truth.

1. Perhaps you will affirm, that neither gehenna nor any other word is used in the hebrew scriptures to denote a place of endless misery for the wicked. This I readily grant. I admit that neither the doctrine of a future existence, nor the fact of a future retribution, is taught with distinctness and in a formal manner in the five books of Moses; but that the Jews of those days had some faint belief in both there can be no doubt. I also acknowledge that the evidence in support of these sentiments is not full and striking in the subsequent writing of the Old Testament. But what do these admissions prove in favor of your position? Just nothing at all. You must grant that the great majority of the jewish nation in the time of our Savior had a decided belief in both a future life and future retribution. And I have given you the outline of the testimony which has convinced those who have given this subject a thorough investigation, that gehenna was used to teach future punishment for the wicked in the time of Christ's personal ministry. So that your objection has no direct application to the question in controversy, and is satisfactorily refuted by the evidence presented.

2. Perhaps you may affirm, that gehenna occurs but twelve times in the christian scriptures, and is the only word which is supposed to mean a place or state of misery for the wicked. I admit that the word gehenna occurs but twelve times in

the New Testament. But does this admission prove the truth of your position? By no means. If our Savior has taught the doctrine of future retribution in but one sentence in the whole of his teachings, I am perfectly satisfied; for I cannot believe he was ignorant of the truth on this question; neither can I allow that he uttered even one falsehood. And surely any believer in revelation ought to bow in profound submission to a doctrine twelve times distinctly declared. Did he teach the idea of Providence on as many different occasion? Did he even assert the existence of his Father in a dozen discourses? Examine the records for yourself. But I do not admit that gehenna is the only word used in the christian scriptures to mean future punishment for the wicked. I find this solemn truth under different phraseology in very many other passages, some of which will be noticed in my next communication. And I am willing to confess that the removal of gehenna from the controversy would not shake my belief in the doctrine of a future retribution. I confine my remarks to this word in the present letter because I considered the argument on the topic perfectly satisfactory and conclusive. So that your objection in this instance is fairly answered.

3. Perhaps you will affirm, that the word gehenna is used only by our Savior and James, and ask why it was not mentioned by the other apostles? I am able to return a most satisfactory answer to your question, while I admit the truth of your assertion. Gehenna was a word which the Jews of Judea understood. To these our Savior addressed his discourses; and James wrote his epistles to converts from the same body. Some to whom the apostles preached, and to whom several of the epistles were partly addressed, were indeed of jewish extraction. But then they had been educated in foreign countries. They used the Greek language.

They knew little or nothing of the colloquial usages of Judea. They were acquainted with the Old Testament only through the Septuagint. Consequently the apostles, if possessed of the true spirit of gospel ministers, would not use a word which some of their hearers or readers could not understand. All these were firm believers in future retribution before and after their conversion, and consequently had no special need of elementary instruction on this doctrine. This then is the very best reason in the world why the other inspired teachers did not use the word gehenna. They could not use it to mean future punishment when addressing such believers with any more propriety than I could use the word hell to convey the same idea to a congregation of Germans. You will please to remember that the question is not whether the same word is always used, but whether the same doctrine is taught throughout the New Testament; and that this is the fact I shall fully prove. I seldom use the word hell in my discourses, but I preach future punishment for the wicked as distinctly as our orthodox brethren, who repeat the word hell in every sentence. Here then is a full refutation of your objection.

4. Perhaps you will affirm, that the word gehenna is not once used in addressing the gentiles, and ask the cause of this omission. I admit the truth of your affirmation, and will give you a convincing answer to your question. Gehenna is a word of hebrew origin. They understood neither this ancient language nor had heard of the meaning this word had acquired among the inhabitants of Judea. Consequently it

would have been talking or writing an unknown tongue to have reminded them of the gehenna fire. Suppose a missionary should address a society of converted Indians in their native dialect. Would he use the word hell when he wished to mention future punishment? By no means. And were not the inspired preachers possessed of common sense? If so they could not use gehenna when speaking or writing to heathen or converts from heathenism. All these believed already in future rewards and punishments, and only needed confirmation in their present belief. Consequently your objection has no weight against my argument.

5. Perhaps you will affirm, that the greater part of what our Savior said concerning gehenna was addressed to his disciples, and ask why he did not say more on the subject to the unbelieving Jews, if the word meant future misery? The truth of your assertion I admit, and will return a satisfactory answer to your question. To whom were most of his discourses addressed? To his disciples surely. To whom were his doctrines entrusted? Who were selected to propagate his gospel? And to whom was the greater portion of all his infractions on every subject delivered? To his disciples certainly. Why then should he make a distinction on this question? But, my dear sir, he did preach gehenna to the unbelieving Jews; and the different manner in which he declared this doctrine to the two classes of hearers fully establishes the truth of my exposition. Mark this peculiarity. When addressing his disciples he speaks of gehenna as something they might avoid by being his faithful disciples. Now if gehenna means a literal, temporal punishment, the very way to be exposed to it was by embracing his religion, and thus exciting the anger of the Jews. But if the word means future punishment, then surely they might escape by being righteous and holy. On the other hand, when he addressed the unbelieving Jews he uses language like the following. "How can ye escape the damnation of gehenna." Now if gehenna meant a literal, temporal punishment, these Jews were in no danger of suffering it; for they were the ruling party, and of course would not condemn themselves to death by fire; and at the destruction of Jerusalem the Roman, enemies did not burn any individuals outside of the city; according to your definition of the word therefore our Savior threatened them with a punishment to which they were not exposed, and would never suffer. But if you give the common meaning to gehenna his words are literally true. These unbelieving and persecuting Jews were in danger of future punishment from their very wickedness. So that this objection turns against yourself with tenfold power.

6. Perhaps you will affirm, that in all the places in which gehenna is used, the persons addressed are supposed to be acquainted with its meaning. This I readily grant. When the word hell is now mentioned we uniformly understand future misery. This was not the original meaning of the term by any means. This was not the exclusive meaning in the time our present translation of the bible was made. In the episcopal prayer book you read that Jesus descended to hell. Did the framers of the liturgy understand by this word a state of torment? Certainly not, as you may learn from their writings of the period. So it was with gehenna. It was originally used to mean the valley of Hinnom. But in the time of our Savior it was as generally understood to mean future punishment as the word hell is now supposed to convey

the same idea. This I have already proved by satisfactory evidence. But there is one argument which may be mentioned in this connexion. It was our Savior's boldness in threatening the selfrighteous pharisees with misery beyond the grave which so excited their anger and enmity. Consequently the admission of your objection furnishes another proof in favor of my position.

7. Perhaps you will affirm, that if gehenna means future punishment, the apostles never preached it to Jews or Gentiles. I admit that they used not this word, but it by no means follows that they never preached future punishment. They indeed omitted the word gehenna, and for the best reasons possible. Most of their discourses recorded in the book of Acts were not preached in Judea, where the meaning of the word would be easily understood. Besides there were doubtless more or fewer proselytes and heathen in almost every congregation, and the inspired teachers were too wise to use a word which they knew even one of their hearers could not feel. Not only so. There was no dispute on the subject of future retribution, for all believed this doctrine. Other topics engrossed their attention. So that a knowledge of the circumstances removes this objection entirely. Now you will remember that our principal concern in this controversy is, with doctrines and not words; and if the apostles recognised the belief then existing in future rewards and punishments, it is as much to my purpose as if they had used the word gehenna a hundred times. And that they did preach this doctrine to both Jews and Gentiles, either directly or by implication, I shall fully prove.

8. Perhaps you will affirm, that gospel salvation is salvation from sin, and not salvation from gehenna. The first part of your statement is correct, and the latter part incorrect. Sin and its consequences are the principal causes of misery in this world; and I believe they are the only causes of punishment in another existence. When a person therefore is free from sin and its consequences he is saved from spiritual wretchedness. Paul speaks in a passage I have already quoted of some of his converts being already saved, and on this account they would be hereafter saved from wrath or torment. Consequently he plainly taught that salvation from sin would secure salvation from future misery. And our Savior plainly taught the same doctrine in those very passages in which he uses the word gehenna. Yes; he assures his disciples, that unless they avoided certain sins, sins which could not come under the cognizance of human laws, they were in danger of gehenna. Salvation from these sins would then save them from gehenna. He told them to fear not any punishment man could inflict, and on your ground man could burn them to death in gehenna fire; but to fear him who could cast them after death into gehenna. According to the infallible teacher therefore salvation from those very sins which no human tribunal could punish would save them from gehenna and future wrath. Now does he not declare that some of mankind would not be saved from their sinfulness? Do not the apostles urge men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling? Do they not ask them how they can escape if they neglect so great salvation? Were they in no danger of losing christian salvation? Are not faith and repentance frequently mentioned as unalterable conditions of christian salvation? Now so long as sin exists misery must continue, and even longer, as you can testify. So long as there are those

whom Jesus has not saved from wickedness, so long there must be punishment. That many leave this world in an unsaved condition you will not deny. Consequently they need salvation from sin hereafter before they can be saved from misery. So that this objection is directly opposed to your own doctrine.

9. Perhaps you will affirm, that neither the hebrew, greek nor english languages had originally any name for a place of future punishment. Suppose I should admit the truth of this declaration, what would you gain in your argument? Just nothing at all. I can assert also that neither of these tongues had originally any name for a place of future reward. But does this destroy the truth of the doctrine? Surely not. You well know that all the nations which have spoken these several languages have believed in both future rewards and punishments from time immemorial. If our judges should condemn fifty pirates to be hung and omit to name any place of execution, would this prove that the sentence could never be executed? Ridiculous. Now you know that in the infancy of language sensible objects, processes and operations are the only ones to which names are usually given. In every language spiritual ideas are expressed by words which originally related to material objects; and which when first employed to denote things unseen and spiritual were used metaphorically. This is the fact in relation to paradise, heaven, gehenna and the like in other languages. So that this weak objection is fully refuted.

10. Perhaps you will affirm, that gehenna was originally used to mean the valley of Hinnom, and ask when its meaning changed to future punishment? I admit your assertion, and will answer your question by asking another. The word paradise was originally used to denote an earthly garden. The word heaven was first employed to mean the space over our heads. When did their meaning change to a place or state of future happiness? Because you cannot give a satisfactory solution to this inquiry does it follow that there is no happiness beyond the grave? Surely not. Then if the precise period cannot be fixed when the meaning of gehenna was changed, does this prove that it never has been changed? Absurd. When the english translation of the bible was executed, the word villian was applied to Paul and the other apostles. Its common meaning at that day was servant. Can you tell me when it was changed to denote a vile scoundrel? Such objections then are utterly futile. It is enough that we have the evidence that a change had taken place in the meaning of the word gehenna in the time of our Savior.

11. Perhaps you will affirm, that if the Jewish meaning be given to gehenna, it will prove a material hell. Not at all. This is one mode of infidel attack upon our religion. They say the Jewish writers describe God as possessed of human limbs, senses and passions, and therefore the God of the bible is a material Being. In the same way they attack the descriptions of heaven recorded in the scriptures, and contend that christians expect to enter a pleasant garden, or a splendid city, or the bosom of Abram, or the region among the stars. All this results from their ignorance or depravity. We must have sensible things to make ideas plain to uneducated minds. And consequently objects of this nature are employed when speaking of future punishment as well as when heaven and the Deity are mentioned. So that

this objection amounts to nothing, and would apply with as much force against the belief of a spiritual Father.

12. Perhaps you will affirm, that if I give to gehenna the meaning of future torment, I prefer the Targums to the books of the Old Testament. By no means. Your objection has no application to the case in question. I do not go to the jewish writers and commentators for any religious doctrines or precepts; or for their opinion on any article of christian faith and practice. But to ascertain the meaning of a word is a purely philological question. And the only way in which this can be done in the present instance is by reference to the Targums and Talmuds. This every critic will tell you. This every man of candor must admit. For we have few if any jewish writings of the period wanted except those I have consulted. I wish for example to ascertain the exact meaning of the term gehenna in the time of our Savior. The Old Testament cannot give me satisfaction on this question. Why so? Because the most modern writings in this book were composed about four hundred years before Christ. After this period the hebrew language underwent many and great transformations. Now the Targums and Talmuds come very near the days of our Savior. And even the comparatively later jewish writers, who use the word to denote future punishment, as they do in hundreds of instances, are good authority. For you cannot suspect them of borrowing the signification of hebrew words from christian writers. They evidently ground their doctrines on the Targums, the early Rabbins, and the Talmuds; for to all these they constantly refer. The Old Testament in the Septuagint version furnishes no authority one way or the other, for the valley of Hinnom is always rendered in some other form of words. Perhaps you will ask why great use is not made of these jewish writings in illustration of the scriptures? They have indeed been used to great advantage. Look at Lightfoot, Wetstein, Schoettgen and others; the greatest names in biblical criticism, and you will never ask such a question a second time. I have answered every objection which I think can have any influence with reasonable men. I will therefore conclude my present communication with one or two observations.

If you or any of your denomination are not satisfied with my conclusion, I ask you to appoint some well qualified person to make a thorough investigation of the whole subject. All the necessary books are to be found in the Library of Harvard University, which is open to all settled ministers within ten miles of Cambridge. I have no fear of the result. I feel morally certain that conviction must be produced upon any unprejudiced mind by the evidence there to be found, that our Savior used gehenna to mean future punishment. I had no idea of the mass of arguments for this definition until I gave my attention to the inquiry. I then found that I had neither time nor qualifications to make that thorough research which my work demanded. I accordingly obtained the assistance of two friends, the Rev. George D. Nichols, and the Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, tutor in Hebrew and Mathematics in the University, who are amply and admirably qualified for the undertaking. They have spent hours and days in poring over the Targums, and Talmuds, and other authorities in various ancient and modern languages. They have furnished me with numerous quotations, translated from the original chaldaic, some of which you have

in the present communication. They have provided materials enough for a volume, a small part of which are here presented; but as the case appears to me so perfectly clear, I have thought one letter sufficient for this topic. I am therefore prepared to defend the position I have taken; and, not only so, I can command the services of those who have already laid me under such lasting obligations, as well as of others whose acquirements and candor will render their statements worthy of the highest confidence. Many questions must be settled by a preponderance of evidence on one side. In this instance almost every argument of consequence favors my definition. You can say something against it, and so you can against the existence of matter. But the inquiries of biblical critics on this subject have uniformly led to the same results; and all I ask is that you should induce some disinterested witness to go to the College Library and make a thorough investigation of this question. Until then I shall consider that I have fairly proved the doctrine of future punishment from that class of passages in which the word gehenna occurs.

A letter to the Rev. Bernard Whitman, on the term Gehenna, rendered hell in the common version

Walter Balfour, Bernard Whitman
T. Whittemore and B. B. Mussey, 1834

Sir,

I have read your book, called – ‘Friendly Letters to a Universalist.’ In your sixth letter, I find my ‘First Inquiry’ is attacked, without naming it or me. To this letter I shall confine my reply; for with the rest of your book I have no more concern, than any other Universalist. I have no particular objections, however, to reply to your whole book, on the following conditions:

1. When Universalists, generally, deem your book worthy of a general reply, and wish me to undertake it. But I suspect, they look on your book, as you say Unitarians viewed mine, – ‘unworthy of any public notice.’

2. Some of your celebrated Unitarian ministers must endorse your book. Were I to refute the whole of it, Unitarians might say – ‘You have only killed a fly; for we consider Mr. Whitman’s book a very weak defence of future punishment.’ I wish to be certain, sir, that I am not to fight with ‘*a shadow*.’ If your greatest men think your book unanswerable, let them announce this to the public.

3. You must give me some public pledge, that you will not continue to misrepresent my opinions. Such a pledge is indispensable, as you have so grossly misrepresented my sentiments in your sixth letter. If you are so idle, as to find time to write misrepresentations, I cannot spare time to continue to write exposures of them. But for the following reasons, I should have taken no notice of your present misrepresentations. 1. Your sixth letter contains the first attack made by Unitarians on my views of gehenna. And as it professes to be ‘*a thorough investigation*’ of the subject; that you are ‘*to bring forward such evidence as seemed to settle this controversy beyond all doubt,*’ I thought some notice of it was necessary. 2. It appears the

learned arguments of the Unitarians against my views of gehenna are given in your sixth letter. Its principal materials were furnished you from Cambridge university, and at the expense of considerable time and labor to some gentleman there. From these considerations, I have concluded to examine this letter in detail. I shall quote all the material statements in your own words, and reply to them, – leaving the reader to judge for himself. I shall follow you step by step; from the commencement to the conclusion of your letter.

You commence thus: ‘My dear sir, I have selected and arranged eight classes of passages, which distinctly teach, or plainly imply future punishment.’ But you inform us, your limits did not permit you, ‘to give even a brief exposition of but one of the number.’ You observe – ‘the question at issue is not to be decided by the number of times a future retribution is recognized in scripture. A few undoubted instances must be as satisfactory to every sincere believer as many hundreds.’ Agreed. The question then is – What are the ‘*undoubted instances*,’ which you have selected out of your eight classes of texts? You answer – ‘I shall confine myself to that class of passages in which the Greek word gehenna occurs.’ No one can doubt, but this class of passages, are the most ‘*undoubted instances*’ you could find, in proof of your future retribution.¹ But when you come to p. 185, you say – ‘I am willing to confess, that the removal of gehenna from the controversy would not shake my belief in the doctrine of a future retribution.’ What then can shake your faith in this doctrine, if it would remain unshaken, after the ‘*undoubted instances*’ of proof are removed from it? Who, or what, can control that man’s faith, which is beyond the control of ‘*undoubted instances*’ of proof, and is not affected by their removal?

You say – ‘Gehenna is a word of exclusive Hebrew origin.’ And, after giving us the common description of the valley of Hinnom, etc. you add – ‘so far there is no disagreement.’ Nothing material, sir, except this. If gehenna is a Greek word, and exclusively of Hebrew origin, why did you not go to the Hebrew scriptures to ascertain its scriptural meaning? why avoid them altogether? But I must notice your next paragraph in detail, as it opens the controversy between us.

You say – ‘Now the learned commentators of all denominations contend, that the name of this loathsome, and fiery, and wormy valley, was afterwards used as an emblem of the future punishment of the wicked. They contend that our Saviour used gehenna to signify the torment which awaited the sinful in another existence.’ To this, sir, I answer. 1. The commentators *contend*, that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God. But you deny this. And if their *contending* for a doctrine is good evidence of its truth, Unitarianism is a mass of falsehood. Why then use an argument, which destroys your own system? It is what commentators *prove*, not what they *contend* for, any of us ought to care about.

¹A reply then to these ‘*undoubted instances*’ will be a reply to your whole book; for if you cannot establish your system by ‘*undoubted instances*’ of proof, it is a hopeless case to attempt it by such as are doubtful. It so happens then, that my battle is to be with the best of your troops, and if they are routed, victory is sure over all the rest, by your own confession.

2. No commentator has ever proved, that any *sacred writer* made gehenna 'an emblem of the future punishment of the wicked.' You adduce no such proof from them, which shows you could find none. And do you think, sir, that I ought to believe your *assertion* – 'that our Saviour used gehenna to signify the torment which awaited the sinful in another existence?' This has been *asserted* long enough. I now call on you to *prove* when, where, and by what inspired writer, gehenna was made an emblem of the future punishment of the wicked. This word has no such sense in the Old Testament, as all confess. Now, as you assert, this sense of gehenna was common among the Jews in the days of the Saviour, show us God's authority for it, some time between the completion of the Old Testament and the commencement of the gospel dispensation? I shall deem it of human origin, until you have proved its origin divine.

But alluding to, me, you say – 'This opinion was generally received as true, until one who is now a member of your body denied its correctness. He endeavored to show, that no such change had taken place in the meaning of the word. He aimed to prove, that gehenna must be taken in its literal sense, as a place of temporal punishment near Jerusalem.' On this it may be observed: 1. Here your misrepresentation commences; but I shall defer an exposure of it, until you are nearly done repeating it. Who, except Bernard Whitman, will say, that I 'aimed to prove that gehenna must be taken in its literal sense?' etc.

2. I not only deny, but glory in denying, 'that our Saviour used gehenna to signify the torment which awaited the sinful in another existence.' For ten years I have believed this opinion incorrect, and your book demonstrates its incorrectness. You abandon the Bible as proving it correct, as we shall see in the sequel.

3. You seem to intimate, that my views of gehenna are not true, because they do not accord with the 'generally received' opinion. Be consistent, then, and abandon Unitarianism; for does it accord with generally received opinion? If either the *antiquity* or *universality* of an opinion, is proof of its truth, let us both retrace our steps, for we are sadly out of the right way. But it must beget a smile, to see a Unitarian pleading the authority of commentators and generally received opinion, as evidence against my views of gehenna. It is building again what you have destroyed. You go on to tell us – 'Unitarians consider the doctrine of future retribution firmly established without a reference to this class of passages: they took little or no notice of the work; and very few of the denomination have perused it even to this day. Those who examined for themselves, stated, that the investigation of the subject was superficial, the reasoning inconclusive, and many of the arguments irrelevant,

and deemed it unworthy of any public notice.¹ On these statements we have a few remarks to make.

1. It is of very little consequence, what the Unitarians thought or said about my book; or that they deemed it 'unworthy of any public notice.' Certainly I have no reason to complain, that it has not been sufficiently noticed. I have sat, myself, and heard it preached against some half dozen times, and have learned from others, that many a clergyman has made it his theme in the *sacred desk*. It has also been noticed publicly in books from the press, by Messrs. Sabine, Hudson, Allen, Stuart, and now by yourself. And how often it has been noticed in the public journals, is beyond all my calculations. This is much more public notice, than I ever expected my book to receive. Indeed, few books for the last ten years in this region have received more public notice and it might well dispense with all' notice from Unitarians.

2. It appears, that as I left the Unitarians texts enough to establish their future retribution, they cared little about my book. This is assigned as the reason why 'they took little or no notice of the work, and very few of the denomination have perused it even to this day.' I know, Sir, that you have perused it, and now misrepresent it. I know also that some other Unitarian ministers have not only perused it, but approved of it. And one of these, instead of misrepresenting it, marked in the copy he read, his approbation of it; and he is not behind Mr. Whitman in character, talents, or investigation. I do not mention this, to prove my book correct.

3. But you tell us, some Unitarians examined my book for themselves. And they 'stated,' but to whom is not mentioned, 'that the investigation of the subject was superficial, the reasoning inconclusive, and many of the arguments irrelevant, and deemed it unworthy of any public notice.' Supposing these statements correct, permit me now to ask you a few questions.

1. Must not you be a very idle man, and fond of low dirty work, to meddle with my book? Why stoop to notice a work, which for ten long years has been below Unitarian notice, by your own frank confession? You disgrace the whole denomination, to say a word about a work, which was too contemptible for their elevated dignity to notice. Is the dignity of Unitarians fallen? Or, is my book risen in value during the last ten years?

2. But why was it necessary, before you noticed a book, which is below Unitarian notice, that you should go to the University for assistance? Let us hear your own confession about this; (p. 194.) 'I found that I had neither time nor qualifications to make that thorough research which my work demanded. I accordingly obtained

¹Does not this savour of sectarian self-importance? Must a book be good for nothing, unless Unitarians condescend to notice it? I am not aware, that many people think wisdom lives with, and must die among Unitarians. But by your own account, if my book is generally condemned among them, it is on the testimony of a few, for you say few of them have ever perused it. If it is condemned *generally*, it is condemned unheard, for but few Unitarians have *examined it for themselves*.

the assistance of two friends, the Rev. George Nichols, and the Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, tutor in Hebrew and the Mathematics in the University, who are amply and admirably qualified for the undertaking. They have spent hours and days in poring over the Targums and Talmuds, and other authorities in various ancient and modern languages. They have furnished me with numerous quotations, translated from the original Chaldaic, some of which you have in the present communication.' Is it possible, Sir, that you 'had neither *time* nor *qualifications* to make that thorough research which your work demanded,' to notice a book in which 'the investigation of the subject is superficial, the reasoning inconclusive, and many of the arguments irrelevant, and deemed unworthy of any public notice' by Unitarians! I suspect one of two things must be true. Either you did not believe what the Unitarians said of my book, or you must be a very modest, diffident man, unconscious of your superior talents. I am at a loss to perceive, how this book, could require any '*thorough research*' to refute it. These learned gentlemen ought to have told you – Mr. Whitman, it is only wasting time, to spend hours and days poring over the Targums and Talmuds, to find something to refute a book, which you know is below Unitarian notice, and which few of them have ever perused.' But it seems, you were all alike foolish in giving yourselves a world of trouble about nothing. I am sure, Sir, I never anticipated my book was to give you and these gentlemen so much trouble. But blame yourselves, – (or you confess the book did not deserve it.

3. But with all this learned assistance, why was it necessary for you to misrepresent my book? How do you account for the strange inconsistency, that the very first notice of the book, which for ten years has been below Unitarian notice, you now only notice it, to misrepresent it! Shall I ascribe this to want of discernment, want of candor, or something worse? A man of your controversial celebrity ought to have despised this. What possible need could there be, to misrepresent such a contemptible book, which any fool or child could refute, according to your Unitarian account of it? But,

4. Why should *Unitarians* now notice the book, which has been so much noticed by our orthodox brethren? If Messrs. Sabine, Hudson, Allen, or Stuart have refuted it, your notice of it is perfectly superfluous, a work of supererogation. When this child of mine was brought into the world, I confess I had some anxiety for its fate. I received no aid from the University. And by your own confession, the poor child might have died, for any aid it has received from Unitarians since. At its birth, they deemed it a poor, puny, sickly thing, which must soon die a natural death. They considered it 'unworthy of any public notice,' and very few of them have ever looked on the child to this day. It has, however, outlived all the hard treatment it has met with, and I have no fears it will ever expire under your hands. But as the poor child, would not die by unitarian neglect for the last ten years, it seems they wish now to kill it by their public notice. They will do the child no harm by their opposition, for the more hardly it has been treated, the better it has grown. In plain language, sir, my book still remains unanswered. All who have attempted this have more or less misrepresented it, and you excel them all in misrepresentation. Such attacks have done it good, and if misrepresentations of it, have cost you and others so much

trouble, what must be your labor, when you grapple with its real sentiments. If you have run with the footmen, and they have wearied you, you know the rest.

If my book is superficial in investigation, its reasonings inconclusive, and many of the arguments irrelevant, it is certain you had a similar opinion of all the books which have been written against it. This appears from your next words. You say, 'when I commenced my preparation for the present letter, I did not think much space could be allotted to this part of the discussion. On examination, however, I became convinced that your view of the word was altogether erroneous, and concluded to bring forward such evidence as seemed to settle this controversy beyond all doubt. The results of a thorough investigation will now be submitted to your candid consideration.' A plain confession sir, you believed, that none who have attempted to answer my book, had settled 'this controversy beyond all doubt;' or, had laid before us 'the results of a thorough investigation.' Unless they had all failed, in refuting a book below unitarian notice, your attempt was unnecessary. Let us now attend to your '*thorough investigation.*' You say,

I. 'In the first place I will state some of my reasons for rejecting your definition of the greek term gehenna. How then do you say I define it? Your answer is – 'You contend that gehenna was used to denote a place of literal punishment in this world alone, out of the city of Jerusalem.' This, however, is only your own misrepresentation, which I shall show in its place. But against this misrepresentation all your force is directed, and my views of gehenna are left unmolested. You say, 'All valuable commentators affirm, that Jesus employed the word as an emblem of the spiritual punishment of the wicked, both in this world and the next existence.'¹ This is the view I take of the subject, and the one which I shall attempt to defend.' Let it then be distinctly remembered, that the view which you have pledged yourself to defend, contains the following ideas. You haro got to prove, that gehenna means '*spiritual punishment,*' and spiritual punishment '*both in this world and the next existence.*' That this spiritual punishment is for 'the wicked;' and that Jesus employed gehenna as an emblem of this punishment. Let us now attend to your reasons. You say,

'1. I reject your definition of gehenna, because it makes our blessed Saviour utter nonsense and falsehood. Look at the several passages in which he employs the word. The following is the first instance, Matt. v. 22.' After quoting this text, you say – '*I defy you or any man; I challenge you or any individual.*' And you repeat your challenge thus – '*I defy you to produce a single example in which they (the*

¹Mr. Whitman, – on whose authority do commentators affirm this? Not on God's authority, for it is conceded on all hands, gehenna has no such meaning in the Old Testament. Not on the authority of Jesus Christ or his Apostles, for you affirm, p. 183, that – 'gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of the Saviour to mean future punishment.' It is not on inspired authority; nor even on the authority of uninspired Jews, who lived in the days of the Saviour, as we shall see afterwards. Even supposing the Jews, in our Lord's day, used gehenna in this; sense, do you think Jesus imbibed their traditions in his childhood, and propagated them as a part of the doctrine received from his Father? Did he receive for doctrines the oommaudments of men? Did he not constantly refer the Jews to their own scriptures?

Jews) punished any breach of their laws by burning in the valley of Hinnom; and consequently no one of those our Lord addressed, were in any danger of being thus punished for any crime whatever.' Thus, you go on to fight your first battle with a man of straw to the end of the paragraph. But all this is mere blustering; for every child knows from John xviii. 31, that the Jews then could not put any man lawfully to death, by any mode of punishment whatever. And surely, Bernard Whitman, of Waltham, knows, that my views of gehenna have nothing to do with 'burning in the valley of Hinnom.'

You say, our Lord's meaning in this passage is – 'he meant that the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings must be as severe as the punishment which could be inflicted in three several methods. And when he used the word gehenna, he extended the sufferings beyond the grave, as this word was then employed to denote the future misery of the wicked, which I shall soon prove.' So, you are honest enough to confess, that all this is mere assertion, but which you are to prove afterwards; and yet you draw the following conclusion: 'Thus you see your definition of gehenna makes our Saviour utter nonsense and falsehood.' Can you tell us sir, what is the precise value of a conclusion, which is drawn from a misrepresentation, and a number of confessed assertions? Thus ends your first battle with a man of straw. You say,

'2. Take a second class of passages.' These are Matth. v. 29, 30. 9. Mark xviii. 43, 45. After quoting the first of these texts, you repeat your misrepresentation thus: 'What connexion would the cutting off an offending member have with being burnt in the valley of Hinnom? What court had authority to inflict this kind of punishment on account of a person's being led into sin by his right eye?' My readers must consult the Rev. Bernard Whitman for an answer to these questions; for I know of no '*connexion*' these things have with my views of gehenna. You forget to give us an explanation of any of these passages. Such is your '*thorough investigation*' of the subject. But you say,

'3. Take a third class of passages.' These are Matth. x. 28 Luke xii. 5. You quote the first of these texts, and ask – 'What can you make of this verse, on your system? I answer, Consult my book, and see. Why did you answer a matter before you heard it? Prov. xviii. 13. But you ask again – 'What more than the body could be destroyed in the valley of Hinnom?' And thus pass off your misrepresentation in the form of a question. You add – 'Give the true exposition of the passage, and our Lord's instructions appear clear, striking, rational, and consistent.' But how can this appear, until 'the true exposition' is given? You give us no exposition, either true or false; so that we must take *nothing* for 'a thorough investigation' of the subject. You say,

'4. Take a fourth class of passages.' But this is only Matth. xxiii: 15. After quoting it, your misrepresentation is thus repeated. 'Then according to your definition he (the proselyte) ought to be burnt twice in the valley of Hinnom.' As usual, you give us no exposition of this passage; but say,

'5. Take a fifth example.' This is Matth. xxiii. 33. Your established misrepresentation is thus repeated. 'The Scribes and Pharisees were in no more danger of being burned in the valley of Hinnom than of being drowned in the then unknown valley of the Mississippi.' Agreed. We are also agreed, that 'this verse is manifestly addressed to men in real danger of gehenna, whatever it might be.' What then was it? Dr. Allen, sir, Orthodox as he is, confessed I had offered something like argument in my exposition of this passage. But, according to your views, our Lord said to the unbelieving Jews – 'How can ye escape the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings, the spiritual punishment of the wicked both in this world and the next existence?' Does the context, sir, point out such an exposition as this? Examine and see, if it does not rather sanction mine, given in my first Inquiry. You add,

'6. Look also at the passage from James, Chap. iii. 6. After quoting it, you ask – 'Does the writer mean to declare, that the human tongue is literally set on fire of the valley of Hinnom? 'Which is your common mode of presenting your misrepresentation. But as a rarity, you give us the following exposition of this passage. You say – 'A passage from one of the Jewish writers will illustrate the meaning of this verse. "A crafty tongue with coals of juniper, which were lighted in the infernal gehenna." Another author has this sentence, "I from above will scatter arrows upon evil tongues, thou from beneath shall cast up coals upon them."' But, sir, did you not notice, that in the first of these quotations, gehenna is called the *infernal* gehenna, which *smells* strongly of paganism. And in your second, *gehenna* is not mentioned at all. Nor does it appear, how either of these quotations give the true sense of the passage. Casting '*up coals,*' and '*coals of juniper,*' does not look much like a '*spiritual punishment.*' The Jewish hell and yours, is far from being the same, as we shall see in the sequel. The, difference is so great, that I am surprised, you did not perceive it, and abandon your cause.

You have thus passed in review, all the texts in the New Testament where gehenna occurs. I have now a few brief remarks to make on your labors. 1. The whole number of occurrences are twelve. These you divided into six classes; but for what reason I cannot conjecture, unless it was for parade, and to afford you more opportunities to repeat your misrepresentation, and fight six battles with a man of straw. Your troops, might surely have been divided into more or fewer divisions, to gain such a victory.

2. From no one text, have you so much attempted to prove, that gehenna means '*spiritual punishment.*' This you never intended. You have made no appeal to the Old Testament, and your proofs from the whole Bible are here closed. It is a mere burlesque on investigation, to call yours '*a thorough investigation.*' I have been saved all trouble, of defending my views of the different texts where gehenna is used, for you have waged no war with them, or so much as named them.

3. It will be asked, what then have you been about all this time? I answer, making assertions; giving us promises; and fighting with your own shadow. Being '*burned in the valley of Hinnom,*' has been the burden of your song, your unvaried

tune of misrepresentation. It is of Waltham manufacture, sir, and if it makes the Saviour utter nonsense and falsehood, blame the manufacturer. Is it asked, How then are you to prove your views of gehenna, seeing you have abandoned the Bible? The sequel will show, that the Targums and Talmuds are to be your oracles on the subject.

4. Shunning battle with my views of gehenna, speaks a volume. It was not from ignorance of them, this was done. In your last paragraph under your first reason, you begin thus – ‘Perhaps you may now say, that our Saviour alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem.’ But you perceived you was stumbling near my views, and finished the sentence thus – ‘and those who were not converted to Christianity, would then be burnt in the valley of Hinnom.’ Not forgetting to add – your view ‘makes our Saviour a fool and a liar.’ But all this shows, you knew more about my views of gehenna, than you deemed prudent to disclose to your readers. Here, there was a want of something else than discernment. Had my writings furnished such an unguarded sentence, no doubt but you would have quoted it. I was not prepared to expect such misrepresentations from Mr. Whitman, and I am sorry he should have resorted to them. I frankly forgive you, and am sure, your own painful feelings will be a sufficient punishment. Nor is there any need for you to go into another world to suffer it, for no doubt you will suffer enough here from your own reflections. But you say,

‘2. My second reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. The word evidently denotes some kind of punishment in all the instances in which our Saviour used it.’ Well, as you only mention ‘spiritual punishment, both in this life and the world to come,’ I must conclude this is always your sense of gehenna in the New Testament. It means ‘the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings.’ p. 167. But if you really believe this, it is very strange you should carefully avoid proving it. You say – ‘Now we have no evidence that the valley of Hinnom was a place of punishment in the time of the Saviour.’ Be it so; I say, ‘Now you give us no evidence, that gehenna meant a spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come in the time of our Saviour,’ which balances this account. You add – ‘We never find any person, but Christ and his Apostles, using the word.’ True. But this fact shows your assertion false in another place, that gehenna ‘was uniformly used by the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, to mean future punishment.’ p. 183. If it had then meant this, our Lord would have got enough of such punishment threatened him by the Jews.

But you say – ‘Our Saviour mentions various kinds of trials to which his Apostles would be liable; but he mentions gehenna in this connexion but once; and he then uses the word in such a manner that you plainly perceive he could not mean corporal punishment, since he had just spoken of killing the body as a matter of no consequence.’ This is a strange statement; for, 1. The chief part of all our Lord said about gehenna, was mentioned to his Apostles. Now, if he only mentioned gehenna once to them, in connexion with the trials to which they would be liable, do tell us, in what other connexion it was mentioned to them? 2. Did our Lord

threaten his Apostles, with '*spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come,*' and that in connexion with the trials to which they would be liable? And did he threaten them with this, a great deal more than he did the wicked Jews? Moreover, was the destroying both soul and *body* in gehenna a matter of no consequence? And did this mean '*spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come!*' 3. Do you console Christians at Waltham, under their trials, by threatening them with this gehenna punishment? And do you say very little about it to your wicked hearers? You tell us, p. 186 – 'I seldom use the word hell in my discourses.' Where then is your fidelity or consistency? 4. My views of gehenna, rationally and scripturally account for our Lord's conduct, in saying so much to the Apostles, and so little to the wicked Jews about gehenna. This you may see in my First Inquiry. But my views, whether right or wrong, you were not prepared to engage with.

I thank you for the following. You say – 'The Apostles never speak of themselves as in any danger of being burned in the valley of Hinnom; and the Jews never threaten either them or their Master with such a punish merit. Consequently I cannot possibly believe, that our Saviour meant a literal, temporal punishment in the valley of Hinnom, when he used the word gehenna.' Who ever supposed he did? But I return you your own remarks with a slight alteration. 'The Apostles never speak of themselves as in any danger of gehenna punishment in the next existence; and the Jews never threaten either them or their masters with such a punishment. Consequently, I cannot possibly believe, that our Saviour meant spiritual punishment in the next existence when he used the word gehenna.' This is committing suicide on your own system. We have sometimes met with a writer who contradicted himself, and in using one argument destroyed the force of another; but here you dash your views of gehenna to pieces with one single blow. This argument, sir, is like a two edged sword. In striking your man of straw with the one edge, you have killed yourself with the other. The fact, sir, is indisputable, that the Apostles never expressed the least fear about punishment in your gehenna or hell; nor did the Jews ever threaten them or their Master with such punishment. No, sir; where did the Jews ever threaten Christ or his Apostles, with any *gehenna* punishment? How then do you account for the fact, admitted by yourself, that the Jews never threatened Christ or his Apostles with gehenna punishment, if gehenna 'was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to' mean future punishment?' They must have been very modest, and very diffident, to hear him say, 'How can ye escape the damnation of gehenna,' yet never retorted the threatening upon him. Like you, the Jews could say – 'We seldom use the word *gehenna* or *hell* in our discourses.' And yet you assure us, it was '*uniformly*' used among the Jews in that day. Their uniform silence, is at point blank variance with your assertion. Again you say,

'3. My third reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. You have no evidence that a perpetual fire was kept up in the valley of Hinnom at the time our Saviour was on earth.' Answer. 'You have no evidence, that gehenna in the days of the Saviour meant 'the spiritual punishment of the wicked both in this world, and the next existence.' This is death again by your own hands. But again: whether a perpetual fire was, or was not kept up in the valley of Hinnom in the days of

our Saviour, is of no consequence to my views of gehenna. Whether you believe, or disbelieve this opinion on Rabbi Kimchi's authority, does not affect them, as we shall see presently. You are here, only prolonging your battles with a man of straw. You say,

'4. My fourth reason for rejecting your definition of gehenna is this. All the truly qualified biblical critics from the earliest days of research to the present time have given a different exposition.' A different exposition from what, sir? 'From the one you have been all along imputing to me, which is, 'being burned in the valley of Hinnom.' But this is not my definition, but your own misrepresentation; and they must be poor biblical critics, who do not give a different exposition from it. But, 1. You forgot sir, that the exposition given of gehenna by the biblical critics, is as different from your views of gehenna as it is from mine. What biblical critic defines gehenna to mean – *'spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come?'* 2. It is truly amusing, to see you finding fault with me, or rather with your own misrepresentation of my views of gehenna, as different from that of the biblical critics, – giving different views from them yourself; and yet skulking behind their authority for protection. But their authority would weigh little with you, where Unitarianism was the point in discussion.

3. But why fight so many battles with a man of straw? Why shun an encounter with my views of gehenna as a child would a fancied ghost? Your well-known courage, stimulated by the critics, commentators, and Cambridge scholars, has not emboldened you so much as to name my views of gehenna.

Such are all your reasons, for rejecting what you call my views of gehenna, but which is a gross misrepresentation. I must now have my own way for a season. I have stated above, in very plain terms, that you have grossly misrepresented my views of gehenna punishment. That charge I shall now prove. The fairest way to do this, will be, first to state your misrepresentations in your own words – and second, quote from my books, the views of gehenna I have published to the world. The reader seeing both, can then judge for himself, whether thy charge is true or false.

1. Let us see what your misrepresentations are, and in your own words. We are not liable to mistake here, for they are often repeated. On p. 164, you said – 'I aimed to prove, that gehenna must be taken in its literal sense, as a place of temporal punishment near Jerusalem.' On p. 165, you said – *'I contend that gehenna was used, (by Jesus) to denote a place of literal punishment in this world alone, out of the city of Jerusalem.'* On p. 166, you said, I maintain *'gehenna punishment means burning in the valley of Hinnom.'* And, *'being burnt in the valley of Hinnom,'* p. 167. On p. 168, you said, I hold that gehenna means *'being destroyed by burning in the valley of Hinnom,'* and, *'to be burned twice in the valley of Hinnom.'* On p. 169, you represent me as believing, that gehenna means *'being burned in the valley of Hinnom, literally set on fire of gehenna.'* And on p. 170, you state my views to be, *'burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom.'* I might refer to other pages, where the same or similar misrepresentations are given. But these instances are sufficient to

show, what your misrepresentations are. Let us now see,

2. What views of gehenna punishment, I have given in my books, published years ago to the world. My difficulty here is, in making a selection which is brief, as I cannot spare room to give my views in detail. For this, see my First Inquiry, Chap. ii. Sect. 1, and other publications. After quoting the 19th Chapter of Jeremiah, and also the 7th, from verse 29 to the end, I show at length – ‘that Jeremiah used gehenna as an emblem of future’ temporal punishment to the Jews as a nation.’ But I shall make the following quotation from my reply to Professor Stuart’s Exegetical Essays. It not only contains a brief statement of my views of gehenna, but is a refutation of the same misrepresentations made by yourself. It stands thus, on p. 218:

‘1. Did the inspired writers in the Old Testament use the terra gehenna, as meaning ”*tartarus*, the place of infernal punishment?” No; you do not say, or insinuate any such thing. On the contrary, you contend for its meaning *only* the valley of Hinnom. And you wish your readers to believe, that *valley of Hinnom* is the only sense your opponents attach to this word. Was such a *misrepresentation* of the views of Universalists respecting this word, done designedly, or was it from ignorance of their sentiments? I wait for your answer to this, to know whether to exercise *charity*, or feel *pity* for the man and his cause, which obliged him to state such a gross misrepresentation. It is on the authority of the Jewish Rabbins, not the Old Testament writers, the sense of *tartarus* is given by you to *gehenna* in the New Testament.

‘2. The inquiry must then be, In what *sense*, or *senses*, did the Old Testament writers use the term *gehenna*? I find they used it, 1st. *Literally* for the valley of Hinnom, as the word signifies. The texts where it is so used I need not cite, as on this point there is no dispute between us. They may all be seen in my First Inquiry.

‘2d. I find *gehenna* used in a figurative or emblematical sense, to describe the temporal miseries God was to bring on the nation of the Jews, for their sins. Some of their greatest sins and abominations had been committed in this valley, and the place is used to set forth the wretchedness of their condition, when God’s judgments came upon them. It was a fit emblem to set forth this, by your own description of the valley.’

I shall only add the following from p. 219. ‘That *gehenna*, or the valley of Hinnom, should be used as a symbol to set forth the temporal miseries of the Jews, can never be consistently objected to by you. Do you ask why? Because on p. 143 you speak of your *hell* in a future state being symbolized by it.’ And surely, Mr. Whitman cannot object to this, for he tells us, p. 165, and other places – ‘Jesus employed gehenna as an *emblem* of the spiritual punishment of the wicked, both in this world and the next existence.’

Such are my views of gehenna, whether right or wrong. They were not adopted to-day, but were published to the world years ago; and with them Mr. Whitman

no doubt was familiar. In writing the above reply to Professor Stuart's misrepresentation, little did I think I was preparing a reply to the misrepresentation of the Rev. Bernard Whitman. Such a misrepresentation comes with an ill grace from Unitarians, who have complained so bitterly of orthodox misrepresentations. But, widely as the two sects differ in their opinions, in one thing they are agreed, to misrepresent the opinions of Universalists. Mr. Whitman, your misrepresentations are so palpable, and so often repeated, that no remarks are necessary to point them out. Any child can perceive them. I have tried to devise an apology, but I find this impossible. I even find it difficult to account for your attack on Universalists, and why you should select my First Inquiry as the subject of your misrepresentation. I have asked,

1. Was Mr. Whitman ignorant of my opinions? No. It would be dishonorable to his character, to suppose he attacked a book, and was ignorant of the sentiments it contained. You are not one of those Unitarians, who have 'not perused the work, even to this day.' I have asked,

2. Can Mr. Whitman have any personal grudge to gratify against me, or the sect of Universalists? As for myself, I cannot indulge for a moment such a suspicion; for we have always been on the most friendly terms when we have happened to meet. Nor am I aware, that Universalists as a sect, have ever given him any provocation. It is true, the Rev. L. R. Paige, of Cambridgeport, pointed out some things in his writings, which looked like contradictions. But this was not a sufficient reason, why he should attack the whole sect of Universalists, or me in particular. Mr. Paige is of age to answer for himself, whenever Mr. Whitman is at leisure to call on him. I have further asked,

3. Could Mr. Whitman's vanity prompt him to attack Universalism, thinking he could refute that, which our Orthodox brethren had failed in accomplishing. No, for in this case, he would have magnified, not depreciated, my book. It was necessary to the gratification of his vanity. I have asked,

4. Did Mr. Whitman's ardent love of truth, and hatred of what he deemed error, prompt him to this attack on Universalism? This is doubted; for an ardent love of truth, would have prevented him from misrepresenting my opinions. Besides, the question occurs, Why has he delayed his attack so long, for he has been familiar with my views of gehenna punishment for ten long years? Why notice now, what Unitarians have deemed unworthy of notice so long? Something of late must have roused Mr. Whitman against Universalism. What then has done this? What led him to misrepresent my opinions?

5. I can devise no other cause, but the rapid spread of Universalism. It has been said, and with some appearance of truth, – '*Universalism bids fair to be the prevailing heresy of the age.*' And some have alleged, that my First Inquiry has contributed to its prevalence. I suspect, Unitarians, like some other sects, have got alarmed at its rapid progress, and Mr. Whitman thinks himself competent to put

down the *heresy*. I admit there is just cause for alarm; but will it ever be put down by misrepresentation? Is it not alarming, that some people composing Unitarian societies, should be Universalists? Does it not add to the alarm, that some of them are even found in Orthodox societies, yea, are members of their churches? And, our Orthodox friends have long alleged, that some Unitarian ministers are Universalists.

We presume it to be more than an idle rumor, that Mr. Whitman, Unitarian minister at Waltham, is himself a Universalist. And what renders the case more alarming still, sometimes a society dismisses an Orthodox or Unitarian minister, and settles a Universalist in his place. And for one Universalist, or Universalist minister who goes over to them, two come from them over to us. But what renders the case desperately alarming is, none of them seem able to refute Universalism, either from pulpit, press, or in public debate. Many have tried to refute it, and the very attempts have only tended to the increase of the heresy. What a melancholy state of things.

I am aware, very few Unitarian ministers openly avow Universalism in their preaching. But even this fills the ranks of Universalists. People, and even our Orthodox brethren, give Universalists credit for their honesty, in openly teaching their sentiments. But they have long blamed Unitarians, for disguising theirs. It is said, they never openly avowed Unitarianism, until driven to it by controversy; and perhaps it may be the same, in their openly avowing Universalism. Most people like frank, open honesty in religion, and prefer the Sect of the Universalists on that very account. They also perceive, that Universalists are willing to live on friendly Christian terms with Unitarians; but this is not generally reciprocated on their part. Some decline an exchange of pulpit services with the Universalists, and with the same breath, loudly and bitterly complain, that their Orthodox brethren will not exchange with them. They seldom, exchange with Universalists, except when the people demand it, and the dread of a dismissal produces a compliance. Besides, Universalists in some towns, have aided in the building of Unitarian meeting-houses, and have been denied the use of them for an evening lecture, when not occupied by the Unitarians.¹ In some cases, promises were held out, until Universalists had bought their pews, and afterwards no regard was paid to them. The patience of some Universalists have been tried to long suffering; and seeing no remedy, have united and built a house for themselves. And some Unitarians, disgusted at this treatment of Universalists, have abandoned the Unitarians and joined with them. Thus the very opposition to Universalism, accelerates its progress. Have Universalists ever treated Unitarians in this manner? Did they ever deny Unitarians the use of their meeting-houses when not occupied by themselves? If they have, I blush for

¹To this remark, we are happy to say, there are some honorable exceptions. In several places we have preached in Unitarian houses. It is also our opinion, that the best men among Unitarians, disapprove of this illiberality of one sect of Christians towards another. They are willing people should hear all sides and judge for themselves; and some Unitarian ministers are willing to exchange pulpit services with the Universalists.

such Universalists.¹

I am truly sorry, Mr. Whitman has proclaimed war against Universalists. But I cannot believe most Unitarians approve of his conduct; and certainly never will approve of his misrepresentations. It is my consolation, that I have never given him the least provocation to this, but always have esteemed him, and wished to maintain Christian friendship with him. If we must have war, all will exonerate me, for the first gun has been fired by himself. It is true, it is only blank cartridge, mere misrepresentation, but still it shows no very *friendly* disposition. He no doubt would have charged with grape-shot, had my book furnished it. In plain language, his misrepresentations show, that he cannot meet my views fairly, and this must eventually injure himself, and the cause he has espoused. It will turn out, for the furtherance of Universalism still more, for people will see, it cannot be refuted by Mr. Whitman with all his aid from the University. When he shuns battle with my views of gehenna, and fights with his own shadow, people will ask – ‘What can this mean? We can account for it in no other way but this: – either weakness in him, or truth in the sentiments he opposes. He has shunned battle with nothing that is Orthodox; but before he can do any thing with Universalism, he is obliged to misrepresent it.’ But perhaps Mr. Whitman is to set the battle in array under his second division of the subject, to which I shall now give attention. He says,

‘II. In the second place, I will mention a few reasons for believing that our Saviour used gehenna to mean spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come.’ (p. 72.) You immediately add – ‘this is the testimony of the Jewish writers of antiquity.’ But are you not mistaken; for what Jewish writer testifies – ‘that our *Saviour* used gehenna to mean spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come?’ It is certain you quote no such testimony from them; but on the contrary say – ‘I go to their writings to ascertain the exact meaning of a Hebrew word in their day, and for no other purpose. I have nothing to do with their theology or religious sentiments.’ Unless ‘their day,’ and ‘the days of the Saviour,’ then are the same, you go to their writings in vain: and if you adopt their sense of gehenna, how can you avoid the theology they connect with it? Moreover, as there is no other sure method of arriving at the exact meaning of gehenna, but from the Jewish writings of antiquity, this is confessing your abandonment of the Bible, in deciding the question at issue.

You ask, ‘What works then have we to which reference can be made in this controversy?’ You answer – ‘We have the *Targums* and *Talmuds*.’ Again, you ask, ‘What then are the Targums?’ You answer – ‘They are Chaldee paraphrases on different portions of the Old Testament.’ Prideaux, sir, enumerates eight Targums;

¹Mr. Sabine frankly confessed to me, that he had never seen before, such candor and liberality as was manifested by the Universalists in Charlestown. When he announced his intention to preach down my First Inquiry, and was refused a suitable meetinghouse by his own orthodox brethren, they unanimously voted him the use of theirs. He accepted of it; and he was allowed to take his own time, and his own way to accomplish his purpose. The result of his labors is well known, and need not be here mentioned.

and some critics increase their number to ten. But you only select three of them, which no doubt you deemed best adapted to your purpose. There are two Talmuds, and you use them. You also quote some other Jewish writings, which will be noticed in their place. Now, as you say, 'I go to these writings to ascertain the exact meaning of a Hebrew word in their day, and for no other purpose.' The principal point of investigation *here*, is, did any of these Jewish writings exist in the days of the Saviour? The *antiquity* of your Jewish writings, is the question in discussion; and if you do not prove that they existed in our Lord's day, how can they prove how gehenna was then used among the Jews, or in what sense it was used by the Saviour? Let the reader bear constantly in view, that the *age* of your Jewish writings, is now the point in dispute. You say,

'In the first place, there is the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel.' The question is, When did he live and write? You say, – 'He flourished in Jerusalem, within thirty years of Christ.' This is your *assertion*, and this has been asserted by some others. But why did you conceal from your readers, that critics of the first eminence, have given a very different account of the age of Jonathan's Targum? Some critics, sir, date this Targum in the seventh century after Christ, and you seem to admit, none of the Christian fathers quote it for the first four centuries. But, as you bring up again the date of this Targum, when you make your quotations from it, I shall reserve what I have to say further about it, until its proper place. You say,

'In the second place, there is the Targum of Joseph the blind.' Well, when did he live and write? In the days of the Saviour? No; you frankly confess – '*this author flourished about three hundred years after Christ.*' But this, sir, is giving up the ship; and it is sinking her to add – 'he was a teacher of the law at Babylon,' and his Targum, 'is probably a collection of extracts from his disciples' manuscripts.' Concerning this Targum, Prideaux says – 'Who this Joseph was, or when he lived, is not said.' And Calmet remarks – 'This author is much more modern, and less esteemed, than Jonathan ben Uzziel.' And Horne adds – 'The younger Buxtorf, and after him, Bauer and Jahn, are of opinion that the whole is a compilation of later times: and this sentiment appears to be the most correct.' You say,

'In the third place, there is the Jerusalem Targum. This must have been written as late as the sixth century, because events are referred to, and geographical names are inserted, which could not have had an earlier date.' Well, by your own confession, this Targum did not exist until the sixth century after Christ. But Home says – 'It is more likely not to have been written before the eighth or ninth century.' Would it not answer the same purpose, sir, to refer us to the Targum of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, who flourished at Waltham, in the year eighteen hundred and thirty-three. But the very late date of this Targum does not discourage you; for you add – 'its authority however may be regarded as great.' Why? You answer, 'for it consists principally of 'extracts from earlier Targums and other Jewish writings.' You are not bold enough to assert, that they are as early as the days of the Saviour, but you say – 'in fact there is such a coincidence between many passages of this Targum, and passages in the New Testament, that some critics have supposed it

was extant in the time of Christ.' A drowning man will catch at a straw. Prideaux, sir, gives these coincidences, – which are, Luke vi. 38. Rev. xx. 6,14; v. 10. Matt. vi. 9; compared with this Targum, on Gen. xxxviii. 26. Deut. xxxiii. 6. Exod. xix. 6, and Deut. xxvi. 6. But he accounts for these coincidences of language thus: 'The truth of the matter most probably is, there were sayings and phraseologies which had attained among the Jews in our Saviour's time, and continued among them long after; and hence our Saviour and his apostles, and afterwards the author of this Targum, had them as from the same fountain.' But, unfortunately for you, not one of these coincidences mentions anything about gehenna. And it is still more unfortunate, there is no proof, that this Targum 'consists principally of extracts from earlier Targums.' And if even this was proved, it can never be proved the quotations you make about gehenna, are part of those earlier Targums. So your straw fails you for support. I suspect, sir, your '*thorough investigation*' was not very thorough.

But, after all the importance which you seem to give to Joseph's Targum, and the Jerusalem Targum, we shall see in the sequel, you avoid quoting them. For this reason, I despatch what I have to say about them in this place. It was ill-judged in you to introduce these Targums – confess their late dates – yet wish your readers to believe, they prove in what sense our Lord used the term gehenna. They may certainly ask, Does Mr. Whitman think us fools? But you say,

'Let me now offer a few explanatory remarks respecting the Talmuds.' Well, when were they written? By your own confession, the *Mishna* of the Jerusalem Talmud was not made until 'about the year two hundred.' And the *Gamara*, its second part, not until 'a century afterwards.' And you also confess, the Babylonish Talmud was not made until about – 'the year four hundred,' or 'a century later.' But even these dates are somewhat too early, as will appear from some quotations to be made in the sequel. Farther discussion about this is altogether unnecessary. Conscious their dates did not suit your purpose, you add – 'but as both these Talmuds are composed chiefly of sayings and writings, much older than the date of their compilation, they are good authority for ascertaining the meaning of Hebrew words, at a much earlier period.' Mr. Whitman, the question is, Did these *sayings* and *writings* exist in the days of the Saviour? This is the point to be proved. If these sayings and writings are now in existence, quote them. And if they are not, what do you know about them? How can sayings and writings, about which you know nothing, ever prove in what sense our Lord used the word gehenna? Is not this getting along at a miserable rate, to talk about *sayings* and *writings* you have never seen, nor read, nor knew what they contained. This, sir, is not standing still, – it is sinking.

Before quoting your Jewish writers, you give us the following preparatory remarks. I shall quote them entire, as they deserve some notice. You say, pp. 175, 176,

'Now I wish you to understand distinctly the use I am about to make of these Hebrew writings of antiquity, I do not search them to ascertain what the Jews be-

lieved concerning future retribution. No. Their opinions weigh nothing with me in this controversy. I go to them for the express purpose of learning what meaning the Jewish nation gave to the word *gehenna* in the days of our Saviour, and immediately after. He was born of Jewish parents, and would use language as understood by his brethren according to the flesh, unless he signified to the contrary. This he has not done in the present instance. Now this is the only true and sure way of coming at the real meaning of words in any language. Let me give you an illustration. You find the word atonement but once in our English translation of the Christian scriptures. You wish to know what meaning was attached to this term in the time of the translators. How can you determine this question? By examining other books which were written near that period. You take the plays of Shakspeare. You there find the word thus divided, *at-one-ment*. This shows you that the people of that day meant by the word atonement, reconciliation, bringing together those who were at variance, making them one. Now, I am about to pursue a similar course in relation to the word *gehenna*; and all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.'

On this paragraph I remark, 1. I '*understand distinctly*' the use you are about to make of the Hebrew writings of antiquity. I understand, you 'go to them for the express purpose of learning what meaning the Jewish nation gave to the word *gehenna* in the days of our Saviour, and immediately after.' I also understand, Jesus was born of Jewish parents, and would use language as understood by his brethren according to the flesh, but *learned from their own scriptures*, unless he signified to the contrary. This he has not done in the present instance. But I cannot understand, that Jesus adopted a sense given to *gehenna* by the Jews, whether it was scriptural or not. Nor can I understand, that the Jews, in our Lord's day, used *gehenna* to designate future punishment; or, that you can quote any Jewish writing that existed in his day, which teaches such a sense of *gehenna*. And if such a writing did exist, I cannot understand it to be scriptural or rational, to interpret our Lord's words by Jewish traditions which he condemned. I hope you will understand this *distinctly*. 2. I am not surprised, you begin to feel uneasy in the prospect of making your quotations from Jewish writings, and make apologies about them. They are so silly and ridiculous, as to give a man of common sense the *fidgets* for a month. Keep yourself perfectly easy, sir, for I have no suspicion you believe a word of them. I suspect, your uneasiness chiefly arose from perceiving, that your quotations did not prove your *spiritual punishment*; hence you now drop this phrase and use another, '*future punishment*.'

3. But observe, sir, in the above paragraph you assume what you ought to have proved. You assume, that the Targums and Talmuds you are about to quote, existed in the days of the Saviour. But why assume this, which is the very point in discussion? Why assume this, sir; for by your own confession, most of these writings did not exist until several hundred years after the days of the Saviour. I do not blame you for not accomplishing an impossibility. No, I only blame you for attempting it. All built on this assumption of course falls to the ground; and your all, you know, is built upon it. But having assumed, that the Targums and Talmuds existed in the

days of the Saviour, you go on to assume, that these writings must explain what was the sense of gehenna in his day. Yes, you aver, they must as certainly do this, as Shakspeare's playts must explain what was the sense of the word atonement when our English version of the New Testament was made. But this is imposing on your readers; for it appears the Targums and Talmuds did not exist, until two or more hundred years after the days of the Saviour. In preaching at Waltham, do you use Scripture words, in a new and strange sense, which they are to have three or four hundred years hence 1 If you do not, why impute this to the Saviour 1 But if he did this, why did he not say as you do – 'I have nothing to do with their Theology. Their opinions weigh nothing with me in. this controversy.' But,

4. The word *atonement* is a very unfortunate example selected for illustration. *Gehenna*, like the word *atonement*, is a compound word; but divide it as you may, you cannot make it mean 'spiritual punishment,' either in this world or the world to come. Again. If for want of Scripture usage of the word *atonement* in the New Testament, you must recur to Shakspeare's plays to ascertain its meaning, there was no occasion to recur to the Targums and Talmuds to ascertain the Scripture sense of *gehenna*; for you confess it occurs twelve times in the New Testament. But a man of your scholarship, could recur to the original for the true sense of both words. Now, sir, if *katalage*, rendered *atonement*, occurs four times in the New Testament,¹ and *gehenna*, rendered *hell*, occurs twelve'times, here was sufficient Scripture usage to ascertain the meaning of both words. There was not the least occasion to go to Shakspeare, the Targums and Talmuds, to find their true meaning. And if this range of Scripture usage was too limited or uncertain, you could extend it to the Old Testament in both cases. Put thip would have ruined your whole system.

5. You tell us – 'I am about to pursue a similar course in relation to the word gehenna; (as with the word atonement,) and all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.' If this, sir, be true, then abandon the Protestant maxim, that 'the Bible is its own best interpreter.' If this is true, adopt the Catholic maxim, that 'the Bible must be explained by tradition,' yea, by Jewish tradition.' If this be true, Bible Societies ought to take the hint, and have the Targums and Talmuds bound up with the Bible. If this be true, Jesus Christ, after condemning the whole mass of Jewish traditions, adopted the sense given to gehenna in their traditions several hundred years after his death. But, as you risk your reputation, in saying – 'all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at the true meaning of gehenna but by the Targums and Talmuds,' I must give this some attention. Now, sir, I assert, no *judge* of this question will give such a decision. I submit it to the following judges, and no one will say they can be biassed in favor of my opinions.

1. Was Dr. Campbell a judge? Let us hear his decision? In his third dissertation, he says – 'The opinion of Grotius and some learned Rabbis, unsupported by either argument or example, nay in manifest contradiction to both, is here of no

¹Besides, *katallasso* occurs six times for your assistance.

weight. Scripture usage alone must decide the question.' No, says Mr. Whitman – 'Targum and Talmudic usage *alone* must decide the meaning of gehenna.' You expressly say – 'All judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.'

2. Is Dr. Jahn a judge? In his dissertation on the importance and best method of studying the original languages of the Bible, he says – 'Every thing depends on the *usus loquendi*; so that whatsoever is not directly or indirectly deduced from it, is necessarily uncertain and unstable. The *usus loquendi*, however, is a simple *historical fact*. To discover what it was, we must investigate what meaning the ancient Hebrews attributed to the words and phrases of their vernacular tongue.' See the whole dissertation. ,

3. Is Professor Stuart a judge? In his notes on Jahn's dissertation, and modifying some of his remarks, he says – 'I admit we have but very scanty remains of the ancient Hebrew tongue: but, in the volume which we have, are comprised a great variety of authors, and all the varieties of composition. It is from a comparison of these that the *usus loquendi* of the Hebrews is acquired; just as in reading Herodotus, and Homer,' and Xenophon, we obtain the *usus loquendi* of the old Grecians, and Attic writers.' He adds – 'it is not correct to say, that there are no good witnesses to the *usus loquendi* of the ancient Hebrew except the kindred dialects. The Hellenistic Greek in the Septuagint, in the Apocrypha, and in the New Testament, written by Jews who either spoke the Hebrew itself, or a mixture of it with the Syriac or Chaldee, which so nearly resembles it, is, *in a great multitude of instances*, a good witness to the point in question. The words indeed are Greek, but the language, i. e. the method of expression, the coloring, and the sense of the words are all conformed to the Hebrew mode of expression and thinking.' I might quote much more to the same purpose from Mr. Stuart. Did he, in his controversy with the Unitarians, say as you do – 'all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at the true meaning of the Scriptures respecting Christ's divinity, but by consulting the Targums and Talmuds?' Had he done this, they would have deemed him insane. But,

4. Is Horne a judge? Let us hear him directly on the point in question. In his Introduction to the critical study of the Holy Scriptures, vol. ii. pp. 298, 299, he thus writes – 'In availing ourselves of the assistance to be derived from the Jewish writings, we must take care not to compare the expressions occurring in the New Testament too strictly with the Talmudical and Cabbalistieal modes of speaking; as such comparisons, when carried too far, tend to obscure rather than to illustrate the sacred writings. Even our illustrious Lightfoot is said not to be free from error in this respect; and Dr. Gill has frequently incumbered his Commentary with Rabbinical quotations. The best and safest rule, perhaps, by which to regulate our reference to the Jewish writers themselves, as well as those who have made collections from their works, is the following precept, delivered by Ernesti: '*We are to seek for help,*' says he, '*only in those cases, where it is absolutely necessary; that is, where our knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew tongues affords no means of ascertaining an easy sense,*

and one that corresponds with the context.' See the whole paragraph. Have you, sir, observed Ernesti's precept? Was it absolutely necessary for you to go to the Targums and Talmuds for the true sense of gehenna? Did the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures afford no means of ascertaining an easy sense, and one that corresponds with the context? No man will say so, who has paid attention to the subject. It was absolutely necessary, for you to go to the Targums and Talmuds to establish your system about gehenna; for without them you confess it cannot be established.

5. I shall add a judge from your own sect. In the 'Unitarian Miscellany' there is an article headed '*Causes of early errors in religion.*' The writer concludes his article thus. 'Christians should study with care the grounds of their faith, and, rejecting all systems of human invention in which these errors are found, should seek for truth in the Bible *alone*. Here, and here only, we have the religion of Jesus and his Apostles, unimpaired by the ravages of time, and unperverted by the vain imagination and wayward designs of men.' Have you sought '*for truth in the Bible alone,*' respecting *gehenna* punishment? No, sir; you have sought for it *alone* in the Jewish writings of antiquity, and expressly say, p. 183 – 'I know of no other way of arriving at the meaning of Hebrew words and phrases.'

Here, sir, is a whole bench of judges, Scotch, English, German, and American, whose decision is unanimous against your assertion. Most critics adopt Ernesti's precept, and recur to the Jewish writings only when Scripture usage fails. They seldom recur to them to determine any doctrinal point, but only where Jewish rites, ceremonies and customs are the points in question. You are inexcusable, and self-condemned, in appealing to the Targums and Talmuds on the subject of gehenna. Were I to say – 'all judges will assure you, that the true sense of the word *logos*, John i. 1, is that given in the Targums and Talmuds,' what would you say? To be consistent, you must abandon your Unitarianisra, for these writings assert the divinity of the Messiah from the word *memra*, *logos*, or *word*. See Basnage's History of the Jews, pp. 173, 174. Unitarians would laugh the Trinitarians to scorn, were they to prove the divinity of Christ by the Targums and Talmuds, saying – 'all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.' But I must drop this topic, and attend to your quotations from the Targums and Talmuds. I shall quote the whole of them at once, from pp. 176 – 180. You say,

'In the first place, take a few extracts from the Targum of Jonathan. Read the following declaration. 'Abram saw gehenna belching forth smoke and burning coals, and sending up sparks to punish the wicked therein.' Surely he did not see the valley of Hinnom, for this would make him witness what no one pretends took place until a thousand years after his time. Hear the following remark: 'The wicked are to be judged, that they may be delivered to eternal burning in gehenna.' This surely cannot refer to the valley of Hinnom. Very many passages occur in which the wicked are threatened with the punishment of gehenna. But you want only those which clearly prove that future punishment was intended. Listen then to the three following sentences: 'Like embers in the fire of gehenna, which God created the

second day of the creation of the world.' 'The earth from which springs forth food, and beneath which is gehenna, the cold of whose snow is changed so as to become like fire.' 'Thou shalt see them descending into the earth to gehenna.' Thus have I given you five extracts from this Jewish writer who lived about twenty or thirty years before Christ. They plainly prove that he considered gehenna a place or state of future punishment for the wicked. They are comments on the following passages of scripture. Isa. xxxiii. 14, 17. Cant. viii. 6. Job. xxxviii. 5. Wolf's *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, Part II. pp. 1159 – 60. Wetstein's N. T. on Matthew v. 22. Bartoloccus *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, Part II. p. 136.

'In the second place, take an example from *Medrasch Thillium*, an allegorical exposition of the Psalms, ascribed to Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, who was born the first year of the Christian era. These are his words: – 'Circumcision is regarded with favor; for the holy and blessed swear to Abram, that no one who was circumcised should descend into gehenna.' This cannot mean the valley of Hinnom. Wetstein. Matt. iii. 9. Bartoloccus, Part IV. pp. 272, 320.

'In the third place, take a few specimens from the *Pierche Eliezer*, written by Eliezer the great, whose wife was great-grand-daughter to that Simeon who took the infant Jesus in his arms. He flourished about the year seventy-three. These are his sayings: – 'On account of the sabbath, Adam was delivered from the condemnation of gehenna.' 'Whosoever confesses his transgressions and forsakes them is delivered from the condemnation of gehenna.' 'The holy and blessed God has dealt with me in truth and goodness, and delivered me from the condemnation of gehenna.' 'All angels and seraphim shall not deliver the wicked from the condemnation of gehenna.' You see that in all these cases gehenna is evidently used to denote future punishment. Bartoloccus, Part I. pp. 184, 5. Part IV. Chronological Index. Wetstein. Matt, xxiii. 33.

'In the fourth place, take a few instances from *Beraschith Rabba*, which was written by Rabbi Hoschiakia. He flourished about the year ninety-five. These are the sayings: – 'Hereafter Abram will sit at the gates of gehenna, and will suffer no circumcised Israelite to descend thither; but what will he do with those who have sinned beyond measure? He will restore to them their foreskin, and they will descend into gehenna.' 'Before paradise gehenna was created; gehenna on the second day, paradise on the third day. This is the edge of the sword which turns every way, and which being directed towards them hereafter sets them on fire.' 'In that hour gehenna ascends upon the wicked. Woe to the world on account of the judgments thereof.' Wetstein. Matt. iii. 9; v. 22; xxiii. 33. Luke xvi. 22. Bartoloccus, Part II. pp. 788, 82, 134.

'In the fifth place, take one example from *Maase Thora*, ascribed to Rabbi Hakkodesh, who was born about the year one hundred and twenty. These are the words: – 'God admitted Hiram, king of Tyre into paradise/because he had built the temple, and had been from the first, a pious man; and he lived in paradise a thousand years; but when afterwards he began to be filled with pride, and made

himself a deity, he was expelled from paradise, and descended into gehenna.' Wetstein. Luke xxiii. 43. Wolf. Biblioth. Heb. Part II. p. 839. Bartoloccius, Part III. p. 773.

'In the sixth place, take a few passages from the *Talmuds*. I will give them in the order they occur in the original works. Look then to the following examples: – 'For those who observe the law, paradise is prepared, but for transgressors, gehenna.' Does this refer to this world or the next? 'While you apply yourselves with the greatest labor and trouble to the study of the law, and yet neglect to fulfil it, you will become heirs of gehenna at your death, while you have enjoyed no pleasure in this life.' This admits of no doubt. 'Heretics, traitors, apostates, epicurians, those who deny the law, and those who deny the resurrection of the dead, those who separate themselves from the doctrines of the Congregation, and those who cause terror among the dwellers upon earth, and those who have sinned and caused many to sin, as Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, and his companions; these all descend into gehenna and are punished therein, ages of ages, as it is written. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.' This surely extends the meaning to a future world. 'That ungodly man, Turnus Rufus, asked Rabbi Akiba, If your God loves the poor, why does he not feed them? He replied, in order that we may be delivered through them from the judgment of gehenna.' 'Whoever carefully celebrates the three feasts to be instituted every sabbath is delivered from three calamities, namely, from the distress at the coming of the Messiah, from the judgment of gehenna, and from the war of gog and magog.' 'God will redeem my soul from condemnation to gehenna, and he has delivered my body from condemnation to gehenna.' 'God hath set the one against the other, that is, gehenna and paradise.' 'You will escape the judgment of gehenna, and your portion will be with Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel and Leah.' 'The fire of gehenna does not prevail against the sinners of Israel so as to consume them, but they are sent down into it, to be frightened and scorched awhile, on account of their evil deeds: afterwards Abraham, who kept all the commandments and went down into the fire of the Chaldeans to sanctify the name of God, descends thither, and through his merits brings them forth from thence that he may establish the promise of the covenant.' I could extend my quotations to an indefinite number; but sufficient have been presented for all necessary purposes. Wetstein. Matt. 3. 9; 5. 22; 28. 15, 33; Luke 23. 43; Bartoloccius, Part I. p. 143, 148, 138, 133.'

Such, sir, are the precious materials, furnished by your friends at the University. They cost them 'hours and days poring over the Targums and Talmuds,' etc. to collect. They are the results of a '*thorough investigation*,' which is to '*settle this controversy beyond all doubt*.' Let us then examine these quotations? They present two general topics for consideration – *the dates of your Jewish writings*, and *the nature of the punishment described in your quotations from them*.

1. Let us examine the *dates* of your Jewish writings. If the reader asks – Were not the dates of these writings introduced above, and why introduce them again?

I answer, Mr. Whitman introduces them twice, but it is not my business to prescribe to him what course he ought to pursue, but to follow him in the one he has adopted. I come then to my second task about *dates*. On p. 172, you said, it was 'the testimony of the Jewish writers of antiquity, that our Saviour used gehenna to mean spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come.' And on pp. 173 – 175, you mentioned as your witnesses to prove this, the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, the Targum of Joseph the blind; the Jerusalem Targum; and the Jerusalem and Babylonish Talmuds. Such was then the list of your witnesses; and in presenting it to the court, you said concerning Joseph's Targum, '*this work has a peculiar value in our present inquiry.*' And concerning the Jerusalem Targum, you observed – '*we must allow this Targum an authority on this question equal to the New Testament.*' Such, Mr. Whitman, were your statements then? But how happens it, these witnesses, so important to your cause, are now absent? Why have you dismissed them? If it was because none of them existed in the days of the Saviour, for the same reason all your witnesses ought to have been dismissed, and your cause abandoned. But if you have dismissed these two witnesses, you have introduced others. Their number is now increased to six, corresponding to your six classes of texts, and no doubt you have made the best possible selection of them. Let us now attend to them, and let the reader bear in mind, your Jewish writers must have lived in the days of the Saviour, and must be credible, competent witnesses to prove our Lord used gehennato mean future punishment. You say,

'1. In the first place take a few extracts from the Targum of Jonathan.' Well, the question is, when did he live and write? Above, p. 172, you said he 'lived within thirty years of Christ.' But now, you say he lived, 'thirty years before Christ.' In addition, to what I said about Jonathan's Targum above, we have now a few remarks to make. 1. Eminent critics are against you, as to the antiquity of this Targum. Jahn says – 'The work is a collection of interpretations of several learned men made towards the close of the third century, and containing some of a much older date, for that some parts of it existed as early as in the second century appears from the additions.' With this statement, respecting the age of Jonathan's Targum by Jahn, Eickhorn, Bertholdt, Baur, and other eminent critics generally agree. Prideaux says, vol. 4. p. 578 – 'These Targums are the ancientest books the Jews have, next to the Hebrew Scriptures. This is certain of the Targum of Onkelos on the Law, and of Jonathan on the Prophets.' He adds, 'Onkelos' Targum is not only the first in the order of place, as being on the Pentateuch, but the first also in order of time and the ancientest that was written of all that are now extant.' Onkelos' Targum you do not quote at all, and for a good reason, because it says nothing about gehenna meaning future punishment; and yet, it is universally admitted to be the oldest and best of all the Targums. Jonathan's Targum is your chief dependence to prove your position, yet is admitted to be inferior to Onkelos' Targum, both as to age and value.

But further; as some critics place the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, as productions of the second or third century after Christ, so Prideaux says concerning all the Targums – 'It was much above one thousand years after Christ, ere Christians knew anything of these Targums; and scarce three centuries have

passed since they have become common among us.' Alas! for the poor ignorant Christians, who lived in ancient times, for they wanted these writings to teach them the true sense of gehenna. Had you only lived a few hundred years ago, you would have been in the same deplorable condition.'

2. But the nature of Jonathan's Targum is as much against you as its date. Prideaux says – 'For, whereas the Targum of Onkelos is a strict version, rendering the Hebrew text word for word, Jonathan takes on him the liberty of a paraphrast, by enlargements and additions to the text; for therein are inserted several stories, and also several glosses of his own, which do not much commend the work.' Calmet says – 'The Targum of Jonathan, son of Uzziel, is much more diffuse than Onkelos, and especially on the lesser prophets, where he takes great liberties, and runs on in allegories. It is thought that the Jewish docters, who lived seven hundred years after him, have made additions to him.' It is evident, your quotations are *glosses* and *additions* made to the sacred text by somebody; and it matters but little, when they were made, or who made them.

3. Jonathan has no Targum on Canticles and Job, as you intimate, p. 177. I presume, your friends at the University, furnished you with a mass of extracts taken from various Jewish writers; but you have ascribed that to Jonathan, which was taken from some other writer. The mistake is of little consequence, and a thing which might happen with a very accurate man, from mere inadvertence. It is similar, to a lawyer in court, ascribing a part of the testimony to one witness, which was given by another. By what witness was it given? And by whomsoever it was given, how does it serve your cause? You must make a Targum, and date it as far back as the days of the Saviour, before it can be of any use to you. It is very idle to quote anything which is more modern.

'2. In the second place, take an example from *Medrasch Thillium*, an allegorical exposition of the Psalms, ascribed to Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, who was born the first year of the Christian era.' Indeed! But, 1. Supposing this true, how do you know but his '*allegorical* exposition of the Psalms' ought to be understood *allegorically*? Basnage shows, that some of the Jewish writings were written so, and must be so understood. But to answer your purpose, this *allegorical* exposition must be understood '*spiritually*,' to suit your 'spiritual punishment.'

2. Basnage, in his history, mentions a Jewish writer, of the name of Akiba. But his testimony would not be received in court, where a ten dollar bill was impending. Some say he was born A. D. 1, and died A. D. 120, or 140. Basnage says, p. 115: – 'St. Epiphanius makes him lire before the captivity of Babylon. But he is grossly mistaken. For this doctor was master of *Aquila*, that famous interpreter, who translated the Holy Scriptures in the reign of Adrian.' And in p. 149, speaking of the University set up at Lydda, adds: – 'Here it was, the famous Akiba taught, till Gamaliel drove him from his school.' But for what was he famous? Let Basnage answer: – 'On pp. 515 – 520, among other things, he gives us the following account of Akibas' character. He became the forerunner to the famous robber Barchochebas,

who pretended to be "*the star that Balaam saw afar off.*" After relating Akibas' clandestine marriage with his master's daughter; his studying twenty-four years; his coming home with twenty-four thousand scholars, who all died between the passover and pentecost; he adds: – 'Akiba continued teaching and writing books, one whereof is cabbalistical, and is called *Jetzirah*, but it must be distinguished from that which is ascribed to the Patriarch Abraham, and bears the same name. He was so learned, as to give an account of the least letter of the law; and it is boldly said, that *God revealed to him, what he had concealed from Moses.* We find in the Mischna and the Talmud, a thousand sentences ascribed to him, and which are looked upon as so many judicious decisions. God had permitted him to enter paradise as well as doctor *Asai*, to whom he was to marry his sister. *An entire volume would not contain the remarkable things he has said and done.* These are the commendations they give this doctor, who caused the desolation of his country, and supported the fraud of an impostor, who called himself the Messiah.'

Basnage goes on and says, – 'Akiba became the forerunner of the famous robber and impostor Barchochebas, when his fame was at its height. These two men, falling in with the prejudices of the people who were for a conquering Messiah, brought on a war which ended in their ruin. They mustered an army of two hundred thousand men, every one of whom 'could pluck up a cedar of Libanus, as they run on horseback.' Basnage adds, 'Adrian caused Akiba's skin to be torn off with an iron comb. And with him the honor of the law vanished.' Moreover, he says, – 'This war broke out in the year one hundred and thirty-four, in the seventeenth of Adrian's reign.' Basnage seems to fix the year of Akiba's death 'to the year A. D. 135, or 136.' See pp. 156, 531. There must be a mighty famine of proof in the land, and even at the University, when Akiba is one of your witnesses. For,

3. I ask, on what solid ground do you ascribe such a work to Akiba on the Psalms. I have looked into Basnage's history with some care, but cannot find any such work ascribed to him, or any Akiba whatever. Wolfius, who professes to give a catalogue of all the works which pads under his name, ascribes no such work to him, or any person by the name of Akiba. Prideaux, vol. iv. p. 571, mentions as the seventh Targum, 'that on Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs.' Is the work you refer to a part of this Targum? If it is, Prideaux ascribes it to Joseph the one-eyed,' and adds – 'But who this Joseph was, or when he lived, is not said.' The Jews have a number of books, such as the book Sohar, Jetzira, Pirke, Abbot, etc. But critics deem them worthy of little confidence. And Basnage affirms – 'Some Rabbins have said, that perhaps these holy doctors never lived, and their miracles are a fabrication.' You say,

'3. In the third place, take a few specimens from the *Pierche Eliezer*, written by Eliezert the great, whose wife was great granddaughter to that Simeon who took the infant Jesus in his arms. He flourished about the year seventy-three.' Well, the year *seventy-three* is not exactly in the days of the Saviour. But I pass this to notice – 1. Concerning Simeon, Basnage says, p. 147 – 'The Christians seeing this man to bear a considerable figure among the Jews, have fancied, that he was that old Simeon mentioned in the Gospel who waited for the kingdom of God, and received

Jesus Christ into his arms.' I presume you took your statement from Basnage. But why conceal from your readers, that Basnage goes on to show at length, that this is a mere fancy, and has no foundation in truth.

2. But concerning Eliezert, and the work you ascribe to him, let us hear Basnage. He says, p. 510 – 'The Jews endeavor to raise the glory of their desolate nation by making a great many learned men (on whom they father a great many fictitious works) survive the ruin of the temple, and live in the beginning of the second century. *Eliezer*¹ *the great* lived at that time.' Basnage goes on to relate some very ridiculous things concerning him. One of these is – 'This doctor owned, as he was dying, that he had the art of transplanting the harvest from one place to another.' See some more of such wonders, p. 293. I am not surprised, such a person should utter the nonsense you quote, but I am indeed surprised, you should refer to such authority. You give credit to the fictions of the Jews, made to gratify their pride for great names, and love for antiquity. You say,

'4. In the fourth place, take a few instances from *Beraschith Rabba*, which was written by Rabba *Hoschiakia*. He flourished about the year ninety-five. The year ninety-five however, is still further distant from the days of the Saviour. But even this date is too early, according to the critics; for,

1. Prideaux, in a note, vol. iv. p. 565, says – '*Beraschith Rabba*, is an old Rabbinical commentary on the book of Genesis.' And he shows, that as the author of this work quotes the Targum of Aqurlia of Pontus, who lived about the year 130, it must be of a later date than the year ninety-five. Some think this writer was a disciple of R. Hakkadosh, and flourished A. D. 195. According to this account you are at least one hundred years wrong in your calculations. But,

2. We shall see presently, from some quotations I shall make, that the date of this, and indeed of all your Jewish writings, are very uncertain: that no Jewish writer you have quoted, existed in the days of the Saviour. You say,

'5. In the fifth place, take one example from *Masse, Thora*, ascribed to Rabbi Hakkodesh, who was born about the year one hundred and twenty.' This is still more remote from the days of our Saviour. And if this person was *born* in the year one hundred and twenty, his work could not be written until the year one hundred and fifty, or perhaps later. But this work is condemned by the critics as of little authority; and it, and other Jewish writings you have quoted above, are said to be interpolated. The oldest of them, are not supposed to have existed before the end of the second century. You say,

'6. In the sixth place, take a few passages from the Talmuds.' You ought to have said, *not a few*, for your principal quotations are from the Talmuds. But here you are silent about their dates. Perhaps you were ashamed to repeat them, as they

¹Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, Chapters or sentences of R. Eliezer.

are far too modern to be of the least service to your cause. You must be on the point of *failing*, to pay in coin from the Talmuds. How can they ever prove that gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to mean future punishment? A volume of quotations from them could not prove this: a thousand volumes could not prove our Lord *usea* gehenna in this sense.

I am aware you will say some critics place *some* of the Jewish writings as far back as the days of the Saviour. I then ask, 1. Which of them all will you fix on? I presume it will be the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel. So be it; but permit me to ask, why you have referred to any of the rest, unless it was to make a great flourish about Jewish writers, who can prove nothing on the question at issue. But you are well aware, sir, that it is not proved Jonathan's Targum existed in the days of the Saviour; and until this is satisfactorily established, it cannot answer your purpose. To say the least, you will admit, critics are much divided about the antiquity of Jonathan's Targum; for if some say it existed in our Lord's day, others say it had no existence until several hundred years after, as shown above. The reader will then ask – Since doctors disagree, in what way shall the question in discussion be decided? We hope, attention to the following questions may enable us to decide this question almost to a moral certainty. Let us inquire, then, –

2. What dependence is to be placed upon the dates which the Jews give to their writings? If much confidence was placed in the accuracy of the Jews, about the dates of your ancient writings, why are critics so much divided about their antiquity? On this question let us hear Basnage. He says, p. 2 – 'The Rabbins, who are but little acquainted with their own history, vend their fables for matters of fact. Provided they are believed by their own nation, they do not trouble their heads to reconcile their narrations with foreign historians, whom they mightily despise. They boldly make anachronisms, write the grossest absurdities in chronology; and without any scruple of conscience, corrupt the truth of history.' And p. 170, says – 'The doctors that have made these collections of traditions, taking advantage of the ignorance of their nation, have thrown upon the paper whatever came into their heads, without troubling themselves with reconciling their conjectures with foreign history, to which they were utterly strangers.' He adds, p. 531 – 'It seems to be a labor sufficiently vain to criticise the faults of the Jewish chronology; for we find no solid ground whereon to fix our foot. After a harsh and ungrateful task, a man is often obliged to perplex his calculations. Bartoloci¹ is forced to build like the rest upon suppositions, or testimonies as uncertain as those which he confutes.'

Prideaux agrees with Basnage. He says, vol. ii. p. 363, 'In historical matters it is not to be regarded what the Jews write or what they omit concerning them. That of all nations in the world that have pretended to any sort of learning, they have taken the least care to record past transactions, and have done it very bunglingly,

¹Bartoloci is your oracle, for you are constantly referring to him in your quotations. You do not give us his words, that we may judge of what he says; but Basnage here declares, he builds on suppositions and uncertain testimonies, as uncertain as those which he confutes.

and in a manner that looks more like fable than truth, wherever they have pretended to it.' He adds, vol. iii. p. 126 – 'To be out 200 or 300 years in their chronology is nothing with the Jews. They are certainly the worst historians, and the worst accounters of time, that ever pretended to be either. The Jewish writers are far from being exact in their chronological computations; for the sake of a round number, or an imaginary mystery, they often in such matters, shoot under or over the truth, at their pleasure.'

What dependence, sir, can be placed on your Jewish writings, if one half of these statements are true? And is it any wonder critics are divided in their opinions about their dates, where no certainty is to be obtained? Their dates rest on Jewish tradition. The Scriptures say nothing about such writings. And the quotations just made, show, all hope is at an end, of obtaining any thing like certainty from Jewish accounts on the point in question. How, then, it will be asked, is this point ever to be decided? I answer by some other sources of evidence; by other writings which do not depend on uncertain tradition. Let us then inquire –

3. Are there any Jewish writings of antiquity, the dates of which do not depend on uncertain Jewish tradition? Did these writings exist in or about the days of the Saviour? And do they, or do they not teach, that gehenna thin meant future punishment? I pass over the Old and New Testament Scriptures; and also the Septuagint version; as having no direct bearing on these questions. All admit gehenna does not mean *spiritual* or *future punishment*, either in the Old Testament Hebrew, or the Greek version. And the question in discussion is, did our Lord in the New Testament use gehenna to designate future punishment? You assert he did, and appeal to uninspired Jewish writings to prove it. But it is very doubtful, that any of these writings existed in our Lord's day. I now make an appeal to Jewish writings, which all admit existed in or about Christ's day. They contain no such sense of gehenna.

I mention first, Onkelos' Targum, which is allowed on all hands, to be the oldest and best of all the Targums. If any Jewish writing which you have quoted existed in our Lord's day, this did. But observe, sir, it never intimates that gehenna meant future punishment. No one alleges this, and we may be sure it does not, as you have not quoted it. But, I mention the writings of Philo Judeus and Josephus. Calmet says – 'Philo was deputed with others to go to Rome, A. D. 40.' And Basnage thinks, p. 133, that he composed his works 'before the birth of Christ,' or when he was about 'eight or ten years old.' Josephus was born at Jerusalem, A. D. 37, and all his works were composed between A. D. 70, and A. D. 100. Here then are two writers, who lived in or about the days of the Saviour, and their writings show they were believers in future punishment. I may add, *some* of the apocryphal books were written about the same period, and it appears some of the writers believed also in a future retribution. Here, then, are Jewish writings of antiquity. They are the most valuable extant; were written about the period we want them, and ought to settle the question between us. Does Philo, Josephus, or any of the apocryphal writers intimate, that 'gehenna was used in their day to mean future punishment?' No. This you know to be a fact, and you confess it, by taking no notice of these writings. But

in view of this palpable fact, you assert, 'gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to mean future punishment.' Was it honorable in you to conceal this fact from your readers? And in view of it how could you make such an assertion? for all the wisdom of man can never reconcile your assertion with this fact.

From what you say, p. 194, some may conclude that the learned gentlemen at Cambridge, had ransacked all Jewish antiquity for your assistance; had so gleaned this field that nothing was left behind; that like the locusts in Egypt, they had devoured every green thing. They have only, however, furnished you with a little of the rubbish of Jewish antiquity, which few persons deem worth the labor of digging out. You would hiss out of the arena of controversy the things they have furnished, if Unitarianism was the question in discussion. But I shall inquire,

4. How is it known, that the Jews have assigned too early dates to their writings? What could induce them to do this? And is it certain they have done it? The following quotations will answer all these questions:

Basnage says, pp 261, 262. – 'The Jews are as much prejudiced for antiquity as the Christians; and men become venerable to them, in proportion to the remoteness of the age they lived in. Time is commonly more considered than merit: and therefore, those that would be revered by the people, have fathered their writings on the ancient doctors, or, like the Christians, have ascribed new works to the old masters in order to give them more authority than they would have, if they had appeared with the true name of their authors. They have, for example, in the synagogue, some commentators upon Scripture called *Medraschim*¹ to which they ascribe a great antiquity. The *Mechilta* ought to have been composed by the Rabbins, that were cotemporary with Juda the Saint. And yet the Gamara is cited in it, to prove a custom invented by the Rabbins for stoning. How then can we allow this book so venerable an antiquity, though in reality it is the ancientest of all their books?'

Basnage proceeds – 'They have moreover in their synagogues, some great *commentaries*, *Midraschim Rabbot* which are said to be Nachmanide's who ought to have lived in the end of the third century. And yet they make mention of Dioclesian's empire, and Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, and in general, still call the Roman empire the empire of Edom, which shows that this work was not composed till after Constantine, under whom the Christians became masters of the empire.'

Basnage adds – 'In the last place they have published the sentences of the fathers *Pirke Abbot*. They have also published other sentences under the name of R. Eliezer; who must have lived in the time of Gamaliel II. since he was his brother-in-law.

¹*Medrash* signifies commentary, from a root *darish*, because the commentary sought the sense of Scripture. Your quotations are not translations of the sacred texts, but are taken from these *Midraschim*. You see now what the critics say of them.

Nevertheless, the imposture is so ill disguised, that he quotes Akiba, as one of the ancientest fathers, who must have been the disciple of the great Eliezer. The fault is still more manifest, to quote Juda the prince, the son of Gamaliel, who was not born till Akiba was dead. He speaks of the kingdom of the Arabians, which was not erected till Mahomet. We must excuse him for all the stories which he tells, viz. that the tempting serpent was as big as a Camel, and Adam used him for a pad: that God clothed the first man in a precious robe, and a cloud of glory; but after his sin, dressed him in the serpent's skin. However, his first robe was preserved in Noah's Ark. Cham, who seized upon it, gave it to Nimrod, who, wearing it, saw all the beasts of the earth, and the fowls of the air come and worship him as their lord and king.' A fine story.

The love for great names and the pride of antiquity, led the Jews into palpable contradictions, as the above statements show. It may then be asked, if a book, pretending to have been written when this country was first settled by emigrants from Europe, mentioned George Washington and the battle of Bunker Hill, and that the 'writer was familiar with both, what confidence could be placed in his book? None. It would lie on the shelf, for food to the spiders. It is so with the Jewish writings, for few concern themselves about them. But this leads to another question,

5. Have your Jewish writings of antiquity been interpolated and corrupted? This I believe is universally admitted. Dr. Kenecott, speaking of the Targums generally, says – 'it has been abundantly proved in many remarks before made, that the Chaldee paraphrases have been wilfully altered.' And Basnage, speaking of Jonathan's Targum, says, p. 361 – 'We cannot depend so much upon this performance, as upon that of Onkelos; because the doctors who lived about seven hundred years after him, have not scrupled to add many things to it.' The other Jewish writings, *Medrasch*, *Thillium*, *Pierch*, *Eliezer*, *Beraschith*, *Rabba*, *Masset Thora*, to which you refer, are also said to be corrupted, and are deemed by critics as of little authority. Would you deem them authority against Unitarianism? Or, would you admit them authority in proof of Universalism? Who regards them as authority on any subject of importance? Who can admit them as witnesses about the doctrine in question? A corrupted witness, is not permitted to testify in court, but is liable to punishment. Now, admitting all the Jewish writings you have quoted were in existence in our Lord's day, they can be of no use to you, until you are able to prove, what is, and what is not, the corruptions introduced into them in later ages. But can you prove, that the quotations you have made from them, are none of these corruptions, but were positively a part of these writings in the days of the Saviour? We very much doubt this. Nor can we conjecture, what process could be pursued to establish it. But, admitting the whole to be genuine, I must inquire,

6. Are you warranted to interpret the New Testament by uninspired Jewish writings, and by quotations from them of which you are ashamed? I must doubt this; and I find others condemn such a mode of interpretation. Who can justify you in it? Basnage says, p. 173: – 'We must only remember one thing which the critics

forget, which is,' that the first book of the Tanaites¹ [10] having not been composed till two hundred years after Christ, and the Talmud not completed till five or six hundred years after him; we must not imagine that certain expressions of our Lord and his Apostles are borrowed from the Talmud, or that some Greek words ought to have such a signification, because the like is found among the Talmudists. Let them consult and study them, if they, please, to discover the genius of the language: but let them not draw consequences from words they have implied so long after Jesus Christ, and in a corrupt age, to give scripture passages, novel, uncommon, and forced explications. One would think in reading some commentators, that Jesus Christ and his disciples had no other design than to make some perpetual allusions to the sentences or expressions of the Talmuds, which is ridiculous.' If this is *ridiculous*, it must be *the essence of the ridiculous* in you, to explain all the texts about gehenna by your Jewish writers, and say: – 'I know of no other way of arriving at the true meaning of Hebrew words and phrases.' We have seen above, that Campbell, Jahn, Stuart, Horne, and a prophet of your own, condemn the course you have pursued. But let us inquire,

7. Is there any parallel case, to which we can refer for a decision on the question at issue? Is there any other question which is disputed, and on which an appeal is made to the Jewish writings of antiquity? We answer yes, and proselyte baptism is a case in point, which we shall take from an orthodox critic, no way biassed in favor of my views of gehenna. Professor Stuart, in his late work on 'the Mode of Christian Baptism,' discusses the subject of 'Jewish proselyte baptism.' See pp. 54 – 71. He states the question thus – '*Was baptism as an initiatory rite practised in the Jewish church, antecedent to the time when christian baptism commenced?*' It is seen at a glance, that this question is precisely the same with your assertion, p. 183, '*That gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour, and in succeeding ages to mean future punishment.*' Both points rest on Jewish writings of antiquity; they must stand or fall together; and Mr. Stuart and you appeal to the same, or similar writings. He appeals to them, to disprove the antiquity of proselyte baptism; and you appeal to them, to prove the antiquity of gehenna meaning future punishment. Mr. Stuart disproves both things by his remarks on this subject. In what way then does he discuss, and to what result does he come respecting the antiquity of proselyte baptism? My limits will only permit me to notice in the briefest way, his topics of evidence, and the results of his investigations.

Mr. Stuart first examines the Old Testament, to see if proselyte baptism is taught there, pp. 54 – 59. His result is: – 'I cannot find a word to this purpose in the scriptures.' Well, examine the Old Testament, whether gehenna there means 'future punishment,' and we arrive at the same result. Mr. Stuart says, respecting proselyte baptism: – 'Our present inquiry respects only the *antiquity* of the usage

¹'*Tanaites*: that is, doctors. This word is borrowed from another, which signifies *to teach*. They are also called *Misnaicks*, because the work of the *Mischna* is ascribed to them. Some of them are also called *abba* or *father*. There is cited, for instance, in the *Mishna*, one *Abba Saul*, who was of the stature of the giants, and who burying the dead, found Absalom's eye, in which he hid himself up to the nose.' See Basnage, p. 163. What wonders in your Jewish writings.

in question,' and denies, 'such a custom existed among the Jews, antecedently to the ministry of John the Baptist and of Jesus.' I might repeat his remarks, for they equally apply to the question, Did gehenna mean future punishment antecedently to this period?

Mr. Stuart next proceeds to examine the Jewish writings of antiquity respecting proselyte baptism. Let us see how he proceeds in this examination, and the result of it. The first reference to proselyte baptism he finds in the Mishna, 'collected by Rabbi Judah Haggodesh about A. D. 220.' But this date is too late. Besides, Mr. Stuart remarks: – 'This work contains an almost infinite number of Jewish superstitions, usages, and rites.' He quotes the Jerusalem Talmud in proof of proselyte baptism, but adds: – 'The Jerusalem Talmud, it will be remembered, was composed during the latter part of the third century, some fifty or sixty years, (the time is not exactly known,) after the Mishna was reduced to writing.' He concludes – 'It is probable, then, that the custom in a greater or less extent of baptizing proselytes must have existed in the second century, and possibly still earlier.' So might gehenna at that period mean future punishment, but the second century is not 'in the days of the Saviour.' And if this period is too modern to prove the antiquity of proselyte baptism, it is also too modern to prove that gehenna was uniformly used in the days of the Saviour to mean future punishment. Mr. Stuart will not admit it evidence in the one case; and why should I admit it evidence in the other? The *superstitions* in the books, too, are alike in both cases.

Mr. Stuart goes on to say: – 'We come now to later testimonies, and such as cannot be of any great weight in determining the question relative to the antiquity of proselyte baptism.' He then quotes the Babylonish Talmud, but adds: – 'The Talmud of Babylon is a work of a late period, being a compilation made by the Babylonish Jews, during the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries.' He also refers to 'other Rabbinical works, such as Bereshith Rabba,' etc., and adds: – 'I have not thought it of sufficient importance to transcribe the originals here; for the amount of all the testimonies from the Talmud, especially the Babylonish Talmud, and the other works of the Rabbins, can be but of small importance, in determining the question concerning the antiquity of proselyte baptism.' After referring to Tacitus, Epictetus, and Josephus, Mr. Stuart comes to the following result. 'Thus much for Rabbinic and other external testimony, in regard to the antiquity of the baptismal rite among the Jews. Nothing from among the heathen writers or Josephus, seems in any degree to confirm this antiquity. From the Rabinic writers all that we can gal her is, that sometime in the latter part of the third century, when the Jerusalem Talmud was written, the custom of baptizing proselytes was common; still more so did it become, during the times when the Babylonian Talmud was written, i. e. from the commencement of the fifth century onward, some two hundred or more years.' He adds: – 'On the whole we must admit, that independently of the scriptures, we have evidence which ought to satisfy us that at the commencement of the third century, the custom of proselyte baptism was known and practised among the Jews.' All this may also be said respecting gehenna: for at this period, it meant future punishment among the Jews. But to use the words of Mr. Stuart, such 'works of

the Rabbins can be but of small importance, in determining the question concerning the antiquity "of this sense of gehenna among the Jews." And I may add from him: – 'Nothing from among the heathen writers, or Josephus, seems in any degree to confirm this antiquity.' Can you show, that Mr. Stuart is mistaken in all this? But further;

Mr. Stuart justly remarks: – 'There are so many narrations in the Talmud, which are gross mistakes and ridiculous conceits, that one hardly feels himself safe in trusting to any of its statements respecting facts that happened long before the period when this book was written.' Mr. Whitman, how happens it that you feel yourself perfectly safe, in trusting to the statements given in the Talmud about gehenna? The statements you quote, are respecting the meaning of this word in the days of the Saviour, which was long before the period when this book was written. Your principal quotations are from the Talmuds: and concerning 'the other works of the Rabbins' which you quote, Mr. Stuart says: – 'They are of small importance.' Of as small importance, sir, in determining the question that gehenna meant future punishment in our Lord's day, as that proselyte baptism was then practised among the Jews. But you seem to consider them of the greatest importance, in proving your sense of gehenna.

But Mr. Stuart asks: – 'Is there any other source of evidence to which we can appeal? What have Philo, and Josephus, and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan said or hinted, relative to the baptism of proselytes? The answer to this question, so important to our present purpose, is, Nothing; at least, nothing which serves at all to confirm the idea that the practice in question was extant, or at any rate notorious, at the time when these authors composed their works. All of them lived not far from the commencement of the Christian era; Philo somewhat before; Josephus somewhat after; and Onkelos and Jonathan about the same periods. I know the age of these two Chaldee translators has been questioned, and set down to a period much later, by Eichhorn and some others; but it is more generally admitted that they may be fairly ranked among writers who lived at, or very near the commencement of the Christian era. In all these writers, so far as their works have yet been examined, there appears a deep and universal silence on the subject of baptizing proselytes; a thing quite unaccountable, in case such baptism were usual at that period.' On this quotation, I remark,

1. Philo and Josephus have said *nothing* relative to gehenna meaning future punishment. Just as little as on the subject of proselyte baptism. And if *nothing* is an important answer to Mr. Stuart on the last question, it is of equal importance to me on the first, We stated above, and he admits it here, that Philo and Josephus 'lived not far from the commencement of the Christian era.' Mr. Whitman, here then are two writers, who lived about the days of the Saviour, as all allow, yet are silent about gehenna meaning future punishment at that period. But,

2. You will say – Mr. Stuart declares, 'Onkelos and Jonathan lived about the same periods,' and certainly Jonathan uses gehenna as meaning future punishment.

I am aware of this, but must call your attention to the following circumstances, which go to prove that Jonathan's Targum did not exist in the days of the Saviour. If it did, how happened he to mention that gehenna then meant future punishment? Onkelos is silent about this, and yet his Targum is allowed to be older and better than all the other Targutn's, Jonathan's not excepted. Besides, Philo, Josephus, and I may add some of the Apocryphal books, certainly were written about the days of the Saviour, yet none of them hint that gehenna then meant future punishment. And observe, sir, Mr. Stuart is candid enough to say: – 'I know the age of these two Chaldee translators, (Onkelos and Jonathan) has been questioned, and set down to a period much later, by Eichhorn and some others.' This being admitted, to say the least, the age of these writers is very doubtful, and is much disputed among critics. The very circumstance of Jonathan mentioning gehenna as meaning future punishment, while Onkelos, Philo, and Josephus are silent about it, shows his Targum to be of a more modern date, or your quotations from it are the corruptions and additions made to it in later ages. To use the words of Mr. Stuart: – 'In all these writers, so far as their works have yet been examined, there appears a deep and universal silence on the subject of gehenna meaning future punishment; a thing quite unaccountable, in case such a punishment was uniformly designated among the Jews in the days of the Saviour, by the term gehenna.' You assert, this was its uniform sense in the days of the Saviour, among the Jews. Philo, Josephus, and some of the Apocryphal writers, lived in the Saviour's day. They were Jews, they believed in future punishment, and yet they are all uniformly silent about gehenna. In face of such evidence, must I believe your assertion? Must I shut my eyes to all this certain evidence that it is false, and receive it on evidence which is very uncertain? Had Jonathan's Targum mentioned proselyte baptism, Mr. Stuart would have urged all the above things, and likely some others, that on this doubtful testimony no dependance could be placed.

Mr. Stuart comes to the following conclusion. 'In fine, we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism, antecedently to the Christian era. The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant, and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament, none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the blind, or in the work of any other Targumist excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the 7th or 8th century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers. How could an allusion to such a rite have escaped them all, if it were as common, and as much required by usage as circumcision.' I come to a similar conclusion, sir, respecting gehenna. To use the words of Mr. Stuart with a slight alteration, I say – 'In fine we are destitute of any early testimony that gehenna meant future punishment antecedently to the Christian era. No account of this is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha; none in the Targum of Onkelos; none in the New Testament; none in Philo or Josephus, etc. How could the mention of such a punishment escape them all if what you say be true, p. 183, that 'gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to mean future punishment?' May I not say with Mr. Stuart, 'there is no certainty that such was the case, but that the probability,

on the ground of evidence, is strong against it.' Mr. Stuart observes – 'I am aware that we cannot always argue from the silence of writers, against the existence of this or that practice; but this would seem to be one of the cases, in which silence speaks strongly against the probability of the practice in question at that period. Now, sir, if silence speaks strongly against the probability that proselyte baptism was practised in the days of the Saviour, silence speaks still more strongly against the probability, that gehenna meant future punishment in the days of the Saviour. Does the silence of the Old Testament writings, the silence of Philo, Josephus, and others, not prove, that you are mistaken in saying gehenna was uniformly used in the days of the Saviour by the Jews to mean future punishment.

I shall make one more quotation from Mr. Stuart. He says – 'That we cannot point out the exact time when proselyte baptism began among the Jews, is little to the purpose of those who hold to its great antiquity; for where are the monuments which show how and when a; rite began, which came into general reception in the churches of Christ in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries.' That we cannot point out the exact time when gehenna began among the Jews to mean future punishment, is as little to the purpose of those who hold to its great antiquity. It behooves those who hold to its great antiquity, to show, when it began, and to prove it had a divine origin. Unless they can do this, all are bound to reject it as an invention of men. But trace this sense of gehenna as far back as you can, no one can tell us when, where, or by whom such a sense was first given to gehenna. I have never found that any one risked his reputation in saying it had a divine origin. Mr. Whitman, you do not assert it had, nor do you pretend to prove this sense of gehenna from the Bible. And you might with as much propriety call proselyte baptism, *spiritual baptism*, as call gehenna punishment '*spiritual punishment both in this life and the next existence.*' But supposing, '*proselyte baptism*' and '*gehenna meaning future punishment,*' were both known among the Jews in the days of the Saviour, does this prove them scriptural? No; for by the same logic it can be proved – the Jewish traditions are all scriptural.

I cannot believe with some, that if the Jews in our Lord's day used gehenna to mean future punishment, it follows, our Lord used it in this sense. No; Dr. Campbell says, 'Our Lord spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used those names to which the reading of the Law and the Prophets either in the original, or in the versions then used, had familiarized them. Our translators, and indeed most European translators, represent him as using words which even in their own translation of the Old Testament never occur, and to which in fact, there is nothing there that corresponds in meaning.' Say, sir, is there anything in the Old Testament, which corresponds in meaning to the sense you give to gehenna in the New? Had the reading of the law and the prophets in the original, familiarized them to such a sense? Or, had even the reading of the law and the prophets in the versions then used familiarized them to it? What version, sir, deserving the name of a version, could contain such a sense of gehenna? Will you risk your reputation in saying, that any Jewish writing you have quoted, deserves the name of a version of the Holy Scriptures? Did our Lord ever stand up in a Jewish synagogue, and read

as Scripture the silly nonsense given in your quotations? If our Lord then spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, he could not use gehenna to mean future punishment, for no such dialect was found in their Scriptures. This, all allow; nor will any man assert, that our Lord was in the habit of laying aside the Old Testament sense of words, and adopting a different sense given to them in your Jewish writers. I really thought, sir, that Unitarians contended for the scriptural usage of words in interpreting the Bible.

The following remarks of Mr. Stuart, well deserves your attention on the question before us. He says – ‘The Christian religion is built upon the Jewish. The Christian Scriptures are intimately connected with the Jewish sacred books, and they cannot be understood and explained, except by means of them. The words of the New Testament are Greek, but its idioms, its costume, its manner of thought and reasonings, its allusions, in short, the *tout ensemble* of it is Jewish; nor can these ever be duly understood by any person who is ignorant of the Jewish nation, its laws, customs and history.’ You have been laboring to convince us to the contrary; that the Christian religion is built upon Jewish writers of antiquity. That the Christian Scriptures are intimately connected with these Jewish uninspired books, and they cannot be understood and explained, except by means of them. Have you not said, p. 183, ‘I know of no other way of arriving at the true meaning of Hebrew words and phrases.’ And p. 176, you said concerning gehenna, ‘all judges of this subject will assure you there is no other certain way of arriving at its true meaning.’ Is not this telling us ‘the words of the New Testament are Greek, but its idioms, its costume, its manner of thought and reasonings, its allusions, in short, the *tout ensemble* of it is *Rabbinoc*; nor can these ever be duly understood by any person who is ignorant of the Jewish writings of antiquity, and the things contained in them.

It would be easy to show by a variety of other considerations, that gehenna did not mean future punishment among the Jews in the days of the Saviour; and if it was so used then, he did not sanction such a use of this term. But enough has been said on this question, and my limits admonish me to proceed to another department of the subject.

2. The *nature* of the punishment described in your quotations. The Jewish writers describe a hell, but the question is, do they describe yours? You said p. 165, ‘*All valuable commentators affirm that Jesus employed gehenna as an emblem of the spiritual punishment of the wicked, both in this world and the next existence. This is the view I take of the subject, and the one which I shall attempt to defend.*’ And this spiritual punishment, you told us, consists in ‘*the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings,*’ p. 167. But, sir, do your quotations from the Jewish writers, describe a *spiritual hell*? Do they affirm that *Jesus* employed gehenna in this sense? It is obvious, not one of your Jewish writers mentions *Jesus* in any way, or in what sense he used the word gehenna. And if they do not describe a spiritual hell in your quotations, you have quoted them in vain, and have given the Gentlemen at the University much unnecessary trouble.

My object is now, to examine the *nature* of your quotations, whether they describe your spiritual hell; and if they do not describe it, to ascertain what kind of hell is taught in them. I shall, therefore, go over your quotations in a brief way, collecting the prominent features of the hell which they describe. In this way, we shall see whether it is the same as yours. The leading features of the hell described in your quotations are the following:

1. *Its origin.* We are very plainly told, that God created *gehenna*. Just as plain, sir, as we are told Gen. i. 1, that 'God created the heavens and the earth.' The last we believe on the testimony of scripture; but the first, we must receive on the testimony of your Jewish writers. But I ask, did God create your 'spiritual punishment?' Did he create your 'inimical and revengeful feelings?' This you will not affirm.

2. *Its antiquity.* Few things can boast of higher antiquity, than the hell described in your quotations from the Jewish writers. It was created on 'the second day of the creation.' It seems then, it was created before a single sinner existed; before there were any 'inimical and revengeful feelings,' to constitute your hell, either in this or the next existence.

3. *Its location.* The hell described in your quotations is a *place*, and a place *beneath*, for persons descend into it. And, the descent is from the earth; for some saw 'them descending into the earth, to gehenna.' But do persons descend into the earth, to get into your 'spiritual punishment, 'your 'inimical and revengeful feelings?' Surely not.

4. *Its visibility.* It seems 'Abram saw gehenna belching forth smoke and burning coals, and sending up sparks to punish the wicked.' You say - 'Surely he did not see the valley of Hinnom, for this would make him witness what no one pretends took place until a thousand years after his time.' So be it, sir; but surely he did not see your 'spiritual punishment,' your 'inimical and revengeful feelings?' And surely, until some person saw hell, or fancied he saw it, how could the valley of Hinnom be made an emblem of it? Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom might, with some propriety be made an emblem of the hell described in your quotations, but I cannot conjecture, how it could be made an emblem of your spiritual punishment. What resemblance has the valley of Hinnom to this kind of punishment?

5. *Its nature.* The hell described in your quotations is evidently a raging fire. It 'belches forth smoke and burning coals.' Its very 'snow is changed so as to become like fire.' And we are told about, '*embers in the fire of gehenna.*' That it is material fire, is obvious, for it is to operate on the *body* as well as the *soul*. 'God will redeem my soul from condemnation to gehenna, and he has delivered my *body* from condemnation to gehenna.' And we shall see presently, persons are not only frightened but *scorched* in gehenna. Is this your 'spiritual punishment?' Is this your 'inimical and revengeful feelings?' Your hell, sir, I should think had nothing material about it. Does it send 'up sparks to punish the wicked?'

6. *Who are to suffer its torments?* They are in general the wicked; particularly 'heretics, traitors, apos, tates, epicureans,' etc. 'All Angels and Seraphim shall not deliver the wicked from the condemnation of gehenna.' Dr. Whitby on Rom. ii. declares the Jews considered the Gentiles all wicked, and fit fuel for hell fire. And in your quotations, as well as his from the Jewish writers, hell is made very favorable to the Jews. You tell us, 'circumcision is regarded with favor: for the Holy and Blessed swear to Abram that no one who was circumcised should descend into gehenna.' Circumcision is a wonderful preservative from going to hell, for you say from your Jewish writers, Hereafter Abram will sit at the gates of gehenna, and will suffer no circumcised Israelite to descend thither; but what will he do with those who have sinned beyond measure? He will restore to them their foreskin, and they will descend into gehenna.' But the case of such Jews, even in hell is not hopeless, for you tell us – 'The fire of gehenna does not prevail against the sinners of Israel so as to consume .them, but they are sent down into it to be *frightened* and *scorched* awhile on account of their evil deeds; afterwards Abraham, who kept all the commandments and went down into the fire of the Chaldeans to sanctify the name of God, descends thither and through his merits brings them forth from thence, that he may establish the promise of the covenant.' The Jews, sir, shaped their hell to suit themselves. They did with their material hell, what you do. with your 'spiritual punishment,' modified it by their own religious opinions. The Saviour's gehenna punishment was chiefly threatened to his Apostles; theirs for all the wicked Gentiles, and for very wicked Jews.

In the Jewish hell there were literal torments by fire, and this torment commenced at death. According to your quotations from the Jewish writers, persons 'became heirs of gehenna at their death.' And we have seen above, both *soul* and *body* went to gehenna. But your 'spiritual punishment' must commence as soon as a person has 'inimical and revengeful feelings,' and of course is suffered both in this world and the next existence. The torments of the Jewish hell, began at death in your intermediate state for both soul and body, In short, sir, how could material fire torment a spirit, that which is immaterial. Material fire required a material body to operate upon, and in this the Jews were consistent in contriving their hell torments. We now notice,

7. *Their duration.* Are the torments of the Jewish hell *limited* or *endless*? They are both, if I mistake not, suited to the persons who descend into gehenna. You tell us in one part of the quotations – 'The wicked are to be judged, that they may be delivered to eternal burning in gehenna.' The Jews considered all the Gentiles wicket], deemed them fit fuel for hell-fire; and such was their hatred of them, that they made their punishment eternal. But if the punishment of any Jews in hell was endless, it was only for such as were extremely wicked. 'Heretics, traitors, apostates, epicureans, those who deny the resurrection of the dead, those who separate themselves from the doctrines of the congregation, and those who cause terror among the dwellers upon earth, and those who have sinned, and caused many to sin, as Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and his companions; these all descend into gehenna,

and are punished therein ages of ages.' It is evident, that '*ages of ages*,'¹ cannot mean endless, when applied to the punishment of Jews in gehenna, for we have seen 'the fire of gehenna does not'prevail against the sinners of Israel.' No; 'they are sent down into it to be frightened and scorched *awhile*, on account of their evil deeds,' but 'through the merits of Abram they are to be brought forth from thence. It is a very, plain case here, that restoration from hell at least for the Jews, can be proved on the authority of Jewish writers. Yes, sir; and as some say you are a believer in *universal* restoration from hell, you ought on their authority to correct your mistake; for it does not appear any of the Gentiles are to be delivered from it. You know, your Jewish writers, are just as good authority for this, as for your sense of gehenna. And if their authority is good, the safest course for us all, is to become Jews. The sooner we are all circumcised, the better it will be for us. Being Gentiles, we are only fuel for the fire of gehenna. Your Jewish writers seem to prove the universal damnation of all Gentiles, which we should think is proving too much for your own comfort.

8. I shall only add, your quotations prove an old and generally received opinion to be false. How often have we been told, that the '*great gulf*,' fixed between hell and heaven, is impassable. That there is an eternal nonintercourse between the two places. That no one in hell can pass to heaven; nor can any one in heaven pass to hell. Now, sir, on the authority of your quotations from the Jewish writings of antiquity, this is a gross mistake. We have already seen that all Jews who go to hell, go there only to be 'scorched *awhile*, on account of their evil deeds.' But afterwards, through the merits of Abram, they can get over this '*great gulf*,' and dwell with their brethren, the Jews in paradise. Here the gulf is got over from the one side: let us then hear you, whether it cannot be passed also from the other? You say, in your quotations, 'God admitted Hiram king of Tyre into paradise, because he had built the temple, and had been from the first a pious man; and he lived in paradise a thousand years; but when afterwards he began to be filled with pride, and made himself a deity, he was expelled from paradise and descended into gehenna.' It is evident, then, from your Jewish writings, that this '*great gulf*,' is passable by persons from both sides of it. Father Abraham must have been mistaken, then, when he said to the rich man in hell, 'And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.' In short, sir, unless this '*great gulf*' is passable, how can the doctrine of restoration from hell ever be established? Your Jewish writers of antiquity say it has been passed, and they are just as good authority for this., as for the question at issue between us. You must either take the whole of the Jewish,hell as they have made it, or reject the whole. You have no right to claim the Jewish writers as authority, to prove one thing about it, and reject them in others. With what face can you prefer such a claim?

¹Mr. Stuart, in his Exegetical Essays affirms, the phrase 'ages of ages,' is 'an *intensive* expression, in order to designate with emphasis, the idea of a never-ending period of time.' From its usage by the Jewish writers here, this seems to be a mistake, at least when this expression designates the duration of punishment to Jews.

Such are the leading features of the gehenna, or hell, described in your quotations from the Jewish writers. He must be a man of super-human discernment, who can find a single feature of your 'spiritual punishment' in them. The Targum and Talmud hell has no kind of resemblance to yours. Was it not, then, a very strange mistake in you, to quote these writings in proof of your spiritual hell, when it is as clear as noon-day, their hell was a material raging fire? Your Jewish writers would have deemed it a gross misrepresentation of their views of gehenna, to call it 'spiritual punishment, the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings.' And would not you say, that I misrepresented your views of gehenna, if I stated you believed in a material hell of fire? Yes, as much as you do mine, when you say, that I believe gehenna means 'being burnt in the valley of Hinnom.'

But taking your hell, and the hell described in the Jewish writings as given by yourself, I have now a few questions to ask about both. I shall begin,

1. *With the Rev. Bernard Whitman's hell.* It is not sheol, hades, tartarus, or gehenna, as described in the Bible. Nor, is it any of these as altered by Pagans, Jews, Mahomedans, or most Christians, to suit themselves. No; it is a new hell of modern invention, which is little known in the community, except perhaps among Unitarians. Indeed, I am not sure, if it is even generally adopted among them. If I understand you correctly, your hell has no *location* or *materiality* whatever. This is a very different hell, sir, from Calvin's, in the belief of which I was brought up, and for years preached to others. It is not the hell in which many orthodox people believe at the present day. The good old orthodox hell, has a strong resemblance to the one described in your quotations; your's has no resemblance to either of them. Permit me then to ask, who made your hell? On what divine authority am I to believe in it? I cannot even believe in it on the authority of your Jewish writers, for this is not the hell which they describe. And surely you cannot suppose me silly enough, to believe in your hell on your bare assertion about it. Had you advocated the old orthodox hell, your quotations would have been somewhat to the purpose. But you have missed it entirely, to advocate a spiritual hell, thinking to prove it from the Jewish writers of antiquity. How could you commit such a great blunder?

Some ten or twelve years ago, after a serious examination of the Scriptures, I was constrained by evidence to abandon the old Calvinistic hell, as without foundation in the Bible. Since that period, I have been somewhat careful to avoid believing in any hell of man's making. I should feel like a fool, to have abandoned the old hell of my fathers, and now receive your spiritual hell without scripture authority. Until scripture authority is produced, do not blame me for rejecting it, for I reject all hells made by men, without any exception. I shall as soon believe in the Pagan hell, the Jewish hell, the Calvinistic hell, Dante's hell, any one of the Chinese hells, or any other hell, as in your's, until it is proved from the Bible. I will believe in any hell taught there, but in no other. If I believe in a hell of man's invention, I shall invent one of my own. I have as good a right as any of my neighbors to make my own hell, and make it to suit my own taste, and when my hell is made, I have the same right as others to call *gehenna*, and quote the Jewish writers to prove it. It

must be a nondescript in the history of hells, if the Targums and Talmuds do not prove it, just as much as your's.

I am aware the old Calvinistic hell, which is so like the Targum hell, has of late years been falling into disrepute. It is much too heathenish for modern refined notions. But I am unable to say, what kind of hell is generally substituted in its place. Professor Stuart in his Exegetical Essays, seemed to have abandoned the old orthodox hell; but what one he had adopted, did not appear distinctly from his book. Your own opinions on this subject, seem not as yet very fixed or definite. Like the Professor, you have abandoned the old hell; you have got a new one; you call it by the old name gehenna; you are at a loss how to describe it; and have not yet learned to prove it from the Bible. But I must ask – Is it correct in you to abandon the hell of your fathers; invent a new one; call it by the old name; quote the Jewish writings which prove no such hell; and pass this off to your readers without proof from scripture? Do not misunderstand me, sir; We have had many hell makers since the world began, and I allow, you have the same right as others to engage in this business. What I object to is – you have no right to palm your new hell on the public under the old name gehenna, and quoting the very same proofs for your spiritual hell, which for ages have been quoted to prove the old material hell of fire. It is true, in the course of your letter, you change your *spiritual hell* into *future punishment*, but give no intimation you have changed it from *spiritual* to *material*. Be this as it may, one thing is certain, if your quotations prove a future punishment, they also prove it is material in its nature; who are to suffer it; and that the Jews are to be delivered from it, etc.

I hope you have altered your 'spiritual punishment,' into something different from 'inimical and revengeful feelings.' If you have not, it will involve you in some difficulty. If this is your hell, you must admit all without exception are sometimes in it, even in this world. Few, if any pass through life, without occasionally having 'inimical and revengeful feelings.' And sometimes clergymen, are in this hell in the *sacred desk*; for there we have seen them indulge these very feelings against their Christian brethren of a different sect. And we suspect, all must go into your hell in another world, for few die without some such passions in their natures. And I doubt, if we must not extend the torments of your hell to the brute creation; for we have seen in some of them, something very like 'inimical and revengeful feelings.' But I hope, if you write again on this subject, you will more minutely describe your hell, to avoid all misunderstanding about it. But I have a few questions to ask about,

2. *The Targum and Talmud hell.* It is manifest, from your quotations, that this is a *place*, and a *place of literal torment by fire*. I must then ask – Where was this knowledge obtained? From what bible, book, god, or man, did your Jewish writers learn all their precious information? They tell us, God created hell on the second day of the creation. But I can find no such information in Gen. i. 6 – 9, or in any other part of scripture. They also tell us, Abram saw their gehenna or hell. But can you point out in what part of his history I can find such information? And, as their descriptions of gehenna or hell are comments on certain texts of scripture, Can you

inform us how such information can be dug out of them? You do not pretend, you could find such information in the Old Testament; and the Jewish writers did not derive it from the New; for you tell us they detested this book. It was not derived from the New Testament; for you say, p. 183: – ‘Gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, and in succeeding ages, to mean future punishment.’ As the Jewish writers must have derived their information from some other source, and as you do not specify any divine source, from which it was received, I must press you with the question, From whence did they derive all this information about their gehenna, or hell? I know, you and the gentlemen at Cambridge, derived your quotations from the Jewish writers. What I demand of you is – To tell us, from what source the Jewish writers obtained their information? And, if you assert that it was derived from God, why are you ashamed of it? Why do you say – ‘I have nothing to do with their theology or religious sentiments’ on this subject. Are you ashamed of anything which has come from God? Does it require the apology of Mr. Whitman, a Unitarian minister at Waltham? If you believe it did not come from God, why impose on your readers such Jewish traditions?

You have read Homer, Virgil, and other heathen authors. Permit me then to ask, Is not the Targum and Talmud hell, very like the hell described by the heathen authors? And does not the old orthodox hell, bear a strong resemblance to both? Are they not all so much alike, that I cannot be far wrong in concluding, they had one common origin? I admit there is some difference between the heathen and Targum hell. But the difference is easily accounted for, from Jewish opinions and their national prejudices. And the difference between the heathen and Targum hell, and the old orthodox hell, is also accounted for, from their peculiar views and circumstances. That the one hell is copied from the other, with certain modifications and amendments, seems pretty obvious. The question is, which was the original hell from which the others were copied? You seem to determine this question yourself. On p. 184, you plainly intimate, no such hell is taught in the Old Testament. Professor Stuart advocated no such hell from it. But it is well known, while no such hell was taught by the inspired writers, this hell was perfectly familiar among the heathen. Of course, the Jews adopted the heathen hell, and this is confirmed by Dr. Campbell and other writers. ‘They inform us, the Jews derived many of their opinions from the heathen, and particularly on the subject of a future state. And it is easily perceived, that when Jews and heathens embraced Christianity, such opinions were introduced into the Christian church, and modified to suit the times and views of the people.

Should it be asked, where did the heathen obtain their information about their hell, from which Jews and Christians have copied theirs? I answer, we find it in their fables; and as I have traced it to a heathen source, ‘if you say it came from God, you must prove its origin divine. But I may answer this question, by asking another, – From what source did the heathens derive their notions about idolatry, demons, transmigrations, and a variety of other things? The answer is, – From the inventions of men. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And as after ages of men deemed themselves wiser than those who preceded them, they have altered and

modified the rude hell of the heathen, to suit their own taste and the times they lived in. The heathen hell was too gross for the Jews; and the Jewish writers you quote, shaped it to suit their own nation. But their hell, and the orthodox hell, are both too gross for you, hence you have so modified them as to reduce them to 'a spiritual hell,' consisting in '*inimical and revengeful feelings.*' And whether we have now got to the end of modern modifications and improvements of hell, I do not pretend to say. It is certain, half a century has vastly improved this article, in reducing it from a material, raging fire of coals and brimstone, to a thing purely *spiritual*, without *materiality* or *location*, etc.

But I must do justice to your Jewish writers, and commend their honesty. When they copied the heathen hell, with their own alterations and modifications of it, they did not call it by the heathen name *Tartarus*, but gave it the new name *gehenna*. But, when you wholly change the Targum material hell, into a spiritual hell, you still call it by the old name, and quote the Jewish writings in proof of it. You retain the name of their hell, but seem to be ashamed of their descriptions of it. But, this is very inconsistent in a Unitarian. Have not Unitarians blamed our orthodox brethren, for altering and modifying Calvinism into a very different system, yet calling it by the old name *Calvinism*? Ought not you, either to call your new *spiritual hell* by some other name than *gehenna*, or, cease from censuring them? Are Unitarians the only sect in the land, who have the right to call new things in religion by old names? For one, I must object to your manufacturing *a spiritual hell*, adapted to modern refined notions, and baptizing it with the name *gehenna*; for it bears no resemblance to any of its pretended ancestors. If you are ashamed of the pagan hell, the Jewish hell, or the orthodox hell, do not attempt to impose on Universalists by adopting the names of them. I have called yours 'a spiritual hell,' as expressive of its nature, but if this name does not please you, give it some other which sufficiently distinguishes it from all the hells of other sects or religions. The Jewish hell and yours are essentially different, and ought not to be called by the same name. I may add; – if your hell consists in 'inimical and revengeful feelings,' it would be to some a heaven, for they seem to delight in such feelings. They find '*revenge is sweet:*' and, like Milton's devil, would rather '*rule in hell than serve in heaven.*' Indeed, if hell is inimical and revengeful feelings, most people would look on it as a very trifling affair. And some would say, what a *fuss* the clergy for ages have been making about nothing. At any rate, sir, they have made a mighty *fuss* about a very different hell from your's. Whether your's will produce similar effects as their's, remains to be proved. It has not been long 'enough in use to make a fair experiment.

Such are your quotations, and the remarks we have deemed proper to make on them. Let us now hear what you have to say about them yourself. After giving us the quotations, the very first sentence you utter is this. 'You learn from these various quotations, that *gehenna* was used by the Jews at and after the times of our Saviour to mean future punishment for the wicked.' But have you forgotten, sir, your own statements, pp. 165, 172, that these quotations were to prove, – 'That our Saviour used *gehenna* to mean the spiritual punishment of the wicked, both in this life and the world to come?' Did you not say 'this is the view I take of the subject

and the one which I shall attempt to defend?' But now you seem inclined to drop your '*spiritual punishment,*' and all we are to learn from 'these various quotations' is, '*future punishment for the wicked,*' leaving its *spirituality* and everything else out of the question. But if we learn anything from these quotations, we certainly learn that the punishment is material, and by fire; and if you prove by them a future punishment, you must just take the one they describe. But such is the way you modify your own system, so as to make it more conformable to your quotations. And, of course, Christ must alter his sense of gehenna to suit it. Hence you add: – 'That he used gehenna in the same sense there can be no doubt in the minds of sound critics.' Thus, Jesus Christ and sound critics, shift their sense of gehenna to suit Mr. Whitman's convenience.

But you say – 'The only objection you will be likely to make to this conclusion may be thus stated. You may ask if there is any degree of probability that our Lord and his Apostles knew anything about the Targums?' A pretty weighty objection, sir, but not the only one I could make. I shall, however, make no other, but shall watch carefully how you remove it. You say – 'I have already furnished you some evidence on this question; and I may remark that those scholars who have given this subject a thorough investigation, have a firm belief that some of these Hebrew writings were then in existence.' What kind of evidence you have already given, we have seen. Here you assert, some of those Hebrew writings were in existence in 'the time of our Saviour,' but which of them you do not specify. And it seems, your faith in this rests on some scholars, who have '*a firm belief*' in it. No doubt the Cambridge scholars gave you the evidence which produced *their firm belief* about this. But why should it convince me, for it is not satisfactory to yourself? No; for you add – 'I will present one or two considerations which seem satisfactory to my mind.' A frank confession, that all their evidence, and all you have hitherto adduced, is not very satisfactory to yourself. Well, I hope we are now coming to some evidence, which will be satisfactory, 'that our Lord and his apostles knew about the Targums.' What then are these considerations?

You say, 'In the first place it appears the Jews had lost their national language, the Hebrew, after the return from the captivity, since you find Ezra was obliged to employ interpreters while he read the law to the people.' And after stating, this gave rise to translations of the Scriptures and comments upon them, you ask – 'What more natural than that such translations should be made for the benefit both of the synagogue and of private families, and that they should be generally used?' All this, sir, is perfectly natural and proper. But why do you forget, that your quotations above, are not from any *translation* of the Scriptures, but are *comments* on the texts. They are silly *stories* and *glosses*, which have no foundation in the text, and of which you yourself are ashamed. Besides, all this is no proof our Lord and his Apostles knew about the Targums. Nor, had they existed in their day, they would have approved of that of which you are ashamed. If they knew about the Targums, it is strange they never stumbled on any of your precious quotations. A strange omission this, if they believed what is contained in them.

You say – ‘But in the second place, we have positive evidence that there were translations of the. Scriptures in common use among the Jews in our Saviour’s time.’ True; for we are certain the septuagint version then existed. But if a thousand translations were then in common use among the Jews, it could not serve your cause; for no decent translation of the scriptures could contain your sense of gehenna, or the silly things contained in your quotations. To produce ‘positive evidence’ that translations existed in our Lord’s day, is nothing to the purpose. Nor will it answer, if you could produce ‘*positive evidence*,’ that Targums then existed. No; what you have got to do is this – You must produce *positive* evidence that some *Targums* existed in our Lord’s day, which contained your quotations, and that he *approved* of the sense of gehenna given in them. But, sir, it is idle in you to pretend, that any positive evidence can be produced, that a single Targum existed in our Lord’s day. And how can you ever prove, that our Lord or any of his Apostles, approved of the sense given to gehenna in your quotations? Onkelos’ Targum, is allowed to be the oldest and best of all the Targums in existence; but you well know it is of no use to you, hence you say nothing about it. But I must ask, had such nonsense, as is contained in your quotations, been foisted into any translation in our Lord’s day, do you think he would have quoted it with approbation? I suspect not, sir; the Targums and Talmuds would not have been such favorite authors with the Saviour then, as they are with you on the present question.

You proceed thus. ‘In addition to the books of the Old Testament, the Jews had a collection, oral, of laws or traditions, as they were called, which had been handed down for many ages, from father to son, until finally, about one hundred and ninety years after the time of Christ they were committed to writing, and received the name of Mischna, under which name they have come down to us.’ Yes, sir; but you seem to conceal, for I cannot suppose you forget it, that our Lord condemned the whole mass of Jewish traditions, whether oral or written. See Matth. xv. 1 – 10. Mark vii. 1 – 24. But let us see what use you make of the Mischna on the question before us. You say, ‘ Now, on turning to the *Mischna*, we find it plainly intimated that there were translations, or Targums of the Scriptures in common use among the Jews, at least as early as the time when the *Mischna* was composed, (Targum is a Chaldee word, meaning translation,) and that is even before the time of Christ, since Christ himself often speaks of the traditions of the Jews, and it is of these’ traditions, as has been remarked, that the Mischna is made up.’ On these statements I must remark,

1. Your explanation given in the parenthesis needs an explanation. The word *targum* means *comment*, as well as *translation*. Onkelos’ Targum may be called a translation; but, the Targums you have quoted, do not deserve this name. Your quotations are *comments*, the silly stories and glosses of some persons on the sacred text. You will not risk your reputation in asserting, that they are translations of the original scriptures, or have any foundation in the Old Testament. What madman’s brains then invented them?

2. You intimate, that ‘the mischna was composed before the time of Christ.’ If

this be true, it was composed 'one, hundred and ninety years' before it was written. This is a distinction between *composing* and *writing* which is new to me. But let it be *composed* or *written* at what period you please, it cannot help your cause, for Christ condemned the whole mass of Jewish traditions. Nor, could it aid your cause, if the *Mischna* mentioned a thousand translations or Targums then in use among the Jews. No, sir; to serve your purpose, the *Mischna* must not only mention some Targums which contain your quotations, but prove that such Targums existed in the days of the Saviour, which was one hundred and ninety years before the writing of the *Mischna*. Even all this would not be sufficient, sir, until it is proved, that our Lord approved of the mess of nonsense contained in your quotations. Does the *Mischna* prove this? No, this never can be proved.

It is amusing, to see you break off in the midst of a paragraph, to repeat your old caution to your readers, thus: 'You will keep in mind that I never refer to these traditions for proof of a religious doctrine, but simply to ascertain the use of a Hebrew Word at that period.' The period you refer to is, 'the time of Christ.' But you refer to all these Jewish writings in vain, for none of them existed in 'the time of Christ.' I shall, however, keep your caution in mind, and allow you to speak for yourself, how you attempt to ascertain this. You say – 'It is one of these traditions, as laid down in the *Mischna*, that "all sacred books ought to be preserved from fire, whether they are read or not: *and whatsoever language they are writ in*, they ought to be laid up carefully.'" But what does this *ascertain*? You say – 'This plainly implies that the Jews had their sacred books¹ in more languages than one, in at least one other language besides the Hebrew. But no one pretends, that at this time there were any translations of the Hebrew scriptures in existence besides the Greek and Chaldaic.' But still, this *ascertains* nothing to your purpose, by your own statements. We are certain the septuagint version existed in our Lord's day. Here then, was 'at least one other language besides the Hebrew,' and answers to all which you say is implied in your quotation from the *Mischna*. By your own showing, then, there was no need for any other translations; for this with the Hebrew, were *sacred books* to be preserved from fire, and laid up carefully. But let us see what you say about the *Greek*, and also a *Chaldaic* version, which you say then existed.

1. *The Greek version.* You say – 'It was used by those Jews, who liied in foreign countries, and by them the traditions were never received nor acknowledged to be of any sort of authority.' This, sir, is a precious confession, and is much to the honor of the foreign Jews, for they agreed with Christ and his apostles in rejecting the Jewish traditions. This is also confessing that they rejected your quotations from the Targums and Talmuds. You do not pretend such things are to be found in the Bible, and it is of no consequence whether they are Pagan, Jewish, or Christian traditions. Had all Jews, like the foreign Jews, strictly adhered to the Scriptures,

¹Mr. Whitman, if the Targums and Talmuds, or any other Jewish writings, except the Scriptures are sacred books, why are not your's and mine sacred books, also? They have as good a title to this name as any Jewish writings you have quoted. But when we speak of sacred books, we confine this name to the sacred Scriptures. And until further evidence is produced, I must believe the Jews only gave this name to the books of the Old Testament.

whether in the original Hebrew or Greek version, such traditions could not have existed. You would have had no Targums or Talmuds to quote from. But one of two things is certain: either the foreign Jews did wrong, in rejecting the traditions as of no sort of authority, or you do wrong, in making them authority, in determining the true sense of gehenna. I leave you to say which of these is the truth.

I remember that you say, I refer only to these traditions – ‘simply to ascertain the use of a Hebrew word at that period.’ But you seem to forget, that none of your Jewish writings containing these traditions, existed in our Lord’s day; and at whatever period they did exist, if you adopt their sense of gehenna, you must take also the theology they connected with it. In fact, sir, they cannot be separated; for the very sense they attached to gehenna, is a part of these traditions. Neither can be found in the Bible. Had it contained them, this would have saved a great deal of labor to certain gentlemen at the University. Could the foreign Jews learn from the Septuagint, or those in Judea from the Hebrew scriptures, that gehenna ‘meant future punishment for the wicked?’ Say, sir, could they learn that it meant ‘spiritual punishment both in this life and the world to come?’ You must answer in the negative. I ask again, Did the foreign Jews reject the traditions, but like you advocated the sense given to gehenna in the Targums and Talmuds? No, the honor was reserved for Mr. Whitman, of Waltham, to separate the sense given to gehenna by the Jewish writers, from the doctrines they Connected with it. But I demand of you to tell us, where the Jewish writers got their sense of gehenna and the doctrines connected with it, as neither are to be found in the Hebrew scriptures or Greek version? You admit, this was not learned ‘from the Christian scriptures, a book which the Jews utterly detested,’ p. 174. And you maintain, gehenna ‘was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour, and in succeeding ages to mean future punishment.’ p. 183. Let us have no evasion here, sir; you must either point out that their sense of gehenna originated from God, or inform us, at what point we are to stop in believing your Jewish traditions.

But it is very certain, some of the Jews in Judea rejected the traditions as well as the foreign Jews. The sect of the Sadducees did so. Nor did Christ or his apostles blame them for this, for they also rejected the traditions. Christ told the Sadducees, they erred, not knowing the Scriptures; but where did he ever say to a single individual, – he erred, not knowing the Targums and Talmuds? Surely you will not say, that your quotations from the Jewish writers, were scripture in those days? It was the sect of the Pharisees who chiefly venerated the traditions. But did Jesus ever commend them for this? No; and yet you cannot support your views of gehenna without them.

By saying – ‘the Septuagint was used by those Jews who lived in foreign countries,’ you intimate, that it was not much used in Judea. But it was once the common opinion that Christ and his apostles always quoted the Septuagint. Dr. Kennicott says, – ‘That the writers of the New Testament did not make it *a constant rule* to quote from the Greek version, is certain; as appears from the many places, where their quotations *differ from that version, and agree with the Hebrew.*

And as the quotations now *agree with the Hebrew*, frequently in the express words, generally in the sense; so it is most probable, that they universally agreed at first, and that where the Hebrew was expressed properly in the Greek version, they used the words of that version; and where that version was not proper, *they translated for themselves.*' The New Testament writers, sir, appear to have been very careful what they quoted for Scripture. Now, if they did not quote the Greek version where it differed from the Hebrew, but translated for themselves, can any man believe that they would have quoted or sanctioned any of your quotations from the Targums or Talmuds, supposing they then existed? My credulity is not a match for this, if all the world had *a firm belief* in it.

2. *The Chaldaic version.* You do not positively assert, but very plainly intimate, that a Chaldaic version of the Scriptures, was in use among the Jews in our Lord's day, as well as the Septuagint. But all you say about this, is – 'It is evident, then, that in the passage which has been referred to, (in the Mischna,) the Chaldaic Targums must be meant. I can see no room for further doubt on I this subject.' In this brief way, you wrap the matter up about the Chaldaic Targums, although they principally claimed your attention. But you must not slip out of my hands in this way. Be pleased then to notice. 1. You seem to consider all Targums translations of the Scriptures. But who will risk his character in asserting, that your quotations deserve the name of translations?

2. You deem the Targums sacred books. Perhaps they, and other books mentioned above, might be considered sacred by the Jews. But is it any proof of their sacredness, that the Jews deemed them so? Or, does it prove their sacredness, that the Mishna contains a tradition – 'That all sacred books ought to be preserved from fire, whether they are read or not; *and whatsoever language they are writ in, they ought to be laid up carefully.*' Say, sir, does this prove that they were deemed sacred by God, Christ, or his apostles? If the quotations you have made from the Jewish writers, are from sacred books, what you have quoted ought to be called *sacred nonsense*, for you are ashamed of it yourself. But,

3. The quotation you have made from the Mischna, although it mentions *sacred books*, does not mention Chaldaic books of any kind whatever. The question you are bound to prove is this, that some of the sacred books referred to in the Mischna, were the Jewish writings you have quoted, and that these writings were known to Christ and his apostles, and approved by them. But not a scrap of evidence have you produced of this. No, sir, you leap to this conclusion, by assuming that, because the Mischna mentions sacred books – 'The Chaldaic Targums must be meant.' But let it be supposed they are meant – what then? This is not proving that these Chaldaic Targums existed in the days of the Saviour, or, that he would have approved of what you quoted from them, and noticed above.

4. If you *must* have a Chaldaic Targum referred to in the Mishna, why not give Onkelos' Targum the preference? It is on all hands allowed to be the oldest and best of all the Targums. It is a translation, but the Targums you quote are not. It

may be called a sacred book, but your Targums and Talmuds have no claim to the appellation. But, had the Mishna expressly mentioned Onkelos' Targum as one of the sacred books, it would not have answered your purpose, for it contains no silly *stories* and *glosses* about gehenna. Prideaux declares, – 'The Targum of Onkelos is rather a version than a paraphrase; for it renders the Hebrew text, word for word, and for the most part accurately and exactly; and it is much the best of all this sort; and therefore it hath always been had in esteem among the Jews much above all the other Targums.' Such a Targum as this, would be of no more use to you, than our English version of the Old Testament. On the subject of gehenna, the Targums which contain *stories* and *glosses* and *enlargements* to the sacred text, are your lively oracles.

But according to Jahn, Onkelos' Targum could not be mentioned in the Mishna, if it was written as early as you assert. He says – 'The Chaldee paraphrases are known by the name of Targums (which means *a version* or *an interpretation*.) The most celebrated among them is that of the Pentateuch, ascribed to Onkelos, whom the Babylonian Talmud makes cotemporary with Gamaliel, adding many incoherent tales respecting him. It is evident, however, that he lived several centuries before, the Talmudical writers, since they knew so little of him, although he wrote in Babylonia. Onkelos, therefore would seem to have written, not in the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era, but in the third, or rather in the second, and this is confirmed by his paraphrase itself.' And we have seen, Onkelos' Targum is not only 'the first in order of place as being on the Pentateuch, but the first also in order of time, and the ancientest that was written of all that are now extant.' If these statements of the critics are correct, sir, it settles the question forever, that no Targum existed in the days of Christ and his apostles.

I am aware that you have mentioned, the Targums now extant are partly made up from older Targums not now in existence. But, supposing this to be true, it affords your cause no assistance. You must still prove these older Targums existed in Christ's day, contained your quotations, and that he sanctioned them as giving the correct sense of gehenna. But this never can be done. You cannot prove, that Targums so old ever existed. Nor can it ever be shown, that your quotations are not the corruptions and additions of later ages. Who can believe, sit, that our Lord and his apostles would approve of the childish nonsense you have quoted from your Jewish writers? I am surprised at your reasoning, your conclusions, and the premises from which you draw them.

You add – 'Here then you have one good reason for my definition of the word gehenna.' What is this '*grand reason?*' You answer – 'It was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour, and in succeeding ages, to mean future punishment.' But this is no *reason*, but a mere *assertion*. The first part of it is utterly false. You have given us no proof, that gehenna 'was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to mean future punishment.' And as to the last, that it was so used in 'succeeding ages,' no one disputes. You have produced no proof, that the Targums were known to Christ and his apostles, and that they used gehenna in the

sense given to it in your Jewish writings. In vain, sir, do you labour to show, that the Scripture sense of gehenna and the Targum sense of it are the same. You quote the Targums, to prove your sense of gehenna; and yet your sense of the word differs from the Targum writers, as much as 'spiritual punishment' differs from 'material punishment,' etc.

Your next sentence is remarkable. You say –'I know of no other way of arriving at the true meaning of Hebrew words and phrases.' Astonishing! Is there no other way of arriving at the true meaning of gehenna, but by consulting the Targums and Talmuds? If we admit this to be true, not one in ten thousand can ever understand the Scriptures. And not one preacher in a thousand is competent to teach them to others. You confess your own incompetency, as you got some persons at the University to consult the Chaldic Targums for you. But I suspect this sentence of yours will communicate a new discovery to the critics. It shows a wonderful *march of mind*. But to me it appears to be a *marching backwards*; marching away from the Bible as its own best interpreter, into the bewildering and uncertain light of Jewish traditions. It appears, the Bible is of no great use, unless people understand the Chaldaic language, and are familiar with the Targums and Talmuds.

Such are your reasons for believing, that our Saviour used gehenna to mean spiritual punishment, both in this life and the world to come. And such are the 'two considerations,' which you said were 'satisfactory to your mind,' that 'our Lord and his apostles knew about the Targums.' You conclude this division of your letter by telling us, you have some other reasons, but want room to state them. You assert your sense of gehenna is the true one: you declare the critics and commentators favor your views; and you repeat your old misrepresentation of my opinions. But none of these things require notice here, being sufficiently remarked on above.

In concluding my remarks on this second general division of your Letter, I would ask, What proof have you offered, that gehenna means a 'spiritual punishment,' here or hereafter? Certainly your quotations from the Jewish writers prove no such punishment, and no attempt has been made to prove it from Scripture. Supposing all the texts which speak of gehenna did teach a future punishment,'who could ever learn from them it was spiritual, consisting in 'inimical and revengeful feelings?' One would much sooner conclude from them, that gehenna was a literal torment by fire; and more resembles the Targum hell than yours. But I must proceed to the third division of your Letter. You say, –

'III. In the third place, I will answer the objections which may be made to my definition of the word gehenna.' But these objections, sir, are a few of the facts stated in my first Inquiry, which you convert into objections. And you admit, they have some 'weight with candid inquirers' against your views of gehenna. This was a mere random *hit* in me, for when I wrote my first Inquiry, I was not aware any man defined gehenna, 'spiritual punishment of the wicked, both in this world and the next existence; the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings.' My book, sir, was written not against such a hell as this, but against the old Calvinistic hell I had

believed in from my childhood. You must still claim kindred with it, if my facts, which you turn into objections, have weight against your spiritual punishment. But be this as it may, let us see how you manage with them. You say, –

‘1. Perhaps you will affirm, that neither gehenna nor any other word is used in the Hebrew Scriptures to denote a place of endless misery for the wicked.’ You say ‘this I readily grant.’ But, instead of attempting to account for this fact, you go on to say, the Old Testament does not clearly teach ‘a future existence,’ or ‘future retribution.’ Notwithstanding this, you say, – ‘I must grant that the great majority of the Jewish nation in the time of our Saviour had a decided belief in both a future life and future retribution.’ I grant this, sir, but ask, how they came by this *decided belief*? for by your own confession, it could not be from the Old Testament. Such doctrines, you say, were not ‘*taught with distinctness*’ there. Some of the best critics say, the Jews in the time of our Saviour had derived many of their opinions from the heathens, particularly on the subject of a future state. They had a *decided belief* in demons, Satan, transmigration, witchcraft, etc.; but did their decided belief in such things make them true? According to your logic, as the heathens had a decided belief in idols, this made them true Gods.

To get rid of my fact, like some others, you place the doctrine of ‘a future life’ and ‘a future retribution,’ on the same footing in the Old Testament. You say, the Jews had some ‘faint belief in both.’ I think it can be shown, that persons under the Old Testament dispensation, had a decided belief in a future happy existence; but this is not the point in discussion. But, where is it taught under that dispensation, that any one had ‘a faint faith in,’ or ‘a faint fear about’ punishment after death? It is admitted, *gehenna* then did not express this. Where or how then is such a punishment expressed in the Old Testament? You only contend, ‘*gehenna* was used to teach future punishment for the wicked in the time of Christ’s personal ministry,’ and your faith about this seems to rest on the testimony of ‘those who have given this subject a thorough investigation.’ But neither of you pretend to deny my fact, nor can you find anything, to destroy it, as an objection against your views of *gehenna*. The fact is so palpable, it will not be denied. But you say, –

‘2. Perhaps you may affirm, that *gehenna* occurs but twelve times in the Christian Scriptures, and is the only word which is supposed to mean a place or state of misery for the wicked.’ You add, ‘I admit that the word *gehenna* occurs but twelve times in the New Testament.’ But you say, – ‘if our Saviour has taught the doctrine of future retribution in but one sentence in the whole of his teachings, I am perfectly satisfied.’ So am I, sir; and when you are at leisure, select that ‘*one sentence*’ where you are sure it is taught, and let us discuss its true meaning. I agree with you, Jesus ‘was not ignorant of the truth on this question; neither can I allow that he uttered even one falsehood.’ You say – ‘I am willing to confess that the removal of *gehenna* from the controversy would not shake my belief in the doctrine of a future retribution.’ Remove it, then; for why encumber yourself with it? But, remember, sir, that in p. 163, you called the texts about *gehenna* your ‘*undoubted instances*’ of the truth of a future retribution. If you dismiss them from the controversy, you

ought to make a long apology to Messrs. Nicols and Peabody, for putting them to so much unnecessary trouble. But is not this mere finesse? If it is not, why did you call the texts about gehenna *undoubted instances* of proof? why did you divide them into six divisions? why so much time spent at the University poring over Jewish writings about gehenna? and why did you place your gehenna troops in the front of the battle, if no dependence was placed on them for a victory? Did you perceive the gehenna troops are not to be depended on – hence deemed it good generalship, to boast you can dispense with their services? Take care; – the moment you give up the texts about gehenna, you may give up the contest. People will tell you to your face, Mr. Whitman, if your '*undoubted instances*' of proof have failed, we can place no dependence on any other texts you may adduce. Dr. Allen, Professor Stuart, and others, never boasted that victory could be obtained without the gehenna division was in the field. Thus, instead of destroying ray fact, you expose your own weakness. But you say. –

'3. Perhaps you will affirm that the word gehenna is used only by our Saviour and James, and ask why it was not mentioned by the other apostles?' You say, – 'I admit the truth of your assertion.' But, is it a satisfactory answer to the question, 'why gehenna was not mentioned by the other apostles,' to tell us, gehenna is a word 'which some of their hearers or readers could not understand?' No, sir; for you admit 'gehenna was a word which the Jews of Judea understood.' And did not the apostles often address the Jews in Judea, yet never used the term gehenna? Again, you tell us, 'Some to whom the apostles preached, and to whom several of the epistles were partly addressed, were indeed of Jewish extraction. But then they had been educated in foreign countries. They used the Greek language; they knew little or nothing of the colloquial usages of Judea: they were acquainted with the Old Testament only through the Septuagint.' But what a forgetful man you must be; for did you not tell us, p. 163, gehenna 'is a Greek word.' And you have just told us, the Jews 'educated in foreign countries used the Greek language: they were acquainted with the Old Testament only through the Septuagint?' Now, if gehenna was 'a Greek word,' what could hinder the foreign Jews from understanding it? But you told us also, pp. 174, 175, that Joseph's Targum, and the Baylonish Talmud, were composed at Babylon. Gehenna, sir, must have been understood there; for you refer us to these writings for gehenna, meaning future punishment. Surely Babylon was not in Judea in those days. And if gehenna was understood there, why not by Jews in other foreign countries? And why could not the colloquial usage of gehenna in Judea be understood by foreign Jews; for all allow our Lord and his apostles quoted the Septuagint version, which the foreign Jews understood. And have you forgot, sir, that the foreign Jews often visited Judea, at the feasts, and on other occasions. On the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. there were at Jerusalem, 'devout men out of every nation under heaven.' But Peter, in preaching, did not use the term gehenna, or any other word in any other language to express future punishment.

But there is a very good reason, why the apostles never mentioned gehenna, either to the foreign or domestic Jews: it is one given by yourself, and is conclusive against your views of gehenna punishment. You say, p. 182, 'The Greek transla-

tion, or the Septuagint, was used by those Jews who lived in foreign countries, and by them the traditions were never received nor acknowledged to be of any sort of authority.' It is not pretended, sir, that gehenna either in the Hebrew scriptures or Greek version means future punishment. If it was therefore a Jewish tradition, the foreign Jews would have rejected it, had it been mentioned by the apostles. And that it was a *tradition*, seems manifest from the fact, that the apostles never mentioned gehenna to foreign or domestic Jews, or to any one else. How happened this, if it was used in their day among the Jews to mean future punishment? Its being a tradition, accounts for the silence of the apostles about it. For if our Lord used gehenna to mean future punishment, why did the apostles never mention this to the Jews in Judea, who certainly understood its colloquial meaning there? The importance of gehenna punishment, demanded, that gehenna should be explained and understood by all, whether Jews or Gentiles, in all countries. But the apostles did not concern themselves about *gehenna*, which plainly shows, no such sense was then attached to this word. Or, if it had this sense, they looked on it as a Jewish tradition.

But you go on to say, the foreign Jews 'were firm believers in future retribution, before and after their conversion, and consequently had no special need of elementary instruction on this doctrine.' Strange! Why then, sir, did our Lord's apostles need so much of this '*elementary instruction*;' for most of what he said about gehenna was specially addressed to them? They were certainly acquainted with its colloquial usage in Judea; and you told us, a moment ago – 'the great majority of the Jewish nation in the time of our Saviour had a decided belief in a future retribution.' And on p. 183, said, 'gehenna was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of our Saviour to mean future punishment.' Do explain to us, then, why Christ's apostles should need more of this 'elementary instruction' than all the world besfdes. More than foreign Jews, and more than the wicked Jews who lived in Judea. As you will not say it was to convert them, or constitute them apostles, why did they receive so much of it? It could not be, to fit them for preaching gehenna or hell torments to others, for you confess they never preached *gehenna* to either Jews or es. I insist, therefore, that you must tell us, why gave his own apostles so much more of this 'elementary instruction' than the wicked Jews? The foreign Jews received none of it. And if preaching gehenna, or hell torments, is now so excellent a thing for converting people, as many suppose, how is it accounted for, that our Lord and his apostles used it so little for this purpose? Like you 'they seldom used the word hell in their discourses.' But you say, –

'4. Perhaps you will affirm, that the word gehenna is not once used in addressing the Gentiles, and ask the cause of this omission?' Here again you say, – 'I admit the truth of your affirmation.' But what you say here, is, for substance, repeating what you said under the preceding particular, which lias been replied to. I may just notice, you go on to say the Gentiles could not understand gehenna, and add, 'consequently it would have been talking or wriiing an unknown tongue to have reminded them of the gehenna fire.' Well; but why did they not remind them of the 'hades of fire,' or 'the tartarus of fire,' which the Gentiles did understand? The apostles spoke all languages, and could use the word which any Gentile understood,

to mean the same as gehenna. But they never did this. You add, the Gentiles 'believed already in future rewards and punishments, and only needed confirmation in their present belief.' Well, what persons ever received this *confirmation* from the hands of the apostles? By what words, which the Gentiles did understand, did the apostles confirm them in their belief of future punishment? Had you found any such words, no doubt but you would have produced them. But you say, –

'5. Perhaps you will affirm, that the greater part of what our Saviour said concerning gehenna, was addressed to his disciples, and ask why he did not say more on the subject to the unbelieving Jews, if the word meant future misery.' Yes, sir, I have affirmed this, and you say 'the truth of your assertion I admit.' But it is beyond your powers to devise a reply to this fact or objection. Is it any answer to ask the following questions? 'To whom were most of his (Christ's) discourses addressed? To whom were his doctrines entrusted? Who were selected to propagate his gospel? And to whom was the greater portion of his instructions on every subject delivered? To his disciples, certainly. Why then should he make a distinction in this question?' What connexion have these questions with my fact? How they affect it, I am unable to perceive. Do they account for the fact, why our Lord said so much to his own apostles about gehenna, and so little to the unbelieving Jews? surely not. But you say, – 'He did preach gehenna to the unbelieving Jews; and the different manner in which he declared this doctrine to the two classes of hearers, fully establishes the truth of my exposition. Mark this peculiarity.' This still leaves my fact untouched: and directs the attention of the reader away from it, to 'the *different manner* in which Christ declared this doctrine to the two classes of hearers.' Well, let us see what you say about '*the different manner*' in which gehenna was preached to the apostles and the wicked Jews? You say, – 'When addressing his disciples, he speaks of gehenna as something they might avoid by being his faithful disciples. Now if gehenna means a literal, temporal punishment, the very way to be exposed to it was by embracing his religion, and thus exciting the anger of the Jews. But, if the word means future punishment, then surely they might escape by being righteous and holy. On the other hand, when he addressed the unbelieving Jews, he uses language like the following: – 'How can ye escape the damnation of gehenna! 'Now, if gehenna meant a literal, temporal punishment, these Jews were in no danger of suffering it; for they were the ruling party, and of course would not condemn themselves to death by fire; and at the destruction of Jerusalem, the Roman armies did not burn any individuals outside of the city. According to your definition of the word, therefore, our Saviour threatened them with a punishment to which they were not exposed, and would never suffer.' On this quotation we remark,

1. You can do nothing against my views of gehenna, without your old misrepresentation, – *being burned in the valley of Hinnom*; for here it is again introduced. Now, if gehenna, and the 'damnation of gehenna,' meant the vengeance of God which was then coming on the Jewish nation, as I believe it did, how stands this case both with Christ's disciples and the unbelieving Jews? As to the disciples, there was no way for them to escape this vengeance but by continuing Christ's faithful disciples. Such of them as endured to the end should be saved from it. See Matt.

xxiv. Embracing his religion, and being righteous and holy, was the only safety from this tremendous judgment of God on the Jewish nation. As to the unbelieving Jews, they had filled up the measure of their iniquity, and our Lord told them they could not escape this 'damnation of gehenna.' Were they, sir, in no danger of suffering this punishment? Could their being '*the ruling party*' save them from it? You will not say so. Why then, my dear sir, did you not state my views of gehenna to your readers? Why misrepresent them? But,

2. How, on your own views of gehenna, is my fact accounted for, that Christ should say so much about gehenna to his disciples, and so little to the unbelieving Jews. This fact is not touched. To use your own words, with a little addition, 'these unbelieving and persecuting Jews were in danger of future punishment from their very wickedness, and on this account ought to have had more said about it to them than the disciples.' But those who needed most of your '*elementary instruction*' receive the least of it. Do preachers now say most about hell or future punishment to the church? Do they say little about it to the wicked? There is no way, sir, to account for my fact, but on my views of gehenna punishment. But you say,

'6. Perhaps you will affirm that in all the places in which gehenna is used, the persons addressed are supposed to be acquainted with its meaning.' You add – 'This I readily grant.' You then say – 'When the word hell is now mentioned we uniformly understand future misery. This was not the original meaning of the term by any means.' And after telling us, this was not its *exclusive* meaning when our English translation of the Bible was made, you observe – 'So it was with gehenna. It was originally used to mean the valley of Hinnom. But in the time of our Saviour it was generally understood to mean future punishment, as the word hell is now supposed to convey the same idea.' Here, sir, you very frankly confess, the words hell and gehenna have been changed from their original signification, and made to mean future punishment. But you do not risk your reputation in asserting, that this change of sense was by God's authority. No, this was too much for Mr. Whitman. And Unitarians would be the last people on earth, to receive a sense given by men to the words *atonement*, *logos*, and others, unauthorized by Scripture. Well, Universalists are the last people on earth, who will receive a sense given to gehenna which is unscriptural. Our object, sir, is, to ascertain the sense which the Scripture writers attached to their words, and reject all others given to them by Jews, or any one else.

But you risk your reputation in asserting – 'It was our Saviour's boldness in threatening the self-righteous Pharisees with misery beyond the grave, which so exasperated their anger and enmity.' Well, since you risk such an assertion on paper, I assert you are mistaken, and am willing to risk the whole controversy on the truth or falsehood of your assertion. Prove it, and the controversy is ended. Christ's disciples, had more occasion to be *exasperated* at him than the self-righteous Pharisees; for did you not tell us a moment ago, most of his discourses were addressed to them; and you admitted above, most of what he said about gehenna was to them. It was them, not the self-righteous Pharisees, he 'threatened with misery beyond the grave.' Once, and but once, did he say to the self-righteous Pharisees, 'How can

ye escape the damnation of gehenna,' yet it produced little, if any exasperation of their enmity. Saints in our day, would soon get exasperated at their ministers, if they addressed them about hell or gehenna as our Lord did his disciples, and said but little about it to sinners.

'7. Perhaps you will affirm, that if gehenna means future punishment, the Apostles never preached it to Jews or Gentiles.' You say, – 'I admit that they used not this word.' No thanks to you for admitting this and other facts, for they are too palpable to be denied. You add, – 'But it by no means follows, that the Apostles never preached future punishment.' Perhaps not; but it follows, if they used not the word *gehenna*, they omitted using the word which you declared, p. 183, 'was uniformly used by the Jews in the time of the Saviour, and in succeeding ages, to mean future punishment.' Was not this a great and a strange omission? I find, you give us the following reasons for this omission: 'Most of their discourses recorded in the book of Acts were not preached in Judea, where the meaning of the word could be easily understood. Besides, there were doubtless more or fewer proselytes and heathen in almost every congregation, and the inspired teachers were too wise to use a word which they knew even one of their hearers could not feel. Not only so. There was no dispute on the subject of future retribution, for all believed this doctrine. Other topics engrossed their attention.' The Pharisees and Sadducees were at variance on the subject. Besides, the wiser men among the heathen denied it, and laughed at tartarus or hell, by which the rabble were frightened. The Saviour found fault with the Sadducees for denying the doctrine of the resurrection; but he, nor no Apostle after him, found fault with them for denying your future retribution. To say, 'other topics engrossed their attention,' is a poor reason for neglecting to preach gehenna punishment. It is indirectly telling us, what you and others deem of utmost importance, the Apostles said little about. Are preachers now content with simply *recognizing* the belief in future punishment? No they can hardly find words strong enough to express it. You say,

'8. Perhaps you will affirm, that gospel salvation is salvation from sin, and not salvation from gehenna.' I do affirm this, sir, and you admit I am even half right here. You say, – 'The first part of your statement is correct, and the latter part incorrect.' Well, let us see how you prove I am half incorrect, that gospel salvation is not 'salvation from gehenna' or 'future punishment.' You say, – 'Sin and its consequences are the principal causes of misery in this world; and I believe they are the only causes of punishment in another existence.' Well, I say in your own words, – 'The first part of your statement is correct, and the latter part incorrect.' In the latter part, you assume the question in debate, that there is 'punishment in another existence.' I do not allow you to assume this, for I am not a Restorationist. But until you have proved there is punishment in another existence, it is premature to conclude, 'sin and its consequences are the only causes of it. And as you have never been in another existence, to know sin exists there, how do you know its consequences are felt there? And if sin and its consequences are ever to end, why should they not end with this state of existence, as well as in any future state of existence? If you know, sin and its consequences are to exist, and be the only causes of pun-

ishment in another existence, from the word of God, I say you mistake the meaning of the passages which you suppose teach this. No man, sir, ought to believe this on the authority of heathen opinions, or such passages interpreted by Jewish traditions. Nor ought we to believe it from your reasonings, on the principle of analogy; for, allow me the free use of this principle, and I can make the future state just what you please. You add, – ‘When a person therefore is free from sin and its consequences, he is saved from spiritual wretchedness.’ It is certain, sir, from facts, that no man ‘is free from sin and its consequences’ in this life; of course none are entirely free from this and other kinds of wretchedness. And if sin and its consequences do not end in this life, but are carried into another state of existence, the best saints are not free from wretchedness there. And if sin and its consequences are introduced into the next state of existence, what reason have we to hope they will end there, any more than in this state of existence? And, seeing God was not pleased to free men from sin here, and save them from spiritual wretchedness, why should he do it in the next existence? And if evil men and seducers wax worse and worse here, why not also in the next existence? And so sin and spiritual wretchedness go on to increase to endless duration. But I must ask, Is it not more rational to conclude, sin and its consequences end in the same state of existence in which they began? If they do not end here, it will be difficult to tell when, or where they are to end.

But, you make some indirect references to the Scriptures, to show that gospel salvation is salvation from gehenna, or future punishment. You say, – ‘Paul speaks of his converts being already saved, and on this account they would be hereafter saved from wrath or torment. Consequently, he plainly taught that salvation from sin would secure salvation from future misery.’ By your own showing, when Paul speaks of his converts being *already saved*, he meant ‘salvation from sin.’ Well, you tell us, ‘on this account they would be hereafter saved from wrath or torment.’ But you leap to the conclusion, that *wrath* here means ‘future misery,’ which is too long a leap at once. Had you consulted Dr. Campbell on Matt. iii. 7, or most commentators, you might have seen ‘*wrath to come*’ referred to the impending vengeance of God ‘then coming on the Jewish nation. And this is expressly called *wrath*, 1 Thess. ii. 16. Luke xxi. 23. And ‘*the damnation of gehenna*,’ Matt, xxiii. 33. Now, Paul’s converts, yea, all Christ’s disciples who continued steadfast, were saved from this wrath, this gehenna punishment.

You next make an indirect reference to the texts which speak of gehenna. But you take it for granted, gehenna means ‘*future wrath*.’ This is assuming the whole question, in discussion. Christ warned his disciples against a gehenna. But did he warn them against ‘future wrath?’ If he did, his apostles never warned Jews or Gentiles against such a gehenna punishment, as you have admitted above. Your reference to Heb. ii. 3, is not less unfortunate. The believing Hebrews could not escape, (a just recompense of reward, verse 2,) if they neglected so great salvation. Paul told them, chap. x. 25, that they saw ‘the day approaching,’ when this just recompense would be rendered on the Jewish nation, and apostacy would involve them in perdition with the unbelieving part of their nation, verse 39.

But, you renew your reasonings and say, – ‘Are not faith and repentance frequently mentioned as unalterable conditions of Christian salvation?’ Salvation from what, sir? If faith and repentance are unalterable conditions of salvation from ‘*future wrath*,’ then the whole heathen world, all infants dying in infancy, and nine tenths of the Christian world are not saved from it. You reason further, thus: ‘Now, so long as sin exists, misery must continue, and even longer, as you can testify.’ Well the question is, How long is sin to continue? for when it ceases, misery ceases, or soon after it. You add, ‘So long as there are those whom Jesus has not saved from wickedness, so long there must be punishment.’ I admit, sir, that ‘so long as sin exists, misery must continue;’ and this is granting you also, that if sin continues after death, misery will continue after it; for by your own showing, the existence of misery depends on the existence of sin. You think misery continues longer than sin, but how much longer you do not risk a conjecture. Well, do you even tell us how long sin is to exist? No. Nor do you tell us how long misery is to exist. What you wish to establish is, that sin and punishment exist in another world. Well, ‘how do you make out this I You say – ‘that many leave this world in an unsaved condition, you will not deny.’ Well, suppose I admit this, – what then! Is this any evidence that they go on to exist, and sin, and suffer, in another existence? No, sir, this is taking the very things for granted, which must be proved. The dead know not anything; but you allege, they go on sinning and suffering after death, a doctrine which I cannot find in the Bible. I should like to know, in what part of the Bible I can find the doctrine of salvation from either sin or misery after death? Until you prove men sin after death, how can you prove they need salvation from it after death? And if they do not sin after death, they cannot be punished after death, unless you hold to the opinion, of punishment for the sins of this life in the next existence. But if you do, how do you prove that punishment in our present existence, is not for sins committed in a pre-existence, and so introduce the doctrine of transmigration. You say, –

‘9. Perhaps you will affirm, that neither the Hebrew, Greek or English languages, had originally any name for a place of future punishment.’ This fact you seem to admit also. But it is not meeting it to assert, – ‘these tongues had originally no name for a place of future reward.’ Nor is it true, ‘that all the nations which have spoken these several languages have believed in both future rewards and punishments from time immemorial;’ for some Christians have confessed, that the doctrine of future punishment was not taught by God to the Jewish nation, but was learned from the heathen, etc. But I, Does the antiquity and universality of a doctrine make it true? Then Idolatry is true; Trinitarianism is true; and Unitarianism must be false, But you say, ‘If our judges should condemn fifty pirates to be hung, and omit to name any place of execution, would this prove that the sentence would never be executed?’ I answer, No; and ask, if such judges omitted to name both the *place* of execution and the *sentence* to it, would such pirates be hung? You must answer, No. Well, I ask, where has God mentioned either the *place* of future punishment or the *sentence* of men to it? Produce your texts, where either of these things is taught? I am willing to yield you the whole question in debate, if you produce God’s *sentence* to future punishment, leaving the *place* of execution out of the question. You say, –

'10. Perhaps you will affirm, that gehenna was originally used to mean the valley of Hinnom, and ask when its meaning changed to future punishment?' You admit this fact, but say, – 'The word paradise was originally used to denote an earthly garden. The word heaven was first employed to mean the space over our heads. When did their meaning change to a place or state of future happiness?' I answer, sir, explicitly, – When for the first time, any sacred writer used them in this sense. And if you will show, that any sacred writer used *gehenna* to mean future punishment, the controversy is ended. But again, you say, – 'When the English translation of the Bible was executed, the word *villain* was applied to Paul and the other apostles. Its common meaning at that day was a servant. Can you tell me when it was changed to denote *a vile scoundrel*?' Well, as you refer to the original use of the word *villain*, that it did not mean *a vile scoundrel*, but a servant; so do I, that the word *gehenna* did not originally mean future punishment, but the valley of Hinnom, and figuratively for the vengeance of God on the nation of the Jews. You adopt precisely the same course with the word *villain*, which I do with the word *gehenna*, appeal to its original usage in the Scriptures. You justify the course I have pursued. You say, – may they smile at Mr. Whitman's hell, when he goes to the Targums and Talmuds to prove it.

'11. Perhaps you will affirm, that if the Jewish meaning be given to gehenna, it will prove a material hell.' This objection of your own making, you deny, and say – 'This is one mode of infidel attack upon our religion. They say the Jewish writers describe God as possessed of human limbs, senses and passions, and therefore the God of the Bible is a materia! being.'

If the Jewish meaning of gehenna, sir, does not prove a local material hell of fire, how can words be selected to do this? They describe this hell and no other, as I have pointed out above. And has not a local hell of fire been believed in for ages? Some still believe in no other. But now you tell all good Christians, 'this is one mode of infidel attack upon our religion.' But will your *spiritual hell* shield 'our religion' from infidel attacks? No, sir; my views of gehenna, put an end to infidel attacks on *hell*, by removing this whole corruption of Christianity out of the way. Infidels, sir, are left without excuse; for the Bible says in plain language, 'God is a spirit.' But are they left inexcusable in regard to your hell? Does the Bible ever say – 'gehenna is a spiritual punishment both in this world and the next existence, the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings?' The Bible describes no such hell as this; and no wonder men become infidels, when Mr. Whitman, of Waltham, abandons his Bible, and goes to the Jewish writers of antiquity, to prove a 'spiritual hell,' and behold they prove a literal hell of fire. He makes no attempt to show how their literal hell of fire is to be interpreted *spiritually* to suit his spiritual punishment. It is true 'we must have sensible things to make ideas plain to uneducated minds; but will Mr. Whitman affirm, his Jewish writers described a literal hell, to make a spiritual hell plain to such minds? Will he be so kind as to show how we may *spiritualize* the Targum and Talmud hell?

'12. Perhaps you will affirm, that if I give to gehenna the meaning of future torment, I prefer the Targums of the books of the Old Testament.' You deny this. But, how you can with any face deny it, is surprising. Let us see how you manage? You say – 'I do not go to the Jewish writers and commentators for any religious doctrines or precepts; or for their opinion on any article of Christian faith and practice. But to ascertain the meaning of a word is a purely philological question. And the only way in which this can be done in the present instance is by reference to the Targums and Talmuds. This every critic will tell you. This every man of candor must admit.' What the *critics*, Campbell, Jahn, Stuart, Horne, and a writer of your own sect, have said about this, we have seen above. It is not true, that you do not go to the Jewish writers for any religious doctrine, any article of Christian faith; for is not gehenna or hell punishment a very important article of Christian faith? Is hell torment now no '*religious doctrine?*' Would you have gone to the Jewish writers had they been silent on this doctrine? No. Why then say it is 'purely a philological question?' Why did you not go to the Scriptures instead of the Targums? Evidently, because they did not give the meaning to gehenna which suited your purpose. You say 'the Old Testament cannot give me satisfaction on this question. Why so? Because the most modern writings in this book were composed about four hundred years before Christ. After this period the Hebrew language underwent many and great transformations.' So, you tell the infidels, the Old Testament is of no use in interpreting the New, because it is four hundred years older. Yea, you tell them, the sense of words in the Old Testament alter with the transformations of time and the traditions of men. Will this cure them of their infidelity? No, sir; it must confirm them in it, and increase their numbers. And well may they smile at Mr. Whitman's hell, when he goes to the Targums and Talmuds to prove it.

But you say, – 'We have few if any Jewish writings of the period wanted except those I have consulted.' You had the writings of Philo, Josephus, and some of the Apocryphal books '*of the period wanted,*' but you did not consult them, and for reasons noticed above. The Talmuds are about as long after the days of the Saviour, as the books of the Old Testament were before; and for the same reason you reject the one, you ought also to reject the other. But if the sense of Scripture words, alter by lapse of time and the innovations of men, they must be wonderfully altered in sense in the nineteenth century. You have given us one fine specimen of these alterations; for gehenna now means, '*spiritual punishment of the wicked both in this world and the next existence, the torment of inimical and revengeful feelings.*' Is it any wonder, sir, men become infidels?

But you go on to tell us, 'the comparatively later Jewish writers use gehenna to denote future punishment in hundreds of instances,' and 'are good authority.' You say, 'they evidently ground their doctrines on the Targums, the early Rabbins and the Talmuds; for to all these they constantly refer.' You tell us further, 'you cannot suspect them of borrowing the signification of Hebrew words from Christian writers.' So you frankly confess, this doctrine about gehenna, is grounded 'on the Targums, the early Rabbins, and the Talmuds.' So we have suspected. Excuse me, sir, from deeming them authority..

You say, – ‘The Old Testament in the Septuagint version furnishes no authority one way or the other; for the valley of Hinnom is always rendered in some other form of words.’ But even this, sir, is not strictly true; for in Josh, xviii. 16, we have the word *gaihenna*, which is only a trifling difference in the spelling. But this very confession of yours shows, that when the Septuagint version was made, gehenna or the valley of Hinnom, did not mean future punishment. The translators found no such doctrine in the Hebrew Scriptures, and conveyed no such doctrine to posterity in their version.

You add, – ‘Perhaps you will ask why great use is not made of these Jewish writings in illustration of the Scriptures? They have indeed been used to great advantage. Look at Lightfoot, Wetstein, Schoettgen, and others, – the greatest names in biblical criticism, and you will never ask such a question a second time.’ Ernesti, Basnage, and others above, condemn Lightfoot, etc. for using as they do the Jewish writers in interpreting the Scriptures. What modern critic does this? It is not common among Unitarians, so far as my knowledge of them extends. It is peculiar to Mr. Whitman, and even with him, on the subject of gehenna punishment. Dire necessity drove him to the Targums and Talmuds in this controversy.

I come now to your concluding paragraph. You say, – ‘If you or any of your denomination are not satisfied with my conclusion, I ask you to appoint some well qualified person to make a thorough investigation of the whole subject: all the books are to be found in the library of Harvard University, which is open to all settled ministers within ten miles of Cambridge.’ But there is no need of this, for did not you tell us, p. 165, that your investigation of the subject is ‘*a thorough investigation.*’ No one can doubt, but you have given us in your book, the best evidence which Cambridge library could furnish. We have examined it, and the reader can judge if it supports your conclusion – that you ‘have fairly proved the doctrine of future punishment from that class of passages in which the word gehenna occurs.’ If you had, he could have found it without your asserting it.

Conclusion. I have now finished what I have to say on your letter. I have quoted all your material statements, and replied to them; and I think you will confess, I have neither misunderstood or misrepresented you. Let our readers judge between us.

I am yours, respectfully, W. Balfour.

Explanation of Matthew v. 29, 30, and the similar Texts

by Hosea Ballou

Universalist quarterly and general review, Volume 1

A. Tompkins, 1844

pp. 170-178

“And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell, [rather, into Gehenna.] And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell, [rather, into Gehenna.]”

We take it for granted, that this passage is metaphorical. For nobody, so far as we have learned, supposes the real meaning to be what the words literally express, namely, that we should extract, or amputate, one of our members, in certain cases, lest it should be the means of destroying our whole body. True, it may sometimes be advisable to submit to such a mutilation, in order to preserve our lives; but still, this is not the duty which our Saviour here aims to enforce, nor is it, properly speaking, the subject he is treating of, notwithstanding it is the import of his language when taken literally. He uses this well-known example of a most painful sacrifice for the preservation of corporeal life, only that he may the more strongly enforce a corresponding solicitude to preserve the moral life of the soul. This, we suppose, all will admit to have been his object.

And if so, it naturally follows that those prominent particulars in the passage, which literally relate to the body, are to be understood as figures, and interpreted accordingly; the right eye or hand, the plucking of it out or cutting it off, the perishing of one member of the body, and the casting of the whole body into Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom (translated in our common version, *hell*)—all are metaphorical, meaning something else, of a moral or spiritual nature. That is, the right eye or hand becoming an offence, means something else than is literally expressed; so does the plucking of it out, or cutting it off; also, the perishing of one member of the body, and the casting of the whole body into Gehenna, likewise mean something else than is literally expressed. These are but the figures which are employed to denote other ideas. This consideration, which grows directly out of the obvious character

of the passage, has not been sufficiently attended to, by interpreters; and, of course, their expositions have been proportionably confused.

It may help us to the natural and consistent view of the text, if we take the precaution, in the first place, to distinguish between the outward frame-work of metaphors, of which it is composed, and the meaning which the whole was designed to convey: just as we would distinguish between the literal story in a parable, and its signification or moral. Now, the imagery, or figurative representation in the text, when taken literally, is this: that if one's eye or hand become to him an offence, or cause of danger, it is better for him to part with it, even though it be a right eye, or right hand, than to let it remain to corrupt and finally mortify the whole body, making it a loathsome carcass, fit only to be thrown into that abominable receptacle of filth, the valley of Hinnom, or Gehenna. To the feelings of a Jew, it was the most horrible ignominy to have his corpse unburied, cast into that desecrated place, where the worms were perpetually swarming over the mass of offal, garbage and dead bodies, while a fire was always kept burning to consume the remains. Such, then, is the form of the metaphor here employed. But the meaning which the figure was designed to convey, appears to be, that it is better to deny ourselves everything, howsoever innocent and even valuable in itself, if it become to us an occasion of sin, lest it should be the means of depraving the whole heart and life, and thus of bringing upon us the most dreadful consequences,—consequences that are aptly represented in the figure, by having one's dishonored and putrid corpse thrown into the accursed valley of Hinnom. It will be perceived, at once, that this exposition follows the figure out consistently to the end, by a perfectly easy and natural application of it.

In the common method of interpreting the passage, there is an incongruity, which we do not recollect to have seen distinctly noticed. While interpreters unanimously treat the whole as a metaphor, till they reach the last mentioned particular in it, yet, when they come to this, they usually break off the figure abruptly, and take the casting of the whole body into Gehenna, or hell, as no metaphor, but as expressing, literally, the consigning of the person to a future state of eternal torment. Now this, to say the least of it, is a mixing up of literal with figurative exposition; a practice which is, indeed, sometimes necessary, but which ought carefully to be avoided, whenever the structure of the text will allow us to carry out one or the other mode of explanation, uninterrupted, to the end. Now, there is, evidently, no necessity, here, for a departure from consistency. It is far more important, however, to observe, that these interpreters take Gehenna, here, to be the direct and proper name of a future state of torment, like our word *hell*, in the popular religious language of our day. And some of them assert that, in Christ's time, it had lost its original signification of *the valley of Hinnom*, and become appropriated to express the abode of the damned hereafter. On this alleged appropriation, they found the necessity for abandoning the metaphor, in the last-mentioned particular, and for resorting to a literal interpretation of the concluding clause.

Now, this position is unquestionably an error. Without stopping, here, to inquire whether Gehenna was ever applied, at so early a period, to a future state of

torment,¹ it is sufficient, for our present purpose, to observe, that it had not, as yet, lost its original signification of *the valley of Hinnom*. So much, at least, is certain. For, in this very chapter, we have an acknowledged example of its use, in this sense, by our Saviour. See the twenty-second verse, where he alludes to three degrees of judicial punishments, among the Jews. The first was the punishment adjudged by the inferior courts, called “the judgment;” the second, that awarded by “the council,” or great sanhedrin; and the third was “the Gehenna of fire,” (translated, in our common version, *hell-fire*,) or burning alive in the valley of Hinnom. Here, it is acknowledged by nearly all commentators of repute,² that Gehenna is used as being, literally, the name of the valley of Hinnom. Of course, it had not, as yet, lost that signification. Let it be remembered, now, that it is in this very connection, (only seven verses onwards,) that the text under examination is found, where the word occurs again. And here, too, the consistency of the metaphor requires us, as we have seen, to understand it in the same original sense. Or, if we should set entirely aside all argument drawn from the supposed consistency of the figure, still it is not very likely that our Saviour would first use it as the name of the valley of Hinnom, and then, without farther notice, introduce it, immediately afterwards in the same address, as the name of a wholly different thing,—a state of torment in the world of spirits. Neither does it seem natural that he should speak of casting only the body into such a state, if he had dropped the metaphorical style, and was speaking literally of that doom. Accordingly, all the circumstances of the passage, the tenor of the figure, the form of the expression itself, and the usage exemplified in the context, manifestly point to the primitive sense of the term, here; nor are we aware of any indications to the contrary, except those which long-established prejudices will furnish.

We will conclude our remarks on this passage, by tracing out the relation it holds with its preceding context. Our Saviour had just told his hearers, (verse 20,) that they should not enter his kingdom, unless their righteousness exceeded that of the scribes and Pharisees. To illustrate the greater spirituality of his requisitions, he proceeded, first, to contrast the commonly received standard of morality with his own, respecting malice. (Verses 21, 22.) For instance, it had been said, “Thou shalt not kill;” and here, the righteousness of the Pharisees stopped, on this point. But, in the new dispensation, the indulgence even of anger, without any overt act, was to be made as heinous as murder had been considered in the old; and, if that anger was vented in opprobrious and malicious terms, it was to be held as criminal as those enormities had hitherto been deemed, which were punished with the very highest stretch of judicial severity, namely, with “the Gehenna of fire,” or with burning alive in the valley of Hinnom. After adding a few exhortations on this topic, (verses 23, 26,) to enforce the importance of being reconciled with those who have offended us, he then proceeded (verses 27, 28,) to adduce a second case, exemplify-

¹This question is examined, in the Universalist Expositor, (old series,) vol. ii. article xxxiv., and vol. iii. article xxxviii.

²For the views of commentators on the term, in this place, see Paige’s Selections, Kuinoel, Barnes’ Notes, Livermore’s Commentary, Le Clerc’s Hammond, &c, *in loco*, Stuart’s Exegetical Essays, pp. 141-143, &c.

ing the higher requisitions of his gospel. It had been said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery;" and here, again, the righteousness of the Pharisees stopped, with respect to this sin. But the gospel went further: Christ said, "that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." He condemned the wicked passion in the heart, just as he had done in the case of anger, with as much severity as others showed to the overt act. Now, the form of the expression which he used here, "whosoever *looketh* on a woman," &c, appears to have suggested the first figure in the next verse, "and if thy right *eye* offend thee," &c.; and the connection in which this latter passage is introduced, shows that he had some special reference in it to the sin of lewdness. That the reference, however, was not confined to this one sin, is evident, we think, from the subsequent figure, with which he varied the metaphor,—“and if thy right hand offend thee,” &c. It was a general warning against all occasions of exciting the sinful passions, of whatsoever kind, especially those of lust.

It is remarkable, that many interpreters take the "right eye" and the "right hand," here, to represent the sins themselves, instead of the occasions of sin. And, accordingly, they explain the plucking out of the right eye, and the cutting off of the right hand, to mean that we must deny ourselves our dearest, most pleasing, sins, if they lead us astray. This, however, is absurd,—as if we might have favorite sins which do not corrupt us, and, in that case, might retain them; but if they should operate injuriously, then we must put them away! The very character of the figure presupposes that something valuable in itself, is intended, as the subject of the sacrifice. This idea, indeed, is what gives force to the metaphor. And the natural import of it is, that we must be careful, at whatever expense, to keep our hearts free from guilty desires, just as a prudent man would prevent a fatal mortification from fastening on his body, even at the sacrifice of so useful a member as a right eye or a right hand.

We now proceed to examine the similar passages. There are two, of this kind; parallel, probably, with each other, though not so with that which we have just considered. They are the records which Matthew (xviii. 8, 9) and Mark (ix. 43-48) have given of what seems to have been one and the same injunction of our Saviour. It appears, from each of these evangelists, that he had just set before his disciples a little child as the example of greatness in his kingdom; and that, alluding to their recent contention among themselves, *which* should be the greatest, he had admonished them against offending those who believed in him. For such an offender, "it were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Wo unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but wo unto that man by whom the offence cometh!" Then he adds the solemn injunction, which we shall set down in the two forms which the two evangelists give it.

“Wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cost them from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into everlasting fire, [rather, into the fire that is everlasting.] And if thine eye offend thee,

pluck it out, and cast it from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes, to be cast into hell-fire, [*literally*, into the Gehenna of fire: *the same phrase used in Matthew v. 22.*]- Matthew xviii. 8, 9.

“And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, [*literally*, into Gehenna,] into the fire that never shall be quenched, [*rather*, that is unquenchable,] where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than, having two feet, to be cast into hell, [*literally*, into Gehenna,] into the fire that never shall be quenched, [*rather*, that is unquenchable,] where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than, having two eyes, to be cast into hell-fire, [*literally*, into the Gehenna of fire: *the same phrase used in Matthew v. 22.*] where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”-Mark ix. 43-48.

It is manifest that here, we have, in general, the same metaphor which runs through the text just considered, and that it is to be explained in the same way. But if, as is probable, these two latter passages are but different records of one exhortation of Christ, we must take the phrase, “enter into life,” both in Matthew and in Mark, as synonymous with “enter into the kingdom of God,” in the concluding sentence of Mark’s record; so that, here, the consistency of the metaphor is indeed violated, and, in this one stage of its development, the language shifts, for an instant, from the figurative, over towards the literal character. And yet, there is, after all, some ambiguity, in this respect; since, to “enter into life,” is a form of expression equally applicable, in itself, either to the attainment of confirmed spiritual life, or to the securing of corporeal life. It is equivocal; indicating, perhaps, some wavering of the idea between the purely figurative and the literal. But, on the third repetition of it, in Mark, where it is changed to the form, “enter into the kingdom of God,” the idea becomes decidedly literal, and the metaphor is completely broken, for the moment. For, “the kingdom of God,” is the direct designation of the spiritual life and privileges of the gospel, and has no reference to soundness of bodily health. We mention this, to show that there is an imperfection in the development of the figure, whatever explanation we give to the whole.

Again: it is evident, by comparing the parallel expressions in these two passages, that “to be cast into the fire that is everlasting,” is the same as “to be cast into the Gehenna of fire,” or, “into Gehenna,” or, “into the fire that is unquenchable, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” And we scarcely need to say, that all these are phrases which, in their *literal* sense, designate or aptly describe the valley of Hinnom, with its perpetual fire, and its ever-swarming, ever-devouring host of worms. It has already been seen, that “the Gehenna of fire,” is the appellation

by which Christ spoke of that place. Its fire is called "the everlasting" (*aionios*,) or "unquenchable" (*asbestos*,) because it never was extinguished; and the worm, it is said, "dieth not," because it was always found there, in such abundance. It should be observed, moreover, that this language had a *proverbial* reference to the valley of Hinnom; for our Saviour borrowed it from Isaiah, (lxvi. 24,) where it had been used with reference to that place, and where it had presented the same imagery as here: "They shall go forth," said the prophet, "and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

Accordingly, it is plain that all these phrases denote (we mean, literally,) the valley of Hinnom. The general developement of the metaphor, therefore, if we fill out the break in it, is obviously the same, here, as in the text at the head of this article. And the moral, or signification, of it, is the same, namely: Give up every thing that becomes to thee an occasion to sin; for it is better to enter into the kingdom of God, into the spiritual life and blessedness of the gospel, even at the sacrifice of outward privileges and comforts, than, by retaining them, to have thy whole soul corrupted, till thou art involved in a state of utter abomination and wretchedness; like a dishonored corpse that is cast into Gehenna to be preyed upon by the worms, and abandoned to the fire. Such is the interpretation which appears to us the most natural and simple. Certain it is, that the common explanation is beset with several difficulties. If carried out strictly, it presupposes, 1. That "Gehenna," and "the fire that is everlasting," and the parallel phrases, do not designate, in any way, the valley of Hinnom, but are the direct names or descriptions of a future state of torment in the spiritual world; of course, that the metaphor, with which the passages begin, is wholly abandoned, in the latter part. 2. That to "enter into the kingdom of God," is not to enter into the gospel, in this life, as the expression usually means, but into the state of glory, hereafter,—as if the person had never been in the "kingdom" before. 3. That if we sacrifice any outward privileges and comforts, here on earth, in order to avoid occasions to sin, we shall hereafter be deprived of corresponding conveniences,— shall enter into heaven, maimed, and halt, and half-blind, as it were. 4. That when speaking directly and exclusively of a future state of torment, our Saviour mentioned only the body as being cast into it.

Now, we do not say that these difficulties are sufficient, in themselves, to set aside the interpretation to which they belong. Did the case render it obviously necessary, we might be justified in accounting for them by a supposed irregularity in the figure, and by some carelessness in the expressions. But we do say, that, with a candid mind, unbiassed by overweening attachment to a system, there can be little hesitation in determining *which* of these two expositions is the simpler, the more consistent, and the more probable.

H. B.