

the same way as the other variables, the number of days with rain was also included in the model.

The model was fitted to the data using the maximum likelihood method. The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

The maximum likelihood method is a common method for fitting models to data. It involves finding the parameter values that maximize the likelihood of the observed data. The likelihood function is a function of the parameters and the data. The maximum likelihood estimates are the parameter values that maximize the likelihood function.

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL  
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY



From the collection  
of the  
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY











[REDACTED]

Margt. G. Belden  
June 22<sup>nd</sup> 1833

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, consisting of several lines of cursive script.

A small, dark, rectangular mark or stamp located at the bottom left corner of the page.

**THE**  
**LIGHT OF TRUTH,**

**AND**

**PLEASURE OF LIGHT.**

by *Russel Canfield*

**IN FOUR BOOKS.**

**GREAT IS TRUTH, AND IT SHALL PREVAIL.**

---

**Hilledgeville :**

**PUBLISHED BY M. SMITH.  
PRINTED BY RUSSEL CANFIELD, HARTFORD, CT.**

.....  
**1827.**

**DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, ss.**

**L. S.** **BE IT REMEMBERED**, That on the twenty second day of May, in the fifty-first year of the Independence of the United States of America, Russel Canfield, of the said District, hath deposited in this office the title of a Book, the right whereof he claims as Proprietor, in the words following, to wit:

**“The Light of Truth, and Pleasure of Light, in four Books. Great is Truth, and it shall prevail.”**

In conformity to the act of Congress of the United States, entitled, “An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,”—And also to the act, entitled, “An act supplementary to an act, entitled ‘An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned,’” and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints.”

**CHAS. A. INGERSOLL,**  
*Clerk of the District of Connecticut.*

**A true copy of Record, examined and sealed by me,**

**CHAS. A. INGERSOLL,**  
*Clerk of the District of Connecticut.*

BT

821

.C35

## CONTENTS.

### BOOK FIRST.

- SECT. I.—Of the Magi notion of evil—who created it—The term Devil, not found in the Old Testament—Of the term Satan—Of the Greek term *diabolos*, translated Devil, in the New Testament—Of the origin, or parentage of the Devil. 13
- SECT. II.—Of the Greek terms *Daimonion*, or *Daimoniou* and *Daimon*, translated Devil, or Devils—Testimony of Scripture to prove the Non-personality of a Devil—Of the destruction of the Devil. 21
- SECT. III.—The opinion of Plato, Heisod, and others, respecting Demons—How the English translators rendered the same Greek term differently—Opinion of Homer and Josephus—Of the Jewish Angelology—Hippocrates' opinion of Demoniacs. 25
- SECT. IV.—Definition of the Greek term,—*Diabolos*—Remarks of Dr. S. Clark on personification,—of the number of Angels and Devils—A Devil the popular god of Superstition. 31
- SECT. V.—Observations relative to the Hebrew word *Shaitan*, called *Satan*, in our common version.—An extract from Prideaux, on the Maan philosophy, as revived by Zoroaster. 42
- SECT. VI.—Of witches and witchcraft.—The Magian religion, as revived and reformed by Zoroaster, a supposed Jew.—Zoroaster's day of judgment.—Concluding remarks. 59

### BOOK SECOND.

- SECT. I.—Examination of the Hebrew words Sheol and Gehenna; and of the Greek word Hades, and the pagan Tartarus. 75
- SECT. II.—HELL DESTROYED.—Lecture on 1 Cor. 15: 55. O Hell, where is thy Victory. By Rev. J S. Thompson. 100
- SECT. III.—Further remarks on the words Sheol and Hades. Reasons for disbelieving in the modern use of these terms, urged, from scripture usage. 117
- SECT. IV.—Further examination of the subject. Appeal to the Scriptures relative to the first transgression. 149

## CONTENTS.

- SECT. V.**—Quotations from Dr. Campbell relative to Sheol and Hades, and Mr. Balfour's deductions from them. Further remarks by the Editor. 153
- SECT. VI.**—An examination of the only passage in the New Testament, where our Lord threatens the Jews with Gehenna punishment. 175
- SECT. VII.**—The remaining places where Gehenna occurs in the New Testament fairly examined. 189

### BOOK THIRD.

- SECT. I.**—Statement of the argument—Home-made Scripture No soul fit for heaven while in the body—The Almighty knew, of course decreed the destiny of all souls before he created them. 223
- SECT. II.**—Reasonable arguments—The carnal mind is the cause of sin—The facilities of the disembodied soul to attain holiness—No authority to believe God is limited in his designs with the soul to the time of this life—All believe the soul can exist after death with all its faculties, — why not then be improved by means? 230
- SECT. III.**—The good and wise believe that God has not left the final destiny of man to his own actions and opinions—Remarks of Addison—Query relative to the situation of the soul after death—How God will sanctify the soul after it leaves the body. 235
- SECT. IV.**—If souls cannot be altered for the better beyond the grave, Infants cannot be saved—What it is to be born of God—[Idiots not fit for heaven—Those who never heard of Christ and God, not fit for heaven. 245
- SECT. V.**—Statement of another opinion relative to the origin of the soul—God could have prevented moral evil and human misery—The necessity and benefit of evil and misery. 254

### BOOK FOURTH.

- SECT. I.**—Of the origin of sin—Fabulous account—True account—Sin not infinite, but finite.—Atonement. 267
- SECT. II.**—Second plan of Atonement, examined and refuted. Remarks on its injurious effects. 280
- SECT. III.**—Third plan of atonement examined, and found wanting. Dishonourable to God, and injurious to man. 283
- SECT. IV.**—The personage of the Mediator who makes the Atonement, and his ability for performing the work. 287



## EDITORIAL ADDRESS.

When the subscriber undertook the printing of this volume for the publisher, he contemplated no higher duty, and no greater responsibility, than that attached to the labours of an editor. Circumstances, however, not within his control, brought into requisition his powers as an author, and that under very unfavourable auspices. For error in principle, he asks no quarter; but he is confident in the belief, that the mantle of charity will be spread over those defects of arrangement and style which are almost inseparable from a hasty production. Had time and health permitted, the arrangement and classification of facts and arguments might have been more judiciously made, but he is thankful that no material error in the detail of facts, and no important defect in the deductions from those facts, has yet been discovered.

The extent of authorship for which the editor is specially responsible, is principally designated in the captions to the various sections. As different authors have furnished the principal portion of the several books, original matter was sometimes required to form the connecting links in the chain of facts and consequences. To designate this matter, is deemed superfluous.

Whatever may be the impression of those who are utterly unable to judge correctly, for want of data; certain it is, that few could be induced to come out with arguments against a popular doctrine, unless supported by good testimony. That the evidence on which we oppose the common doctrines is valid, is shown by the fears and tergiversations of our oppo-



Margt. C. Belton  
June 22<sup>nd</sup> 1833

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, consisting of several lines of cursive script.

A single handwritten character or mark located in the middle of the page.

A small handwritten mark or character at the bottom left corner of the page.

THE  
LIGHT OF TRUTH,

AND

PLEASURE OF LIGHT.

by *Russel Canfield*

IN FOUR BOOKS.

**GREAT IS TRUTH, AND IT SHALL PREVAIL.**

---

**Hilledgeville:**

PUBLISHED BY M. SMITH.

PRINTED BY RUSSEL CANFIELD, HARTFORD, CT.

.....  
1827.

form the light, and create darkness : I make peace, and create evil : I the Lord do all these things.”\*

What is evil? whence its origin? has been the fruitless inquiry of the learned and curious for ages. The consequences resulting from the existence of any thing or principle, must define its quality, and decide its merits. And it is necessary to observe the distinction between the operation of a principle, and its final result. The man who wantonly severs a member from the body of his fellow, cannot compensate him for the loss, the act is evil in its operation, and an injury in its result. While the skilful amputator, who separates the gangrenous from the healthy part, and restores the sufferer, is entitled to the gratitude and veneration of the recipient. Thus are we taught to view the Great Physician, who heals the moral maladies of men, and advances them progressively to holiness and happiness. The question of origin is answered. “I the Lord create evil!” The *time* is ascertained by a reference to the beginning of the chastisements of man. The *end* is seen in the purpose of God, who “will finish the transgression, and make an end of sins.”

The second person in the duality of the Persian doctors, has, by an easy metamorphosis, become the devil of the moderns. And it is a fair presumption, that the Jews, during their captivity, imbibed the popular errors of the Magi of Babylon; for they were notorious for going “a whoring after other gods.” Neither has it been uncommon for untutored nations to imagine an evil principle or being, whom they have at-

\* It appears that the above declaration of Isaiah from the Almighty, was made 712 years before Christ, 112 before Cyrus was born—176 before the events noted in the verses were fulfilled.

This prophecy respecting Cyrus, made so long before he was born, was shown to him by Daniel, at Babylon, in the time of Nebuchadnezzar’s insanity, while he visited the place, when he was 37 years of age, and in 27 years afterwards he fulfilled the prediction.

See the History of Daniel, by M. Smith, pages 218 and 291—see *Isaiah 44 : 28, and 45 : 1 to 7.*

tempted to propitiate by prayers and offerings ; while they have assigned to the good spirit, a complacency independent of their agency or actions.

It is worthy of remark, that the term devil, occurs nowhere in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The term Satan, however, a convertible mode of expression, is found ; and it is recorded, that “when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan came also among them.” But this should not excite surprise, since we are assured by the twelve disciples of Christ, that there was not only a Satan among them, but a devil also.

The term devils occurs four times in the Old Testament, as follows : “And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring.” “They sacrificed unto devils, not to God ; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. And he [Jeroboam] ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had made.” “Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils.” This testimony proves, beyond the possibility of confutation, that at a period posterior to the creation of man upon the earth, devils were something new. Also, that Jeroboam manufactured devils, as deliberately as the mechanic does his wares, and probably of similar materials !

We will now extend our inquiry into the New Testament, relative to the devil who tempts the human family, for it is evident the devils of the Old Testament, have no concern in this business. As the term devil frequently occurs in the translation of the New Testament, it would be superfluous to refer you to every passage. It is sufficient to examine the most prominent, where the original contains the appropriate and legitimate term.

It is proper to state, that the word *Διαβολος*, rendered

devil, is from a word compounded as follows ; *δια*, *through*, and *εαλλω*, *to cast*—To dart or strike through—to stab with an accusation, &c. Therefore, the term *Diabolos*, rendered *devil*, signifies an *accuser*, a *slanderer*, an *impostor*.

Christ, addressing his disciples, says, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and *one of you is a devil*.” Here is no less than Christ’s unequivocal declaration, that one of his disciples (Judas) is a devil. But a devil is not the devil, some will say, but is not *the devil a devil*? We acknowledge, that we have no better evidence to prove Judas to be a *real devil*, in *propria persona*, than the testimony of Jesus Christ.

Again—We read “Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. In the original Greek, the word rendered slanderers, is *diabolous*, the legitimate word for devils! The very devil that tempted Christ. Now we believe all God’s threatenings will be executed—all the promises will be performed. But why exhort the deacons’ wives to sobriety, &c. and not to become devils, unless it is not only possible, but certain, too, that a contrary course would make them *devils*?

We read, “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the *devil*; *diabolos* [that tempted Christ,] and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage.” Has the devil the power of death? Yes. In other words: The devil causes death. What is death? “To be *carnally minded is death*.” Paul also says, “the wages of sin is death.” Thus we see, that the devil and death are companions; they walk hand in hand. Wherever you find the devil, there you find death—that is, the carnal mind—and we never find death without finding the devil in company.



Now, we have a trace of him, we will inquire how came this death into our world? This *Diabolos*, this devil, has the power of death, caused its existence, and brought it in his train. But how did it come? Ans. "By man came death." The man existed before death, of course before the devil; and this fact proves that the devil did not produce sin, nor cause man to sin, but the sin of man brought the devil into existence.

How came sin into the world? The Scriptures say "*By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin*"—If death came, or was caused by sin, what has the devil to do with the matter? Ans. If the devil has the power of death, what concern has sin in the business? Here are sin and the devil claiming the honour of being the cause of the mischief, and each of them have the inspired writers for historians! Now we believe both of them are guilty; and as we never find death, but in company with the devil, and never find sin, except in company with death, we therefore, believe they are related, and belong to one family: and perhaps are one and the same, and merely called by different names, to suit the occasion—In proof of this we read as follows in the Scripture:

"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil and satan, which deceiveth the whole world." What a deceiver, to deceive the whole world! by how many names he is called! He must have deceived Paul. Let us inquire of Paul, and learn by what name he calls him. "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Surely this is that old serpent, with another name, or something as mischeivous; for this sin first deceived Paul, and then, not contented with having done that mischief, slew, or killed him! This sin, of which Paul speaks, is most certainly, the very devil himself, or some one quite as bad, who, unsolicited, is performing his business for him!

Let us inquire farther, how this sin, or this old serpent, called the devil and satan, deceives people. It appears he deceived the *whole* world, Christ only excepted.

We read that "Every man [Paul and Christ included] is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, [desire,] and enticed: then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

James calls the devil by the same name as Paul. He also makes man the progenitor of the devil—First, the man's desire—Second, the man's desire conceives—Third, after the conception, in proper time, the birth takes place, and the devil appears, and death in his company. How stubborn is truth? But is this really that old serpent, of whom so much has been said? The very same. Look at him—view him well, so you can recollect his countenance, and beware of his seductions. Remember the caution to the deacons' wives, and profit by the warning.

We are aware that the devil's portrait is not sufficiently coloured, and shaded, yet, to be seen to advantage by all, and will proceed in the delineation of his features. In attending to this, it is necessary to notice a prominent error in the religious world, which has a tendency to lead the mind astray, and to produce absurdity. We mean the popular doctrine of the fall of man. It has been taught, that man was created immortal, and by sinning became mortal, or liable to disease and death. The Scriptures teach no such doctrine. The constitution of man, as ordained by his Maker, has remained the same, so far as relates to his mortality. The declaration which is mistaken for a denunciation of vengeance. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," is only a confirmation of the truth, and its consequences as stated, of man's origin, that he was "formed of the dust of the ground."

Man, therefore, was as much dust before he sinned, as afterwards. Sin did not affect the constitution of his moral, or rather spiritual condition. What could, or what did the Maker expect to result from the work of his hands, different from that which experience has produced? Common sense must answer--Nothing. The declaration of Christ is true now, was always truth, and will remain so throughout the wasteless ages of eternity. "That which is born of the *flesh is flesh.*" Now for the devil. Of what is he born? Ask James. He has told you of his origin, conception, birth, &c. Can the flesh produce a spirit? If it can, you may call that spirit devil, and give him all the rights of primogeniture which Milton conferred upon him. But, still the devil which is born of the flesh, cannot be older than the flesh. We are farther instructed, that the "flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." In other words, the desires born of, or produced by the flesh, are opposed to the spirit [or nature] of God in man.

We have seen that these opposing desires produce, when they conceive and bring forth, sin, or devil, which, when finished, produces death.

We will direct the reader's attention to a prominent passage, for the further elucidation of the subject. We read of man, after he had sinned, or produced death, that he was denied access to the tree of life; evidently that he should remain dead for a season, until God's purpose shall be accomplished in man's redemption through Jesus Christ, who will destroy death, and sin, or devil, the cause of it, in such an effectual manner, that man shall be incorruptible and immortal. We take the liberty to read the passage correctly, and not to be fettered by an erroneous translation, "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is to become as one of us" in the future tense; "to know good and evil" and the connexion amounts to

this, because he is not, in the present tense, like God, and is so ignorant as to know only evil, the Lord turns him out of the garden.

We have now seen that man's constitution is such as to make his subjection to vanity, or sin, not only a probable, but a certain event. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." The Apostle declares, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." In the name of reason, how can that come out of man, which is not in him? Paul adds, "Now if I do that I would not, it is not I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." The Devil was in Paul, on his own confession. Do we not read of Christ, that "he was tempted in all points like as we are yet without sin?" Again. "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." How was Christ tempted? Let James and Paul answer. The man Christ Jesus was tempted as we are. How are we tempted? "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." Christ, then, was drawn away of the lust of the body he bore, which was the same flesh and blood of which the children were partakers. How far was he drawn? Ans. He was drawn not so far as to have the lust conceive, nor bring forth, consequently, he did not sin, nor die; that is, become carnally minded, as a consequence. Paul declares of himself, "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity." The law in Christ's members, did not bring him into captivity. If it is objected that Christ had not in his flesh the evil propensities to combat, common to all mankind: We answer—Then he was not tempted as we are, and the account of his being tempted of the devil that tempts mankind, is incorrect.

## SECTION II.

Of the Greek terms *Daimonion*, or *Daimoniou* and *Daimon*, translated Devil, or Devils—Testimony of Scripture to prove the Non-personality of a Devil—Of the destruction of the Devil.

The more effectually to remove the stumbling blocks from the inquirer after truth, it is necessary to notice the varied translation of the same term, in the original. In all those passages which speak of persons being possessed by devils, the devils being cast out, and the sufferers healed, a different word is found. We read \* *Daimonion*,—not †—*Diabolos*. This word properly signifies insane persons. Hence the declaration of James is to this amount—'Thou believest in one God. Very good. The evidences of God's existence are so notorious, that even insane persons believe as much as this. This belief produces fear, unless it is accompanied with a true knowledge of God's character and purposes. An evil spirit was supposed to produce epilepsy, insanity, &c. Consequently, curing these diseases was termed casting out devils (or demons) destroying their power over the sufferers.

Christ was accused by the Jews of deriving this power from the chief of the evil spirits. This could not be; for no spirit would contribute to his own downfall. He gave evidence that his power was of a higher order; and confounded their ideas of the Magian hypothesis. The Greeks had a catalogue, of 30,000 gods. Their heroes were deified, and their gods were exalted in proportion to their supposed prowess. When Paul preached at Athens "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them

\* Διαβολος,

† Δαιμονιον,

Jesus, and the resurrection." In the original \* *Daimonion* ; our translators were pleased in this verse of Scripture to translate daimonion, gods, but in all other places where the term occurs, they have rendered it devils, or devil, which shows they believed the doctrine of a devil without the authority of Scripture. There were good and evil demons, in the opinion of the Greeks; and the Athenians understood Paul to preach that Jesus had died and was now a spirit in another world : which they signified by the term demon, and considered him a strange one, not having heard of him. This is reasonable, considering their ideas of theology.

There is a species of *prosopopœia*, or personification, even in the Scripture, which authorises the firmest conviction of the truth of our position, relative to the personification of sin. Thus wisdom, "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars : she hath killed her beasts ; she hath mingled her wine ; she hath sent forth her maidens ; she crieth upon the highest places of the city," &c. It is therefore evident, that the personification of a thing, or principle, cannot be a creation of a person, or even a metamorphosis, by which one substance is changed into another. It is one of the helps to aid the mind of man, and increase his means of conception and knowledge.

Again : The doctrine we are attempting to disprove, is an outrageous contradiction of the most prominent asseverations of God's prophets. For it is declared, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." A devil distinct from man, then, is a supernumerary in creation, and less deceitful and wicked than man. If the temptation is supposed to come from the vilest being, the man is more

Greek \* *Δαιμονιον*,

likely to tempt the devil, than the devil the man; for the obvious reason, that the heart of man is deceitful above all.

We will now refer to testimony in the Sacred Volume, which shall farther illustrate and confirm the truth we are trying to support. And, first, we will prove, that a contrary doctrine amounts to unqualified infidelity! the Scriptures are unequivocal in their declaration, that "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," and that "By man came death." While, on the other hand, the popular error we are combating, as unequivocally declares, that by one or more devils sin and death entered into the world: now a compromise can never be effected, but by a virtual surrender of the devil, by an acknowledgment of the truth of the doctrine we avow, and associating him with man, as a consequence of his fleshly propensities.

The consideration of the temptation of the first sinner will remove all difficulty from the mind, on the subject. The law of God to man in Eden, required obedience, and forbid them to eat the specified fruit. Their ignorance in giving heed to their own desires, and distrust of their maker, proved their SIN and moral DEATH. God virtually declared the fruit would kill them, if they ate thereof. The woman disbelieved the Creator, and ate.—God is proved true, the desires of the flesh, the Serpent, a liar. "To sin is to miss of that good, which the divine commandment promises to the obedient.

We have now exhibited concurrent testimony of Scripture to confirm the doctrine taught by St. Paul, that "in his flesh dwelt no good thing." Thus the devil must be sought for in the recesses of the human heart; the seat of all the evil machinations which have disturbed the peace of man. Here is his throne. Here he reigns and conquers, and his fleshly dominion

must be dissolved, ere the rebel receives his doom. The seat of the disease, and its extent, is declared by Paul, in his epistle to his brethren at Colosse. Of Christ, he writes as follows; "Ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power, in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins [not of an imaginary devil,] but of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ." The subjection to vanity is declared, in his epistle to the Romans, to extend to the creation of God. For "the creation was made subject to vanity." The bondage is limited to the present life, in his epistle to the Hebrews; declaring the object of Christ's mission to be the destruction of death, and the cause of it, and the deliverance of those who were all their lifetime [and no longer,] subject to bondage. It is also affirmed, of Christ, that "he both died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living." And the apostle triumphantly exclaims, "No man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord." All have sown to the flesh, and of the flesh reaped corruption. But that which "is sown in corruption," man, "shall be raised in incorruption." That which "is sown in dishonour, shall be raised in glory!" When?

Hear Christ. "Father, the hour is come. Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." The inference is irresistible, it is first necessary that the Son be glorified, before he can glorify the Father! He was glorified. His prayer was heard. "For the suffering of death he was crowned with glory and honour." The members of his body, all men, are included in the triumph; for "he tasted death for every man." The moment of deliverance is announced—the manner of it explained. Through death—death



is destroyed ! The bondage to corruption ceases ! The body of sin is put off—the dishonor is swallowed up in glory ! Sin, the personified devil, is no more ; and the freed soul wings its way, in cherubic splendour, to the mansions of its Father God. Can this be true ? Yes as true as holy writ can make it, and such truths are the joy of the immortal Spirit.

Although we think that enough 'has been said' on this subject to satisfy an unprejudiced mind, that reason and Scripture are against the popish, degrading, and tormenting doctrine of a personal devil—Yet as we know that early, and religious notions, however erroneous, are very hard to overcome, and believing the doctrine we dispute, to be injurious to human virtue and happiness, and the one we wish to establish to be favorable to both, we will extend the subject of inquiry.



### SECTION III.

The opinion of Plato, Heisod, and others, respecting Demons—How the English translators rendered the same Greek term differently—Opinion of Homer and Josephus—Of the Jewish Angelology—Hippocrates' opinion of Demoniacs.

In the New Testament, through the negligence, prejudice, or ignorance of the translators, the word devil occurs as the English term for the three Greek words, *diamon*, *daimonion*, and *diabolos* ; but the latter only should have been rendered devils. The two first words are both derived from *daio*, to *divide*, and all the ancients used the term *daimon*, to signify a being, who distributed to man his proportion of pain and pleasure. Hence *Daimones* among the Greeks, and *Manes* among the Latins, were words of the same import or meaning.

*Quisque suos patimur manes—Virgil.*

All have their manes, and their manes bear—Dryden.

Or all their ghosts endure.

Some have supposed that the word demon, in the sacred writings, always implies an evil spirit, or devil; but this is a conceit of St. Augustin and others, which will not bear investigation. Demons, according to the Gentile Mythology, were middle powers between Sovereign God and mortal man, who performed the office of mediators, and executioners of the divine purposes. Of this opinion was Plato, the most competent judge, and consummate writer on this subject. Apuleius de Deo Socratis, affirms, "the demons are middle powers, by whom all our desires and deserts pass to the gods. It would derogate from the majesty of the celestial gods, to be concerned about such things; therefore all things are done by the will, power, and authority of the celestial gods, but by the obedience and ministry of the demons."

It is abundantly manifested from the best writers of antiquity, that demons were the supposititious ghosts of dead men. Hesiod, a most ancient writer, who flourished nine hundred years before Christ, describes that happy race of men, who lived in the first or golden age of the world, as being promoted, after death, to the rank of demons by the will of Jupiter, and appointed to be guardians of men, and the observers of their good and evil actions.

*Autar epei men touto genos kata gaia kalypse  
Toi men daimonese cisi, Dios magalou diaboulas,  
k. t. l.*

Plato agrees with Hesiod, and admits that he and many of the poets speak excellently, in affirming that when good men die, they obtain great honour and dignity, and become demons. In another place, he maintains, that all who die valiantly in war, are admitted into Hesiod's golden generation, and constituted Demons. Eusebius and Theodoret both cite and approve these passages, from Hesiod and Plato, and use them as an argument for similar dignity and honour

being bestowed on saints and martyrs. Hence it is clear from the writings of the greatest men of antiquity, that the term demon, originally and properly applied to deified dead men. In this very sense, it was understood by the philosophers at Athens, in the days of Paul; for when he preached Jesus and the resurrection, they thought he wished to introduce Christ to them as a demon, or deified dead man. Accordingly they say, "he seemeth to set forth strange demons." Acts 17: 18. Here our translators were as much puzzled by the word demon, as by the term hades, 1 Cor. 15: 55; for though they had constantly translated *Demon, Devil; Hades, Hell*, yet they were in the above places forced to abandon the doctrine of hell, and metamorphose their devils into gods! It is also clear, from the term *deisidaimonesterous*, used by Paul, Acts 17: 22, that the superstition of the Athenians consisted in the fear and worship of these demons. Epiphanius, haranguing against the idolatrous worship of the Virgin, says, (and that very properly) Paul predicted that "some should apostatize from sound doctrines, giving heed to doctrines concerning demons, and become worshippers of the dead, as they were worshipped in Israel." Here Epiphanius refers to Baalim and Astaroth, which were men and women deified after death. Indeed, idolatrous Israel adopted the model of their gods from the neighbouring nations; and the opinions of Josephus concerning the demons, agree with the notions of the heathen philosophers. Homer calls Nenus, Demon—Ilaid 17, 98—104, and though many of the Greek writers use *theoi, kai Daimones*, as distinct, thereby indicating different grades in their objects of adoration, yet demons and gods were generally synonymous terms.

It is acknowledged however, that according to Plutarch, it was an ancient opinion, that some of these Demons fearing that good men might rival them in

honour and happiness, or attain to equal dignity, endeavoured to prevent and hinder them in the pursuit of virtue. Accordingly it became the opinion of philosophers, that part of the demons were wicked and malignant. Josephus, Wars, B. 7. C. 6. says, these evil demons were no other than the spirits of the wicked, who enter into the bodies of the living and kill them, unless they obtain help against them." Hence the demonology of the later philosophers and the Pharisaic Jews, was perfectly analogous to the modern doctrine of good and bad angels. The whole system of Demonology, as also that of the Chaldean and Jewish Angelology, is founded on the fanciful supposition of separate states of spirits, being freed from the body, but possessing its propensities, they assist or torment the living, accordingly as they are benevolently or malevolently disposed towards them. Nothing in all the reveries of a lawless imagination can exceed the wildness of the supposition that souls can subsist after death without a body, and notwithstanding, retain the corporeal passions of that body, from which they are disentangled!

Daimonion appears synonymous with Daimon. It is used by Zenophon and Plutarch to denote the Deity: but it signifies generally, deified spirits, adored as mediators. When we compare 1 Cor. 8: 4—7, and 10: 14, 20, 21. 1 Tim. 2: 5. Rev. 9: 20, we cannot fail to see that the daimonia were the objects of religious adoration, and certainly were not considered as devils. Diabolos and Daimonion, are not once confounded, though the first occurs above thirty, and the latter about sixty times, in the New Testament. The word devil is, therefore, a very improper translation of Daimon in the above texts of scripture. We admit that the word Daimonion, in Matt. 12: 24—27, and the parallel passage, Luke 11: 14—20, is to be understood in the evil sense according to the definition

of Josephus ; and implies, that agreeably to the Jewish notions, some dead men's spirits had the power of annoying the living : but by no just rule of interpretation can the word ever be rendered by the term devil.

Demoniacs were insane or epileptic persons, who were incurable in those days of medical ignorance ; and therefore, from the violence of the symptoms, were regarded by the superstitious, as possessed by diabolical agents. This view of the subject has been successfully maintained by the learned Joseph Mede, in his discourse on John 10 : 20, and by Lardner and Farmer, on the demoniacs of the New Testament. The Jews mostly learned their notions of demons and angels, during the Babylonian captivity, where they became acquainted with the Persian philosophy. Being ignorant of physiology and pathology, they attributed every disease, of whose symptoms they were ignorant, to the influence of demons ; and from the prevalence of the opinion, and the credulity of the patients, the subjects of these sore diseases, believed themselves to be possessed of *demons*, just as the deluded creatures of modern times, have admitted themselves to be witches. Justin Martyr urges it as an argument for a future state of existence, that demons, whom he calls the spirits of the dead, seized and tormented men.—Chrysostom mentions it as a vulgar opinion, in his days, that all who died a violent death, became demons. He also tells us, that some demoniacs would affirm that they were possessed of the soul of such a monk. Homer, speaking of a man, whom a violent disease had wasted, says, a hateful demon had entered into him. From this general opinion, epilepsy obtained the name of sacred disease. Like the Jews, the Romans believed in possession, but used different names, calling the ghosts, *Larvæ*, and the men possessed, *Larvati*; even to the present day, the Turks retain similar notions of insane persons.

Probably the greater part of these silly stories about demoniacs, were fabricated by the Pharisees, who seized on every idle rumour to support their dogmas, concerning spirits, against the objections of the Sadducees. From Matt. 17: 14—18, and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, it appears the Evangelists considered the demoniacs as persons affected with lunacy, or epilepsy. The Jews also identify insanity and possession, John 10: 20. Indeed, it is highly probable, that the notions of demons were rather the vulgar opinion, than the sober sentiment of the enlightened part of society, even in the days of Christ. Origen says, the physicians endeavoured to account for these cases in a natural way, calling them bodily diseases, not admitting the agency of impure spirits. Plotinus, a celebrated philosopher of the third century, blames those who ascribes to demons, diseases which, he says, arise from excess, indigestion, and other natural causes, and are often cured by medicine. Hippocrates, the father of medicine, whose knowledge of the animal economy greatly surpassed that of all others in his time, wrote expressly to prove that there was nothing supernatural in the case of supposed demoniacs; but that all the symptoms arose from natural causes. "When a man (says he) becomes incapable of speech, suffocated, foams, gnashes his teeth, shuts his hands close, his eyes being distorted, and falling down, kicks with his feet, that man has the Epilepsy." How absurd and inconsistent with the superintending providence of God, to admit that the universal parent would allow evil spirits to take possession of his own children, and torment the creatures of his care, the object of his ceaseless love!"

## SECTION IV.

Definition of the Greek term,—*Diabolos*—Remarks of Dr. S. Clark on personification,—of the number of Angels and Devils—A Devil the popular god of Superstition.

*Diabolos*, from *diaballo*, to dart or to strike through, or to calumniate, strictly signifies, *an accuser*, and is constantly used in the Septuagint as the translation of *Satan*, an *adversary*, and *Zar*, an *enemy*. If therefore we translate the word *Diabolos* into English, according to its proper meaning, we shall never be at a loss to know the devil and his occupation, nor the means of successful resistance. We shall be perfectly qualified to understand the language of Christ to the Jews and his apostles, John 6 : 70, and 7 : 14. Dr. S. Clark well observes on the last passage, that personification was very frequent in the language of the Jews, and nothing was more common than to call men by the appellation of that abstract quality, which principally predominates in their character. The phrases, *children of wisdom, of the devil, of God, of a murderer*, are easily analyzed by changing the abstract for concrete terms; and reading *wise, godly, persecuting or malevolent*, children. We now clearly perceive the propriety of calling Judas a *devil*, John 6 : 70. Peter *Satan*, Matt. 16 : 23. Simon Magus, a *child of the devil*, Acts 13 : 10. And slanderous women, *devils*, Titus, 2 : 3—and how *such devils go about as roaring lions, seeking whom they may devour*.

From the doctrine of demonology arose the Jewish notions of angels. The Jews in their degeneracy adopted many of the Heathen dogmas concerning demons, yet preferred the name of angel, to demon, as they did the word Paradise, to the Greek Elysium. They learned the names and grades of angels during their captivity in Babylon, and afterwards amalgamated their religion with the Platonic philosophy, in

Egypt, during the reign of the Ptolemies. The wisdom of Solomon, and works of Philo, are standing evidences of this assertion.

The Christians, in the first age of christianity having embraced the same fanciful opinions, arranged them all under nine classes, angels, archangels, virtues, powers, principalities, dominions, thrones, cherubim, and seraphim. The Talmudists multiplied the good angels to more than 300,000,000,000, and the bad to a number beyond all computation. Isidore and others, say, the number of the elect, exactly equals that of the fallen angels, being chosen from men to fill the places vacated by their rebellion. But Daillon affirms, there is only *one* devil, and the Christians borrowed a plurality from the heathen; whilst Averroes maintains, **THERE IS NO DEVIL AT ALL!!!** Here then we come to the Scriptures to decide the controversy. From Matt. 18 : 12. and Heb. 2 : 16, Hilary determines that angels, are to men, as a hundred to one. *Fallen* angels, cries another, must be more than five thousand, for a demoniac said, my name is legion, Luke 8 : 30. One third *exactly* of the angels fell, exclaims another, for the dragon's tail drew a third part of the stars from heaven, Rev. 12 : 3. It is certain, adds a fourth, that good angels are more numerous than the bad, for we read of twelve legions of the former, and only one of the latter. Matt. 16 : 53.

But while we disprove the existence of such fanciful beings, a thousand voices exclaim, we have seen them! If so, why may we not also obtain a view? Come forth, then, whatever ye are—shadows or substances, spirits sublimated, or transmuted natures—ye who have left your clay to wither, and become the messengers of heaven, and tread the winds and the star-sown wilderness above us! Come down from your stately heights; and stand visible before us! Or, if indeed ye live in the grave, or haunt on Purgatorial shores,



pale tenants of the dim Elysium—Arise, and be manifest! No, they appear not, but to their deluded votaries, to the believers of such fables, and no unbeliever can ever obtain a glimpse, even though it were by the pale light of the moon!!

How deplorable is the state of the human mind, degraded by superstition! Fear being the mother of superstition, we may reasonably expect her god to be hideous and terrific. Hence an imaginary devil has obtained the greatest veneration in many countries of Asia and Africa: and even at this time, however incredible, his worship is very prevalent throughout all christendom. Being the popular god of modern superstition, if any independent man, who dares to think, or express a doubt of his existence, the alarm is sounded, and fearing that the empire of the god of this world is about to be upset, all who wonder after the *beasts*, hasten to cry out for whole hours, Great is the Devil we adore! Be not surprised, the existence and influence of the devil are as necessary to the creeds of modern times, as the honours of Diana were to the craftsmen of Ephesus.

From what has been already said, it is fully manifest, that among the various objects of blinded nations' fear, the ghosts of departed heroes were admitted at a very early period. It was imagined by weak and perverted minds, that men who had distinguished themselves, in this world, by either good or evil actions, would retain their dispositions in the next; and be actively engaged in promoting the welfare of mankind, or plotting their ruin, as far as those propensities excited, or their influence extended. Therefore, men became naturally inclined to honour the good spirits for their services, and offer sacrifices to the evil, to placate their malevolence! We have also seen that Plato and many other eminent philosophers, taught that all intercourse between the Deity and mankind was car-

ried on by means of demons, who ought on that account to receive divine homage ; and that this doctrine was received by many of the heathen nations, and even by many of the Jews, especially the Essens, who believed that thousands of these demons officiated as mediators with Jehovah, and therefore ought to be worshipped. That it was also a general opinion, that acute diseases, plagues, apoplexies, epilepsies, were operated by demons, or ghosts of wicked men, who entered human bodies and destroyed those who were not powerfully supported by the good demons. Accordingly we find, that in all the passages of scripture, which speak of persons possessed of devils, the original word is *daimonion*, and not *diabolos*, which should not therefore have been translated devil, nor devils.

But it appears to have been an early and much agitated question among the ancient philosophers, whence sprang that moral and physical evil, which so often weakens the enjoyment and destroys the happiness of mankind. Being unwilling to abase human pride, by charging it on man, or to attribute malevolence to the Deity, they imagined the existence of a wicked spirit to be absolutely necessary to the existence and continuance of disorder and pain in the world. But the quantum of evil being so great, they supposed that the evil spirit must nearly equal the Deity himself in wisdom and power. This doctrine of devilism was derived from the Persian theology, which taught the co-existence and nearly co-equality of two great first causes ; the one the author of all good, the other the source of all evil. This absurd opinion was the invention of their Magi, who were unable to account for the origin of evil, on any other principles. Very different from this wild fancy, was the message of Jehovah to Cyrus, by the prophet Isaiah, which reproves the foolish sentiment, and declares Jehovah to be the author of light and darkness, and the Creator of both

good and evil. Indeed it is altogether impossible that good or evil could exist otherwise ; for that God who fills the immensity of space, must enclose in his very nature beings to whom he gave existence, and by whose fatherly care they are preserved. Hence it follows that the notion of the existence and influence of the devil, is altogether inconsistent with correct and scriptural views of the divine nature and character. If a devil exist, he must be the rival or servant of the Almighty. The first supposition is atheistic ; for if there be a God, he is without a rival ; nor would he suffer his designs to be frustrated, nor employ a servant to violate his laws, nor disturb the peace of his empire. But, says the objector, if there be no devil, then there is no God, no hell, no need of preaching ! I would not have noticed such manifest puerilities, were they not proclaimed by the doctors of divinity and theological professors of our day, who sound the watchword of heresy, and lead the van of persecution. Is there no proof of God's existence but that the devil needs an opposer ? O fie ! Must God exist, and we preach for the devil's sake ? Shame on those men, who sacrifice truth, and insult good sense to fan the fire of fanaticism ! Is the devil the maker and governor of the infernal regions ? Then certainly he will take good care not to torment himself nor his friends. The wicked have nothing to fear, for if any suffer, they must be the pious servants of God, who have rebelled against his satanic majesty. Moreover, if the devil be the director of hell, and fallen angels the inflictors of its punishments, can these unfortunate sufferers be the tormentors of men who have been equally unfortunate as themselves ? Then surely the devil and his angels are God's servants, and must receive the reward of their services. But are God's servants unhappy, and will virtue and misery be long connected ? If not, then it follows that devils will become saints, and hell a field of liberty !

The term Satan, indicates no more than that propensity to evil so frequently observable in human conduct, and which, like the chemical doctrines of *phlogiston* and *caloric*, is of great utility for the explanation of difficulties. All classical readers know that the most beautiful writings abound with bold, figurative, and hyperbolic descriptions. That nothing is more ornamental in poetry, than *prosopopœia*, or the representation of good and evil qualities, virtues and vices, by personal characters. The word Satan, signifies an adversary, and sometimes it only denotes the abstract quality, calumny. Our translators have rendered it, accordingly, throughout the Bible. Though the term *Satan* occurs frequently in the scriptures, yet generally some human being is intended. David is so called, 1 Sam. 29 : 4. Hadad is denominated Solomon's devil or satan, 1 Kings, 11 : 14. David describes those who rendered him evil for good as his satans ; and prays that his satans might be clothed with shame. Ps. 109 : 20, 29. Jesus calls Peter satan, and Judas a devil, Matt. 16 : 23. John 6 : 70. In the New-Testament, treacherous men, slanderous women, and opponents of every kind, are called satans or devils ; and these words signify no more than adverse propensities. Indeed it would be an impious reflection on the character of the Deity, to suppose he had formed and let loose myriads of malevolent spirits to destroy the happiness of mankind.

If it be demanded, Whence arise those inducements to evil, which so often disturb the peace of society, and ruin man's happiness ? the answer is both easy and scriptural. The heart is deceitful, and every man is tempted when he is drawn aside, or enticed by animal passions or bodily appetites. These expose us to innumerable trials and temptations. Intemperance, avarice, ambition, envy, and discontentment beset us in their turns, and without the utmost vigilance and

circumspection, we are in danger of being overcome. Now can the just and merciful God, the father of mankind, and moral governor of the world, think these propensities to evil so insufficient for the trial of our virtues, that he must superadd the agency of an evil being, so subtle, so malicious, and so powerful as the devil? What a desperate chance have we of succeeding against such an adversary! Shall we say, good is the will of the Lord, and that in all this he has done all things in wisdom! Banished for ever be the thought from all rational and serious persons. God could no more act thus than cease to exist. Every principle of his nature holds such conduct in eternal abhorrence!!

Let the believers in a devil consider, 1. That the belief of his existence constitutes no fundamental article of the christian faith; no part of the New Testament states the necessity of believing such an unreasonable doctrine. If particular passages seem to imply it, or cannot be clearly explained or understood, yet no inference should be drawn from a few passages that would contradict the decisions of reason, and the general tenor of scripture. 2. It is perfectly consistent with the mission of Jesus to adopt the language of the country on all subjects, which did not constitute the main objects of that mission. Christ came not to teach men philosophy, neither to spend his time in combating the Jewish demonology. Every reasonable person, on whose mind the rays of science have shined, will readily admit that neither the astronomy nor cosmogony of Moses will stand the test of modern experience: and might not our Lord as consistently use the foolish language of the Jews about Demons, Demoniacs, and Devils, as Moses the absurd and fanciful opinions of the ancients concerning astronomy? 3. There is no passage that can be adduced to support the doctrine of a devil, which does not contradict some

part of the received opinions on that dogma—but every text in all the scriptures which speaks of the devil or satan, can be fairly interpreted or explained, consistently with the whole tenor of scripture, on the supposition that there is no such being, but that these words universally mean an adversary, or something adverse.

We might have expected that the most pertinacious believers in a devil, would have rejoiced to find, that reason, scripture, and common sense, are equally opposed to the terrifying dogma. But, alas! such are the religious infatuation and credulity of mankind, that an opinion once admitted is seldom rejected, however palpably absurd or monstrously ridiculous.—Hence we find christians cling as close to this doctrine, as if their present and future happiness depended on the existence and influence of an infernal fiend! Atheism and the disbelief of a devil, vibrate the same feelings of horror in the superstitious mind; and, perhaps, atheism itself is deemed by some to be less impious. But if a devil there be, possessing those powers and attributes generally ascribed to him, atheism becomes acceptable, and loses all its hideous forms, for the existence of such a being proves the non-existence of God, or that he is deficient in wisdom, goodness, and power. Why then should men be alarmed, when this doctrine is attacked or disputed; and why should the war-whoop of party be sounded, when we attempt to disprove and explode this injurious and unreasonable opinion? Has the devil created the universe, and filled it with inhabitants? Is he the author of all good, on whom our present and future happiness depends? Did all being start into existence at his command, or is it supported by his power? Is his dominion unbounded and perpetual, and shall his authoritative voice awake the myriads of the dead, determine their doom, appoint heaven as a reward for

his enemies, and people the Tartarian gulf with his allies and friends? What impious absurdity! Jehovah alone holds the reins of universal empire, and all that can excite our hopes in this world, or our perfect felicity in the next, is unconnected with a satanic being.

If the doctrine that teaches the existence and influence of a devil, involves serious consequences, if it be anti-scriptural and unphilosophical, if it be fatal to man's moral improvement, if it poison the stream of religious knowledge at the fountain head, by supposing that God has a powerful antagonist, whose designs he has been unable to frustrate, and whose rebellion shall be as durable as the Divine existence,—in short, if correct notions of the Divine character and government be inconsistent with the belief in such a being—for the honour of God and religion, let the infamous doctrine be for ever rejected.

Those who believe in the existence of a devil, suppose that the evil, which prevails in this world, results from his infernal agency; and also expect that evil to become still greater in another and future state of being. There they look for a hell, crowded with inhabitants, through the resistless powers of diabolical influence: and this reign of misery, this triumph of the devil, they expect to be so complete and signal, as to undergo no change through the revolution of eternal ages!! How can persons who expect such a catastrophe of human affairs, have correct notions of that God, who is all benevolence; whose plans are conceived in wisdom and executed in mercy; whose power cannot be resisted, and whose very name and nature are Love! Those who think God has a competitor, must deny the absolute will of the Deity, and his general providence. They derogate from his supremacy, and eclipse his glory. They dishonour him, and perplex themselves with wild and embarrassing conclusions. In a word, they conjure up a devil to their

own confusion, to the injury of christian truth, and the serious mischief of morality. The fear of a devil may perhaps keep some men of weak minds from excessive vice, and make them slavishly religious, and hypocritically moral. But the love of God alone, proceeding from a grateful recollection of his goodness and providential care, can produce genuine piety and virtue.

It is somewhat outrageous to suppose, that the devil will punish wicked men who sinned by his instigation, and performed all their wicked deeds, in obedience to his desires. Can the punishment of sinners be inflicted by that being whom they never offended ; and God, whose laws have been violated, have no concern in their sufferings ? The belief in the existence of a devil is equally injurious to virtue, simplicity, and christian truth. It affords a palliative for crimes, and induces men to believe that wicked thoughts and evil actions, have not been fomented in their own hearts, but spring from the suggestions of a wicked one. Sometimes men are hurried into enormities, conceiving themselves particularly tempted, at which their mild natures would shudder, were they not influenced by this deceitful doctrine.

If the belief in a devil did not obtain, men must either trace their sins to God as the author, or admit they originate with themselves ; and as they could not presume to charge God directly with sin, they would of necessity, acknowledge their own accountability ; and repentance producing reformation, might justly be expected to result from such a happy conviction. Another serious evil arising from a belief in the existence of a devil, is the continual alarm and terror that reigns in the weak mind tinctured with superstition, by the apprehension of satanic machination and artifice. Every inclination to enjoyment, every expostulation on *religious faith*, and even every suggestion of truth,



though in the very words of scripture, if it seems to contradict long received opinions, are all attributed to the seduction of Satan; and thus the perpetual dread of an imaginary being, keeps the mind in darkness, and the heart in palpitation. Wild enthusiasm, gloomy superstition, and a long train of delusive thoughts, successively distract the serious mind which is unfortunately beclouded by a belief in the devil. And what is worse, men suppose him to be so refined in subtlety, and so resistless in power, that vigilance is almost useless, and the strongest heart cannot feel subjection to his will without horror and dismay. Hence a belief in the existence of the devil, has driven many weak persons to despair, which most assuredly is the natural consequence of such a wild doctrine. What idea must those men have of God, who believe he has placed his feeble creatures in a situation so hopeless and cruel? Must they not conclude that God created man for the purpose of making him miserable? And can the Creator be an object of love, veneration, and gratitude, while he is viewed in connexion with a malignant devil?

If the account we have given of the devil be just, then all notions of witchcraft, or of being possessed by the devil, are vain and groundless. 'Tis all deceit and imposition on the weakness and credulity of mankind! For shame! Let us entertain more honourable sentiments of the moral government of God. Let us think ourselves safe under the protection of his providence; safe from the malice both of devils and wicked men. Let us learn, not to disturb ourselves with any vain or superstitious fears of evil spirits, for we are not subject to any malicious powerful beings. The Lord God Omnipotent reigns alone, whose tender mercies are over all his works. This consideration should fill us with ease and tranquillity, otherwise we do not give God the honour due to him; we do not re-

pose that confidence in his providence, which his wisdom and goodness require, and the security of our own happiness demands. O how different from the doctrines of devils, are the views of God exhibited in the gospel of Jesus! There we read of one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in us all. That it is his gracious intention to save and render eternally happy all his intelligent offspring. There we behold no mighty devil to blacken the moral horizon, or frustrate and baffle the designs of the Deity. But on the contrary, a religion all mild and beautiful, that breathes nothing but pure benevolence, and evidently indicates the approximation of a period, in which truth will completely triumph over error, and happiness be universal. Amen!



### SECTION V.

Observations relative to the Hebrew word *Shaitan*, called *Satan*, in our common version.—An extract from Prideaux, on the Magian philosophy, as revived by Zoroaster.

The most eminent lexicographers agree in the meaning of the term Satan. They uniformly allow that it signifies an adversary. The first passage in which we find it, is Gen. 26 : 21. “And they digged another well, and strove for that also : and he called the name of it SITNAH.” Very little attention to the context will convince any man, why the well was called Sitnah, or Satan, in the sense of an adversary. The herdmen of Gerar strove with, or more properly against, the herdmen of Isaac, and were adversaries, therefore the name was called Satan, signifying adversary. But this is further made evident by verse 27, where Isaac says to Abimelech, who went from Gerar to make a treaty with him—“Wherefore come *ye to me, seeing ye HATE me, and have sent me away*

from you? And in the margin of the 21st verse, we find *hatred* given as the signification of Satan, or adversary.

The comment on this passage is then very plain, without referring to any supernatural agency. The *well* was called Satan, because the hatred of the men of Gerar had deprived Isaac of its possession. The first time we find it in Scripture, then, it is applied as a noun feminine, to an insensible object. In this place, therefore, we look in vain for a personal devil.

The next use of this term is to an angel of the Lord, Num. 22: 22, 32. where the writer, alluding to Balaam, says—"And the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary [satan] against him. Behold I went out to withstand thee [or to be a satan to thee] because thy way is perverse before me." The word *satan* occurs here twice in the original; in one case it is rendered *adversary*, and in the other, *to withstand thee*. The marginal reading to the last verse, is, "to be an adversary unto thee." Whether common opinion of the word *satan*, or that which is here mentioned, on the authority of Scripture, and with the sanction of the greatest scholars in the orthodox ranks, you are permitted to judge for yourselves.

When the princes of the Philistines remonstrated with the king against permitting David to go with them to battle against the Israelites, 1 Sam. 29: 4. David is called a *satan*, translated *adversary* in the common version. In 2 Sam. 19: 22. the sons of Zeruah are expressly called *satans* in the original, and *adversaries* in the translation. In 1 Kings, 5: 4. king Solomon, adverting to his having peace on every side, and of the favourable opportunity which this circumstance afforded, of fulfilling the word of the Lord to his father, respecting the building of a temple, says, there is "neither adversary nor evil oc-

current." In the original, the word here rendered adversary is *satan*. The believers in a personal devil, who existed in a state of beatitude long anterior to the race of man, and finally fell from heaven, by sinning, are welcome to this text if they fancy it favours their views.

But notwithstanding Solomon congratulated himself at this time on the non-existence of a *satan*, he was afterwards troubled by a number of them. For we find in the 11th chapter of the same book, 14, 23, 25. that Hadad the Edomite, Rezon the son of Eliadah, and Hadadezer, king of Zobah, had become his adversaries, or satans.

The first place where *satan* appears in our common Bible, is 1 Chron. 21 : 1. "And *satan* stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel." Had the word *satan* been translated adversary, as in former instances, who would think of imputing to this passage a meaning which involves the whole history in the most ridiculous absurdity? What—did an infernal being, in *propria persona*, stand up before David to tempt him, and did the king of Israel listen to his advice? Let the confession of David in the 17th verse, give the answer. "Even I it is that have sinned, and done evil indeed." He imputes nothing to any *satan* but himself, nor do we read of any punishment inflicted on *satan* for the evil deed. Let us impute this to the pride of David's heart, the lust of conquest and dominion, or the honour of commanding a numerous and warlike host, and we shall be little liable to go wrong.

We have looked, but looked in vain, for any information relative to the orthodox devil. The *satans* of the Old Testament were in no wise connected with the schemes of modern divinity. A well, an angel of the Lord, David, and various others, bear that appellation in Scripture, and in Ezra, 4 : 6, a piece of

writing is termed a satan, and is translated *accusation*! With all these facts before us, where shall we look for the origin of the idea generally attached to this word? We must look for it in the principles of the Magian philosophers, as given by Prideaux, and recollect that his testimony is that of an advocate for orthodoxy.

This able writer, speaking of the popular opinions of the age and country of Job, in his *Connexions*, vol. 1. pp. 185—6. as quoted by Mr. Balfour, says: "Directly opposite to these were the Magians, another sect, who had their original in the same eastern countries; for they, abominating all images, worshipped God only by fire. They began first in Persia, and there, and in India, were the only places where this sect was propagated; and there they remain even to this day. Their chief doctrine was, that there were two principles, one which was the cause of all good, and the other the cause of all evil, that is to say, God and the devil; that the former is represented by light, and the other by darkness, as their truest symbols; and that, of the composition of these two, all things are made: the good god they name Yazdan, and also Ormuzd, and the evil god, Ahraman: the former is by the Greeks called Oramasdez, and the latter Arimanius. And therefore, when Xerxes prayed for that evil upon his enemies, that it might be put into the minds of all of them to drive their best and bravest men from them, as the Athenians had Themistocles, he addressed his prayer to Arimanius, the evil god of the Persians, and not to Oramasdez, their good god. And concerning these two gods there was this difference of opinion among them, that whereas some held both of them to have been from all eternity, there were others that contended, that the good god only was eternal, and that the other was created. But they all agreed in this, that there will be a continual opposition between these two till the end of the world;

that then the good god shall overcome the evil god, and that from thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him; that darkness is the truest symbol of the evil god, and light the truest symbol of the good god. And therefore they always worshipped him with fire, as being the cause of light, and especially before the sun, as being in their opinion the perfectest fire, and causing the perfectest light. And for this reason, in all their temples, they had fire continually burning on altars erected in them for that purpose. And before these sacred fires they offered up all their public devotions, as likewise they did all their private devotions before their private fires in their own houses. Thus did they pay the highest honour to light, as being in their opinion the truest representative of the good god; but always hated darkness, as being, what they thought, the truest representative of the evil god, whom they ever had in the utmost detestation, as we now have the devil: and, "for an instance hereof, whenever they had an occasion in any of their writings to mention his name, they always wrote it backward, and inversed, as thus, *αεωαειϑυ*."

Here Mr. Balfour, arguing on the subject of Job's troubles, and the imputed agency of an evil spirit as the cause of them, thus speaks:—

But what shows such opinions prevailed where Job lived, are the facts and circumstances mentioned in the account itself. These we shall notice presently. Here I would only say, that it is evident satan is introduced as an evil being, and it is generally contended that he was the author of all Job's afflictions. This perfectly agrees to the opinions of the Magians, as stated by Prideaux. Besides, previous Scripture usage of the term satan, forbids us thinking, that the *sacred writers* recognized either an evil god or a fallen

angel under this name. Where, let me ask, do any of them intimate, that an evil being, such as the Persian evil god, or the Christian's devil, existed as a rival to Jehovah? To what else then could the writer refer, but to such heathen opinions? If such a being as the Christian's devil existed, how is it accounted for, that he remained so quiet until the days of Job? Job appears to have been the first man he ever troubled, from the creation of the world. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with many others were good men, and rich men, but he never attempted to injure them in their property, or smite them with a single boil in their whole lifetime. From any thing which appears to the contrary, they had no fear of such a being nor knew of his existence. Had satan just fallen from heaven, in the days of Job, and began his depredations on mankind? Admitting this true, how is it, that as Job was the first, so he was the last man he ever so tormented? The case of the woman, whom he is said to have bound eighteen years, is no exception to this, as we shall show, Section 5. Let it be accounted for then, why satan had such a particular hatred against Job, above all other men before or since. It is easily perceived, that these things are rationally accounted for, on the presumption, that in this account there is a reference to the evil god of the people among whom Job lived. Allowing this, the account is just what might be expected. The character given to satan, answers to that of their god, whom they believed to be the author and director of all evil.

The question which now comes forward for consideration is—Was this account of satan introduced for the purpose of establishing, or was it introduced to refute such opinions? Let satan here be considered, either the evil principle deified, or the devil of Christians, were such opinions intended to be sanc-

tioned by the writer, or does he introduce them, to expose their fallacy, and establish the supremacy of the one living and true God in opposition to them? All I think will agree, that the whole must stand approved or condemned. No middle path can be here taken, for no ground is afforded for it. It is then a matter of no consequence, whether we consider satan in this account the principle of evil deified, or, that he was the Christian's devil. Whether the same or different, I shall proceed to show, by direct, and I think conclusive evidence, that neither of them had any influence in producing Job's afflictions. That they were all sent by the one living and true God, whom Job feared and obeyed, is evident,

1st. From Job's own testimony concerning his afflictions. Job's heathen neighbours supposed their evil god Ahraman was the cause of them. Christians believe their satan or devil was the cause of them. But does Job ascribe them to either? No, when one messenger after another is represented as announcing to him the loss of his property, and at last the death of his children, he says—"The Lord gave and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord." chap. 1: 21. He does not for a moment admit that either Ahraman or the devil had any kind of concern in his afflictions. He no more admits their influence in taking away his property and children, than in the bestowment of them. The giving and taking them away are alike ascribed to Jehovah. Similar were his views and feelings, when afflicted with sore boils. His wife desired him to curse God and die. But he says to her—"Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job 2: 9, 10. Does this look like acknowledging the Persian evil god or the Christian's devil? Notwithstanding the popular opinions, that Ahraman was the



cause of all evil, the severe bodily pain he suffered, and the taunts of his wife, he holds fast his integrity in the true God. Now, permit me to ask, if Job had believed, that either Ahraman or the devil brought his afflictions upon him, why did he ascribe them all to the true God without reservation? And why did he not correct his wife's mistake, by telling her, that Ahraman or the devil ought to be cursed? But Job had no faith in either, hence he told her, that she spoke as one of the *foolish or heathen* women speaketh. Job allowed of but one God, and it is evident, that his adversity and prosperity are both alike ascribed to him. See chap. 42: 10—12. and 1: 21.

2d. The speech of Job's wife, and his reply to her, shows, that neither Ahraman nor the devil was the cause of his afflictions. She no doubt heard what he said, chap. 1: 21. Upon seeing him still persisting in his integrity under his affliction of the boils, she was provoked at him, and in taunting language says to him,—"dost thou still regain thy integrity? Curse God and die." On the word rendered *to curse*, Parkhurst thus writes: "The Lexicons have absurdly, and contrary to the authority of the ancient versions given to this verb the sense of cursing in the six following passages—1 Kings, 21: 10, 13. Job 1: 5, 11. And 2: 6, 9. As to the two first the Seventy render *Berek*, in both, by *eulogeo*, and so the Vulgate by *benedico*, *to bless*. And though Jezebel was herself an abominable idolatress, yet as the law of Moses still continued in force, she seems to have been wicked enough to have destroyed Naboth upon the false accusation of *blessing the heathen aleim* and Moloch, which subjected him to death, by Deut. 13: 6. and 17: 2—7. Job's fear, chap. 1: 5. was, lest his sons should have *blessed the false aleim*; and verse 11. he says ought to be rendered—' And indeed stretch forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, surely he hath *blessed thee* to

thy face,' *i. e.* hypocritically; the verb being used in a past tense. The Seventy render it, *truly he will bless thee to thy face.* And the Vulgate—*unless he hath blessed thee to thy face.* Comp. verses 5, 7. And 1 Kings 20: 23. Satan brings the same charge of hypocrisy against Job, chap. 2: 5. which the Seventy, Theodotian and Vulgate rendered in the same manner. And at verse 9. his wife says to him, *dost thou yet retain thy integrity, thy regard for the true God, blessing the aleim and dying, or even to death?*—Thus far Parkhurst, whose remarks shed additional light on this account. They agree with the usage of the word, which is rendered *to bless*, in other texts: they also accord, with the charge of hypocrisy, which is brought against Job by his friends throughout the book. But what deserves particular notice, these remarks show, that Job lived among a people who had a false *aleim* or god, and a contrast if not a contest between this god and Jehovah is set forth in the account. The false god is spoken of as *one*, and not many, and what god could this be but Ahraman? For the Persians had only two, their good god and their evil god. That a contrast is set forth betwixt the false god and the true, is evident from Job's fear, chap. 1: 5. lest his children should have *blessed* the false *aleim* or god, instead of *cursing* the true God as in the common version. It is also plain from the speech of his wife, who, instead of desiring Job to curse the true God, expresses her surprise, that he should continue to bless him though at the point of death in suffering from his hands. It is apparent, that she believed in Ahraman, and entertained the opinions concerning him as stated above by Prideaux. She was displeas'd with her husband, for continuing to trust in the true God at the gates of death, and even blessing him for his afflictions. In desiring him to renounce his confidence in the true God, did she

mean that he should become an atheist, or live without any God? No; she impliedly wished him to trust in Ahraman, the evil god, the author of all evil, and the cause of all his afflictions. Job had despised him, and continued to trust in the true God to the last. She therefore wished him to abandon this confidence, and trust in the evil god, the true author of his afflictions. By doing so, he would become his friend, remove his afflictions, or terminate them by death.

3d. That this account of satan, is introduced to be condemned, and not sanctioned, appears from the reasonings of Job and his friends throughout the whole book. Job's friends, like himself, did not believe in Ahraman, for they maintain, that Jehovah, on account of his hypocrisy and wickedness, had sent such afflictions upon him. But I ask, does any one of them ever intimate that satan, whether Persian god or Christian devil, had produced his afflictions? No; they are to a man agreed, that they were the doings of Jehovah, nor do they insinuate, that he used satan as a tool in producing them. As a specimen of their sentiments on this subject, let the reader consult chap. 4 : 9. and v. 17, 18. and 8 : 3, 4. Job defends himself against the charge of hypocrisy and wickedness brought by his friends. See as examples chap. 6 : 4, 5. 7 : 20, 21. 9 : 16—18. 10 : 2. 16 : 11—15. and 19, 21. We may then appeal to every candid man, whether Job's friends, would have been silent about satan producing his afflictions, if they believed so. And had they believed satan or Ahraman the author of all evil, would they have ascribed his afflictions to Jehovah? Besides; had Job or his friends believed, that Jehovah used satan as an instrument in inflicting them, why is nothing said about it, either in their charge or his defence? In repelling their accusations, would Job have failed to urge that his afflictions arose from satan's great enmity against him, had he but suspected

that this was true. All know, that people are not very scrupulous now in blaming the devil. Nothing could have been easier or more natural, than for Job to repel the charges against him by saying, that satan hated him and had thus afflicted him. Can any man then believe, that this account was introduced to establish the existence of such an evil being, yet this be contradicted by Job and his friends throughout the book? If true, why not rather go on to confirm such a doctrine? Is it objected—"if false why introduce it at all?" I answer; for the very purpose of refuting such an opinion, and for establishing the unity and supremacy of the one living and true God. It is well known, that false gods are often introduced in Scripture, in contrast with the true, for the very purpose of exposing their absurdity. But I ask, is any false god ever allowed to be able to do good or evil? No; they are challenged to do either, to prove that they are gods. It is admitted by every intelligent man, that in the after parts of the Old Testament, and in the New, there are allusions to the evil principle deified, or the evil god of the Persians. And to darkness as the symbol of this god. See a specimen of these, and how the sacred writers expose such a doctrine, Isai. 45 : 5—7. 2 Cor. 6 : 15. 10 : 3. and 11 : 13. Eph. 6 : 10.

4th. Job's afflictions are referred to, James 5 : 11. and his patience under them, is set forth as an example to us, but not ascribed to satan, but to Jehovah. Indeed no sacred writer, these two chapters excepted, say or insinuate that Ahraman or satan had any influence in producing them. But I have a right to demand, why no sacred writer has done this, if they believe as most people do now that satan was the author of Job's afflictions? If they had the same view of those two chapters as most people now have, is it possible that they would have been silent on such a subject?

5th. However prone the Jews were to idolary, and the superstitions of the nations around them, it was a truth obviously taught in their Scriptures, that their God was good, and that he had no evil being as a rival to him. So far from giving any countenance to an evil being called Ahraman, Satan, Devil, or by any other name, all witchcraft, necromancy, or appeals to any other being or power stand condemned, and the Jews were solemnly charged to have no concern with them. Jehovah, and he alone, is declared to be the creator, preserver, and ruler of all things, and all beings in the universe. Life and death, sickness and health, prosperity and adversity, are all ascribed to him. See Gen. 1 : 1. Dan. 4 : 35. 1 Sam. 2 : 6, 7. Isai. 45 : 7. Amos 3 : 6. Micah 1 : 12. Psalm 33 : 14—15. Prov. 16 : 4, 9, and 21 : 30. The idea of an evil being, which Christians call the devil and satan, and other nations have designated by a variety of names, found no place in the Jewish Scriptures. That the Jews learnt such opinions from the heathen, we shall see in the next Section. In concluding our remarks on this account of satan in the book of Job, let us compare what is said in it, with the above quotation from Prideaux, and we shall see all that has been advanced strongly confirmed.

Let us begin with the term satan ? We have seen that this word signifies *an adversary*. That person or thing, is called a satan to another, which stands in his way, or in any shape opposes him. Thus, the angel of Jehovah, was a satan to Baalam, and the writing sent to Ahasuerus, was a satan to the Jews. Satan, in this account, is represented as opposed both to God and Job. He was their adversary or satan. Prideaux, in the above quotation, informs us, that Ahraman, the evil god, was opposed to the good God, and that this opposition would continue to the end of the world. He also informs us that the evil god was considered

the author and director of all evil. This, is precisely the representation, which is given of satan in the book of Job. All Job's afflictions are supposed to be the doings of satan. Orthodox people contend, that this was the case, and that satan is their devil. They have then got only an evil heathen god, or the principle of evil deified, a mere nonentity, for a devil. But is this very honourable to Christianity? And is it like persons, who reverence the word of God, flatly to contradict Job, in ascribing afflictions to satan which he ascribes to Jehovah? Job contends, that the good God was the author of his afflictions, as well as his prosperity. Those who believed in the evil god, did not deny, but the good God was the author of his prosperity, but would not admit him to be the author of his adversity. Job maintained that Jehovah was the author of both, blessing his name when he took away, as well as when he gave. By this the excellency of his character was made manifest.

But again; in the above quotation from Prideaux, it is not alleged, that the good and evil gods always produced good and evil by their own immediate agency, but that these were brought about by the instrumentality of second causes. Though Job ascribes his prosperity and adversity to Jehovah, yet he, and all the scripture writers represent him, as accomplishing both by human means. Looking at the two first chapters of Job, the agents by which Job's afflictions were produced, are distinctly mentioned. For example, the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters carried away his flocks. Were not they then a satan to Job, in the common scripture usage of this term? And does not their very manner of life, exactly agree to what satan says, chap. 1 : 7. ? "And the Lord said unto satan, whence comest thou?" Well, what answer does he make? He says, "from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." Just such an

answer as those freebooters would have given, for it was their mode of life to roam about committing such depredations. Yea, satan is the very name given to such persons in the East to this day. Messrs. Fisk and King, two of the Palestine missionaries, thus write: "For two hours, however, as we moved along our attendants were engaged in loud and violent disputes with these and other companies of Bedouins, who came up after they went away. They extorted a few dollars from the Armenians and Grecks, and at last took an ass from one of the Arabs. Our Shekh knew all these freebooters, and it is probably owing to his acquaintance with them, and his faithfulness to us, that they were so easily satisfied, and we met with so little trouble from them. He says, most of the Bedouins are much worse than these, and yet he called these satans (shaitan.") See *Christian Spectator*, vol. 7, p. 222. Such is the account given us by two orthodox missionaries. If the writer of the book of Job, did not include the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters in the term satan, all will allow, that the ancient and present usage of this word in the East fully warranted him. We see then, that there was no need for the assistance of a fallen angel, to produce this part of Job's afflictions. The agent by which he lost his children, is as distinctly mentioned. We are told, chap. 1: 18, 19. "That a great wind from the wilderness, smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon them and killed them." Such was the cause, which produced this effect, nor do we perceive, that the aid of any evil being was required to accomplish it. We may just as well accuse satan of blowing down every house which is destroyed by a tornado. Job's sheep were killed by lightning, and it and the wind are agents in the natural world by which God accomplishes his pleasure, over which Ahraman, or the Christian's devil, have no control.

Again; looking at this account, and comparing it with the quotation from Prideaux, we see why Job's boils are expressly ascribed to satan, without any other agent being concerned in their production. All evil indiscriminately, was ascribed to the evil god or satan, as all good was to the good god. But, as there was no visible agent to which the boils could be ascribed, no agent in this case is mentioned. Satan, or the evil god, has to father this affliction himself, without the assistance of any agent. Hence it is said, satan smote Job with the boils, which is not said respecting his other afflictions, though the whole aspect of the account, is in agreement with considering him the author and director of all evil. I shall only add, that it has always appeared strange, that in this account, satan should be represented as conversing freely and familiarly with God. But if the account be as I have stated, the good and evil gods are here only represented as conversing together. It was in unison with the popular opinions concerning them.

In concluding our remarks, let us briefly notice some points of similiarity in the Magian creed, to those of Christian creeds in the present day.

The Persians then had *one* good being or god, and also *one* evil being. Or, as Prideaux observes, "that is to say God and the devil." Christians in this are perfectly agreed with them, for they believe in *one* God, and also *one* devil. Again; the Persians believed, that these two gods were the authors of all good and evil in the world. In this also Christians agree with them, for all good they ascribe to God, and impute all evil to satan, or the devil. Further; the Persians made darkness the symbol of their evil god. So do Christians. When they speak of the devil he is described as black, dark, and hideous, and as loving darkness, and dwelling in darkness, and keeping men in darkness, and will lead them at last into eter-



larkness. Again ; the Persians believed that their god was eternal. Some believed also, that their god was eternal. About this, there was a diversity of opinion. So all Christians believe their god to be eternal, but about the devil there is a diversity of opinion. Though none of them believe him to have been from all eternity, yet some of them believe that he is to live for ever, and shall remain eternally the same wicked being. Others of them think that after a long period of punishment, he will be either struck out of existence, or be redeemed and be eternally happy. But again, the Persians believed, that there was a continual opposition between the good god and evil god, and that this should continue to the end of the world. Then, the good god is to overcome the evil god, and thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him. All Christians contend, that there is a continual opposition between their God and the devil, and that this opposition shall continue to the end of the world. Then, the good is to overcome the devil, and from that time thenceforward, God is to have his world and all good men with him, and the devil is to have his world, and all wicked men with him. Such are a few of the leading points of similitude, between the ancient Magians and Christians in our day, respecting God, the devil, and future punishment. It is but proper and so notice

Some of the points of dissimilitude between them. The Magians then believed, that their good and evil gods were only "two principles." These principles they not only personified, but deified and worshipped. When Xerxes prayed for evil on his enemies, "he addressed his prayer to Arimanius, the evil god and not to Ormasdes, their good god." Chris-

tians, believe their God and the devil, to be, not two principles, but two beings. Their devil is not only a being, but was once an angelic being, but for his sin and rebellion was cast out of heaven. Christians do not worship their devil. But alas, too many who profess to be Christians, like Xerxes, when they wish evil on their enemies, pray to the devil. Christians have a great number of names for their devil. But it is apparent, that whether such a being is called Ahraman, Arimanius, satan, or devil, the leading features of his character among all nations are the same. The evil god has become the Christians' devil. In fact they make their devil the worst being, for though it was believed that their evil god, should at the end of the world have a world to himself with all wicked men, yet it does not appear, that they believed he was to be the eternal tormentor of men. But it is well known, that this is a principal article in most orthodox creeds, and no man would be deemed orthodox, who denied it. I shall only add, that though the Persians and Christians agree in hating Ahraman or the devil, yet the latter have not carried their hatred so far as to write the devil's name inverted. In the next Section we shall see, that the Magian creed was much improved by Zoroaster, and that Christians have not only adopted his sentiments, but the very language in which he expressed them.

## SECTION VI.

Of witches and witchcraft.—The Magian religion, as revived and reformed by Zoroaster, a supposed Jew.—Zoroaster's day of judgment.—Concluding remarks,

*[This section, and a portion of the former, are principally extracted from Balfour's Second Inquiry, a work which ought to be in every family.] The concluding remarks are by the editor.*

1st. In the early stages of the Jewish history, we read of witches and witchcraft. Injunctions are given against these, before we hear any thing about satan or the devil. But notice, that nothing is said to them about witchcraft until they were about to enter Canaan. Many of the injunctions delivered to the Jewish nation, were for the purpose of fortifying them against such heathen notions, and preserving them in the fear and service of the one living and true God. See the following among other passages concerning this. Levit. 19: 26, 31. 20: 6, 27. Deut. 18: 9, 12. Exod. 22: 18. comp. Isai. 47: 12, 13. 1 Sam. chap. 28. The inhabitants of Canaan were given to idolatry, and witchcraft with similar superstitions were its effects on the minds of the people. But such a being as Christians call the devil, was neither worshipped, feared, nor known among them. They had abundance of idols, but no devil or satan, nor are the Jews cautioned to beware of imbibing from them such an opinion. It is then a very great mistake, which many good people have made, in calling witchcraft the devil's art, and in thinking witches and wizzards were in league with him. Concerning this, Michaelis, on the laws of Moses, thus writes, vol. iv. page 89. "We must however entertain very different sentiments on this point, in reference to the time of Moses. For in the Biblical writings prior to the Babylonish captivity, we meet with very little notice of the devil,

and it would seem, that the effects which he could produce on the material world, were considered as but very trifling. The wizzards of those days rather ascribed the efficacy of their conjurations to other gods; and therefore, in the Israelitish polity, witchcraft was commonly accounted a species of idolatry, and of course, most severely punishable. Hence orthodox theology, in the time of Moses, could look upon it in no other light, than an imposture: for no one could maintain, that it operated preternaturally, without admitting the existence of other gods, and their power over the material world.”—The Jews, before they entered Canaan, knew nothing about the devil. Nor did its idolatrous inhabitants, for he was not known in that part of the world. If then, as now, he walked about seeking whom he might devour, it is very unaccountable he should not be familiarly known in Canaan, a land full of idols, and witches, and all manner of wickedness. It seems all these could exist in those days without any devil to produce them.—Nor is Moses, or rather God, under any apprehension, that he would visit that country. We shall see that the Jews were obliged to go to a foreign land to find the devil.

2d. The Jews were carried to Babylon, and spent seventy years in captivity. Here, the Magian religion, revived and improved by Zoroaster, prevailed, and here we shall find that they became acquainted with the doctrine of the devil, and with other religious opinions not found in their Scriptures. To this point I shall now turn the attention of the reader. Prideaux, vol. i. p. 219—240. gives us an account of Zoroaster, his religion, and its success, a few brief extracts from which I shall only make. He says:—“In the time of his (Darius Hystaspis) reign first appeared in Persia the famous prophet of the Magians, whom the Persians call Zerdusht, or Zaratush, and the Greeks, Zoroaster.

“He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab, but much more knowledge ; for he was excellently skilled in all the learning of the East that was in his time ; whereas the other could neither write nor read ; and particularly he was thoroughly versed in the Jewish religion, and in all the sacred writings of the Old Testament that were then extant, which makes it most likely, that he was, as to his origin, a Jew. And it is generally said of him, that he had been a servant to one of the prophets of Israel, and that it was by this means that he came to be so well skilled in the holy scriptures, and all other Jewish knowledge ; which is a farther proof, that he was of that people ; it not being likely, that a prophet of Israel should entertain him as a servant, or instruct him as a disciple, if he were not of the same seed of Israel, as well as of the same religion with him ; and that especially since it was the usage of that people, by principle of religion, as well as by long received custom among them, to separate themselves from all other nations, as far as they were able. And it is farther to be taken notice of, that most of those who speak of his original, say, that he was of Palestine, within which country the land of Judea was. And all this put together, amounts with me to a convincing proof, that he was first a Jew, and that by birth, as well as religion, before he took upon him to be prophet of the Magian sect.

“He did not found a new religion, as his successor in imposture Mahomet did, but only took upon him to revive and reform an old one, that of the Magians, which had been for many ages past, the ancient national religion of the Medes, as well as of the Persians : for it having fallen under disgrace on the death of those ringleaders of that sect, who had usurped the sovereignty after the death of Cambyses, and the

slaughter which was then made of all the chief men among them, it sunk so low, that it became almost extinct, and Sabianism every where prevailed against it, Darius and most of his followers on that occasion going over to it. But the affection which the people had for the religion of their forefathers, and which they had all been brought up in, not being easily to be rooted out, Zoroaster saw, that the revival of this was the best game of imposture that he could then play; and, having so good an old stock to graft upon, he did with the greater ease make all his new scions to grow, which he inserted into it.

“The chief reformation which he made in the Magian religion was in the first principle of it: for whereas before they had held the being of two first causes, the first light, or the good god, who was the author of all good; and the other darkness, or the evil god, who was the author of all evil; and that of the mixture of these two, as they were in a continual struggle with each other, all things were made; he introduced a principle superior to them both, one supreme God, who created light and darkness, and out of these two, according to the alone pleasure of his own will, made all things else that are, according to what is said in the 45th chapter of Isaiah, 5, 6, 7. “I am the Lord, and there is none else: there is no God besides me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me, that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil, I the Lord do all these things.” For these words being directed to Cyrus, king of Persia, must be understood as spoken in reference to the Persian sect of the Magians, who then held light and darkness, or good and evil, to be the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great God who is superior to both. And I doubt

not it was from hence that Zoroaster had the hint of mending this great absurdity in their theology. But to avoid making God the author of evil, his doctrine was, that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person; that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it, as the defect thereof. In sum, his doctrine as to this particular was, that there was one supreme Being, independent and self-existing from all eternity. That under him there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good; and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil; and that these two, out of the mixture of light and darkness, made all things that are; that they are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world; that then there shall be a general reserrection, and a day of judgment, wherein just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works; after which the angel of darkness, and his disciples, shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishments of their evil deeds: and the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light, the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated for ever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity.— And all this the remainder of that sect, which is now in Persia and India, do without any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day.”

Let us now consider, what Zoroaster says shall take place at the end of the world, and compare it

with the creeds of most Christians. He says—"then there shall be a general resurrection." This article Zoroaster no doubt learned from his acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures, for the resurrection from the dead, was the ultimate hope of believers in Christ, who was promised to the fathers. At this resurrection, he says there shall be "a day of judgment."—This, Zoroaster could not learn from the Old Testament, for it does not teach such a doctrine, and when he made his creed, the New was not in existence. The phrase "*day of judgment*," used by him, is that now used by Christians, and in the same sense as he used it. In my answer to Mr. Sabine, I examined every text in which this phrase is found, and showed, that it is not once used in the Bible, in the sense which Zoroaster and Christians have attached to it. To it I beg leave to refer the reader, who inclines to examine this subject. Christians must have borrowed the sense they attach to the phrase "day of judgment" from his creed, for he could not borrow it from theirs, as the chronology of the cases show. But let us hear Zoroaster, about what shall take place at the day of judgment? He says—"just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works." It cannot be denied, that this is the very sentiment and language of Christian creeds. But I ask, how Zoroaster could learn either this sentiment or its phraseology from the Old Testament? If he did, intelligent and orthodox men have erred greatly in admitting that this doctrine is not taught at all, or at least very doubtful in the Old Testament. Jahn, in his *Archaeology*, thus writes, p. 398.—"We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those, which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life. That *these* were the motives which were presented to their minds in order



to influence them to pursue a right course of conduct, is expressly asserted, Isai. 26 : 9, 10. and may be learnt also from the imprecations, which are met with, in many parts of the Old Testament.

Every *orthodox* man must believe that the devil with his disciples, or all wicked men, are to suffer in a world of their own "in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds," and that "the angel of light, and his disciples, shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds : and that after this they shall remain separated for ever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." What man would be deemed orthodox, who refused to believe these things ? And why not allow, that Zoroaster, the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted, was in these things as *orthodox as they are* ? In these things he was orthodox long before them. There is only one of the above articles about which they differ from him in opinion. To the honour of our orthodox brethren be it spoken, they do not say, that the disciples of the angel of light receive future blessedness as a reward for good deeds done by them here. No, they say, it is not of works but of grace, lest any man should boast. It is true, the grace whereby they save men, is rather a purchased grace, than free grace, but on this we forbear remarking.

But it is added by Prideaux—"and all this the remainder of that sect which is now in Persia and India, do without any variation, after so many ages still hold even to this day." If they hold all the above articles, "without any variation to this day," and if they are all true, as Dean Prideaux asserts, why be at so much trouble and expense to send them missionaries ? The chief articles in modern Christian creeds were propagated there many ages before the Christian religion

existed. If these tenets were taken from the New Testament, it is certain Zoroaster taught them long before, and Jesus Christ and his apostles had not the honour of revealing such articles of faith to the world. For example, "they believe in one Supreme God, and in Jesus Christ under the name of 'an angel of light.'" They believe also in the Christian's devil, under the name of 'an angel of darkness.' They believe in the opposition of these two to each other, and which is to continue to the end of the world. They further believe in a resurrection of all the dead, a day of judgment and future retribution. And they believe in the everlasting happiness of all the good, and everlasting punishment of all the wicked." Pray, what more do orthodox people wish them to believe, to be as orthodox as themselves? What more could missionaries teach them, to perfect their Christian creed, which they received from Zoroaster? It is true, there are some articles in the Christian creeds of which they must be ignorant as they were not taught by Zoroaster. It does not appear that he knew any thing about hell-fire, as the place of everlasting punishment for his angel of darkness and his disciples. Nor had he learned that his angel of darkness was to be the everlasting tormentor of the wicked in this place. He was also ignorant that hell was paved with the skulls of infants a span long. His creed does not recognize, either, that it is necessary for people to be willing to be damned for the glory of God, in order to their being saved. As to his making God the author of evil or sin, he framed his system so as to avoid this absurdity. Being damned for Adam's transgression, divine retribution, three persons in one God, and other articles of modern theological discussion, Zoroaster seems to have known no more about, than about captain Symmes' theory of the earth. It deserves the serious consideration of the whole orthodox body,

whether missionaries ought not to come from Persia and India here, to examine into the innovations and additions made in the creed of their founder, the great Zoroaster.

---

### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We have now seen that the personality of the devil, and other tenets of the Magian religion are not taught in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. That Zoroaster did not learn them from this source is evident, by the fact that the orthodox, who still hold the same tenets, cannot find them there. That Zoroaster did not obtain them from the New Testament, is settled by the fact, that it was not written within 600 years of the time in which he flourished. Were they given to him by special revelation from God? No one will affirm this, for he is allowed to be a great impostor. Are they then of his *invention*, and did Jesus Christ and his apostles *sanction* these sentiments by adopting them? If they did, why do we still call *him* an impostor who introduced them, while Jesus is termed the high priest of our profession? As it is admitted by those who are best able to judge in these matters, that the writings of the Old Testament do not contain these sentiments, to what shall we attribute them? Shall we say that Jesus Christ and his apostles taught them by direction of God? If so, why was not Zoroaster, who taught the same six hundred years prior to the Christian dispensation, a true prophet? If the prophets of the Lord advocated these tenets, let us have chapter and verse for it. If not, and they are a part of the Christian system, then Zoroaster, and not Christ, is their promulgator. Christ, then, merely revived the Magian religion, as improved by that

arch impostor, and the moderns who hold these sentiments, are indebted to the greatest impostor that ever lived, excepting Mahomet, for the articles of the orthodox creed, and not to Christ. But will our orthodox friends allow this? And yet how will they avoid it? If Zoroaster *did* teach these tenets, and if the prophets in the Old Testament did *not* teach them, while they are considered as parts of the Christian theology, then are we indebted to Zoroaster, and not to those who came after him, for the sentiments which they merely *revived*.

“Let it now be remembered, that while the Jews dwelt in Canaan they knew nothing about the devil. If they did it was merely by report, that the Persians and other nations believed in such a being. They had precepts, guarding them against witchcraft, idolatry, and all the abominations of the Canaanites, but not one guarding them against that almost infinite being whom Christians call the devil. How our orthodox brethren account for this I am unable to say. On my views, it is easily and rationally accounted for. The devil was the principle of evil deified, transformed by Zoroaster into an angel of darkness, and the Jews go to Babylon to get acquainted with him. That the Jews spent seventy years in captivity there, is a fact disputed by no one.”

How likely the Jews were to imbibe the principles of the Babylonians during their captivity of seventy years, is not very problematical. The *time* of their captivity, was while the Magian religion was in its zenith. They were always prone to go a whoring after strange gods, whom their fathers knew not. The *manner* of their captivity led in a great measure to this result, for they were scattered through that immense territory. Zoroaster's religion recognized one God, and so did theirs. The religion of Zoroaster was *popular*, and they had many inducements to embrace

it. A great similitude existed between the two religions in respect to *idols*, which were discountenanced by both; and this makes it very probable, that Zoroaster was indeed a Jew, as has already been hinted.

As we have now seen that the similarity between the principles of Zoroaster and those professed at the present time by men who claim to be Christians, is very striking, why are not the moderns as properly called *Mehestani*, as were the followers of Zoroaster, and not after Christ, the mere servant of Zoroaster. If, as a master, Zoroaster taught what are now called the principles of the Christian religion, we see no propriety in naming men after him who merely kept in countenance doctrines which had been taught for half a dozen centuries.

That the Jews did embrace the religion of the Persians, viz. the worship of the sun, is evident from Ezek. 8; where the prophet saw in vision certain men "standing between the porch and the altar, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they worshipped the sun."

But this is not the only source whence they derived superstitious ideas. The Grecian philosophy of the pre-existence and transmigration of souls, had evidently made some considerable advances, as may be seen in John 9: 2. "And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, THIS MAN OR his parents, that he WAS BORN BLIND?" The disciples, or others who could ask such a question, must be deeply imbued with the Pythagorean philosophy of metempsychosis. On no other principle can we account for a question which seems to set common sense at defiance.

The highly figurative language of the Orientals, has led the more prosing moderns to regard the figures used, as facts, and the frequency of *prosopepeia*, as proof of real existences. But is any thing we read of *Αποκάλυψ* of the New Testament, or the *κατανας* of

either the Old or New, more clearly applied to personal existences, than the personification of demons, or wisdom, or death? Wisdom is represented as *speaking*, as *sitting*, as *acting*, and yet every one may know by the context, that this is but a personification of an attribute. Very superficial people have indeed mistaken this personification in certain instances, but their mistakes are not binding on us. Death, whether moral or natural, cannot be a real existence, a person having identity, and of course consciousness; and yet it is personified as *riding*, as having a *sting*, and as being destroyed by a *victorious conqueror*. An apostle represents death as a king, *reigning* in majesty, from Adam to Moses, and the prophet represents God as saying, O *death* I will be *thy* plagues. But who believes death to be a real entity? But why should we not with as much propriety believe this, as to credit the personality of the cause of diseases, which, being more than a match for the skill of physicians in those days, was imputed to the influence of demons, or the spirits of departed men? Missionaries in those eastern countries represent people as now using incantations over those diseased as were the demoniacs of old, and it is evident that the same belief still continues. Yet, in this country, a person who should impute *epilepsy* to a *devil*, or *the devil*, considered as the spirit of a deified dead man, or an infernal agent, would be "laughed to scorn," even in this devil-believing age.

But we need look no further back than to the fathers of New England for the *mania* of believing in witches and witchcraft, and real possessions by infernal spirits. The chronicles of those times exhibit a delusion in this respect, *almost* unaccountable. So strong was the predilection for these vagaries, that the colony of Massachusetts was in a fair way to be depopulated. The minister in his desk, and the judge on the bench,

were liable to accusation, and accusation amounted to proof. Judicial proceedings were trammelled by the fetters of superstition, and nothing but a prospect of annihilating the settlement, seemed to awaken them to a just sense of their situation. No man's liberty, or even life, was safe from this monster of fanaticism. Every injury, every insult, or supposed one, and every hatred *without a cause* existing in the person hated, was sufficient to drag the imputed to prison and to death. But who now, does not look back on these ridiculous and horrible phantasies, as the effect of deluded minds, and who is not ashamed to

“—*Own our fathers have been fools so long ?*”

The translation of the terms *διαβολος, δαιμον, δαιμονιον, and σατανα,* by the word *devil*, has not a little confounded the ideas of our ancestors, and indeed of our contemporaries. Having generally very imperfect ideas of the *distinction in language* by the mis-translation, and not caring to venture a search into what a most critical scholar, (Dr. Campbell,) has called an endless subject, they have suffered themselves to be carried along the popular current, and rested contented with the vulgar error, *vox populi, vox Dei*; or, *the voice of the populace is the voice of God.*

That this has been the case, is obvious from the following facts :

1. *The origin of the Devil*; as commonly believed, is too preposterous an idea to bear one hour's investigation. He is represented in the common opinion, as having been an angel of light, of great knowledge, and consequent power. That in the presence of God, where the scriptures represent joy and blessedness as perennial, he *sinned*. *Pride* is supposed to be his sin. On what his pride was founded, his biographers have not seen fit to inform us. How sin entered into a place of divine beatitude, we can no more imagine, than we can take a security that myriads of beatified

spirits of angels and men, shall not, at some future time, turn hell over into a pandemonium, and dethrone the Almighty. If sin could enter the mind of one dwelling in uncreated light, and perfectly pure from the lusts of the flesh, why may not those who have sojourned *here* as tenants in common in the school of vanity, return like the dog to his vomit, and like the swine that had been washed to his wallowing in the mire, Orthodoxy represents our very nature as polluted, and what warrants have we, that a recurrence of these evil propensities shall not at some future time visit us with power a thousand fold accumulated, and miseries a thousand fold aggravated? None at all. All the future, on this supposition is a blank, and those who harbour despair, do it with their eyes open to all these horrid, but legitimate deductions.

2. *The unity, or oneness of the devil*, grants him *omniscience*, and *omnipresence*, two attributes of Jehovah. Thus the power of ubiquity is granted him at once, and he is supposed to be the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience, throughout the habitable world, and in the accumulated millions of those who have departed this state of existence. For, admitting that men sin without "*being* thereto instigated by the devil," and we find no occasion for his existence. But if a personal devil is necessary to the existence of sin, and sin and suffering are to exist and accumulate *ad infinitum*, the ubiquity of the devil is as necessary to the works of misery, as is any given cause to produce a specified effect. Hence the *unity* of the devil renders him equal in two respects, to Jehovah.

3. *His existence is supposed to run parallel with Jehovah's*. If one is in scripture represented as alone possessing immortality, the common opinion is made to clash with the declaration. It is of little account that we read, Heb. 2: 14, and 1 John 3: 8, of his destruction, and that of his works. The *vox populi* is



a ready evidence to the contrary fact, and obtains an implicit credence.

4. *The devil is supposed to have tempted our first parents.* Let this be once taken for *granted*, and all the remaining abominations follow in its train. Let this be disproved, and they all vanish. But are we required to prove the negative? If we are not, it *may* be done, and it *shall* be done. "By one man sin entered into the world." Paul is our author—Now prove by any other passage that sin entered by means of a personal devil, with as much clearness as this proves that man is the author of sin, and the Bible is neutralized; for that which is equally applicable in proof of two opposites, is not testimony in either case. Thus then, a negative is *proved*, or the scriptures cannot prove any thing relative to the subject—Need we seek any further for the origin of evil?

If then we find a personal, omniscient, omnipresent devil, was not originally wanted to deceive, and lead into sin, our first parents, what motive can call for his assistance at the present day? We think the *examples* set before the infants of our race more than sufficient to produce the effects imputed to the devil. If we are made subject to vanity, as the scriptures abundantly testify, no supernatral agency can be requisite to effect our moral degradation. But let us be thankful, that though we are thus subjected, it is through the wisdom of him who hath thus subjected us in the glorious hope, that the creature—the whole creation of God, shall yet be delivered from this bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God—Amen.

**SUPPLEMENT.**

Since writing the above, the editor has read "the National Preacher, No. 9." containing two discourses, from Heb. 10 : 12. As the book of Job is allowed to contain the doctrine of a personal devil with as much clearness as any other in the whole scriptures, we should be thankful to the person who will show us in what respect Dr. Matthews is wrong in the following paragraph. If a personal devil had nothing to do with the matter, by what testimony shall we be satisfied that such a personality exists ?

"You are to view and receive afflictions as coming from the hand of God ;—as sent by Him whose kingdom ruleth over all. You have only to open your Bible, and this truth will meet your eye in almost every page. All those diseases to which you are liable, are most explicitly ascribed to divine agency. When nations, or individuals were to be chastised, the pestilence is called for, and its course is directed, until His purpose, who administers the correction, is fully accomplished. It is stated in Scripture, that all the diseases of Egypt, also every sickness and every plague, though not mentioned in the book of the law, are sent and controlled by the hand of God. "I know, says the pious and afflicted Job, that thou wilt bring me to death. He killeth and he maketh alive." All other calamities with which you can possibly be afflicted are also his messengers. If the devouring flame consumes your property ; if the tempest or hurricane visits you with desolation ; this fire and this stormy wind are but his servants, fulfilling his pleasure."

# LIGHT OF TRUTH.

---

## Book Second.

*Being the Substance of a Lecture on Hosea 12: 14. By Rev. J. S. Thompson.*

O HELL, I WILL BE THY DESTRUCTION.

### SECTION I.

Examination of the Hebrew words Sheol and Gehenna; and of the Greek word Hades, and the pagan Tartarus.

*Christian auditors*: You may ask me, wherefore have you changed the common reading of the text, and used the term *Hell*, instead of the grave? I reply, every person acquainted with the original languages, in which it hath pleased God to communicate to man the sacred intelligence of life and immortality, will readily admit, that the Hebrew word, translated *grave*, in the common version of the Text, is that very same term, which is translated *Hell* wherever the word occurs in the Old Testament. I am therefore justified in reading my Text as I have done in your hearing; and the good sense of the passage, as well as the fulfilment of the prophecy, require this change in the mode of reading. But seeing the word *Hell* occurs in the sacred scriptures as the translation of three different words, Sheol, Gehenna, and Hades, I shall endeavour

1st. To give an explanatory history of these terms.

2d. To disprove the doctrine generally deduced from them.

My hearers will be surprised by the declaration, that not one of the original words, which our translators have rendered *Hell*, conveys the idea of a place or state of punishment in another mode of existence; and consequently their just indignation will be excited against that deceptive system of duplicity, which has so long abused mankind by the misuse of terms, and perversion of reason and religion. The word *Hell*, in its modern acceptation, excites in the mind a very different idea from that which the term formerly expressed. To our notions of it the words of the Latin poet apply.

“*Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur ab illis.*”

The word has lost its primitive signification, which, like the original words of which it is the translation in our Bibles, was perfectly innocent, and has acquired the modern and hideous idea of a place appropriated to the execution of interminable punishment. The word *Hell*, therefore, by the consent of the ablest commentators of all denominations, should be expunged from our Bibles; and no longer used as the translation of the Greek or Hebrew terms; for *there is, confessedly, no word in the original scriptures to express the modern idea of Hell!* The word, says Dr. A. Clarke, is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *Helan*, which signifies to *cover, conceal, or hide*; and hence the tilings or covering of a house, and the covers of books are to this day called *Heling*, and the phrase *to hell* is still used as synonymous with *to cover or hide*, in several of the western counties of England, especially, Cornwall and Lancaster. Thus the true and primitive meaning of the word *hell*, was perfectly accordant with the idea suggested by the Hebrew *sheol*, and the Greek *Hades*; for as nouns, all the three words imply something unseen, concealed, or invisible; and have there-

fore been employed with propriety to convey the notion of an *unseen world, the grave, or state of the dead in general*. Similar are the sentiments of the learned Archbishop Usher, expressed in his *Treatise de Lim. Patr.*—"We have no word in the French or English language to express the idea conveyed by the Hebrew *sheol*, the Greek *hades*, or the Latin *infern*i. Our English word *hell* had anciently this meaning; being derived from the German *hill, to hide*. Hence the ancient Irish used to say '*hill the head*,' meaning *to cover the head*. So that our *hell* then answered to the Greek *hades*, which signifies an unseen place." Drs. S. and A. Clarke, Campbell, Whitby, and others, approbate the above definition of *hell*, and harmoniously unite in opinion, that *hell* originally answered to the Greek and Hebrew terms, but ought not to be used in the modern sense, as the translation of *sheol* or *hades*.

How strange then, that from the term *hell*, should have arisen those dreadful notions, which are so assiduously propagated in the world, and which men of fruitful imaginations have so effectually made to operate as the means of delusion and aggrandizement. It is not however surprising, that superstition should act most powerfully on the fears of her votaries, since the human fancy can paint with greater energy the misery than the bliss of a future state.—With the two simple ideas of darkness and fire, we can create a sensation of pain, which may be aggravated to an infinite degree, by adding the idea of endless duration. Hence from the greater facility of depicting the horrors which distract the mind or ruin the peace of society, *hell*, which contained just as much happiness as misery, in its idea, came to be used by religious impostors of every description, as a fit engine to awe the mind of the credulous into that pliability, necessary to favour the views of the avaricious priest or tyrannical monarch. Egypt;

the mother of gods, superstition, and mystery, gave origin to the whole doctrine of Hell; if we lop off the exuberances of infuriated orthodoxy, during the dark ages of papal delusion. These happy plains, says Diodorus, extending from the Nile to the Pyramids, where once stood the famous Memphis, reported to be the abode of the just after death, are no other than the beautiful country in the vicinity of the lake Acherusia, near Memphis. It is not without foundation, that the dead have been said to reside here; for here terminate the funeral ceremonies of most of the Egyptians. Their bodies, having been conveyed across the Nile and the lake Acherusia, are finally deposited in tombs constructed under the surface of these plains. The ceremonies yet practised in Egypt correspond with all the notions of the Greeks, concerning the infernal regions.

#### SHEOL.

This word, which is translated Hell in the scriptures of the Old Testament, signifies only the state of the dead indiscriminately. Thus Ps. 89: 47, according to the translation of the common prayer, reads, what man is he that liveth, and shall not see death; and shall he deliver his soul from the hand of hell? What Solomon says, (Prov. 27: 20,) hell and destruction are never full, is perfectly explained by chap. 30: 15, there be three things which are never satisfied—Sheol or Hell, etc.

The Hebrew word, *sheol*, is derived from *shaal*, to ask, pray, or hide. Kennicot, who compared the Bible with above 1000 Mss. and thus became a practical Hebrician, affirms that the radical meaning of *shaal*, is to ask or pray. In this sense our translators understood it, Gen. 32: 29. Deut. 4: 32, and 37: 7. Josh. 4: 6, Jud. 18: 5, etc. The Septuagint renders it *aiteisan*, in Ex. 3: 22, and every impartial inquirer will be satisfied by consulting Pool's Annotations on

the passage, Whitby on Acts, 2 : 27, Kennicot's first dissertation, p. 390, and Shuckford's Connexions, vol. 2, p. 340.

The learned Buxtorf defines sheol, the "general place of the dead;" and another very competent judge and excellent Commentator, Dr. Whitby, says, according to the scriptures, the Jewish writers, the ancient Fathers and the still more ancient heathen, the Hebrew Sheol, and the Greek Hades, which answers to it in the translation of the Seventy, signifies the place of reception of all the dead. In this sense alone can we understand the sacred writers.—In the first place where the word sheol as a noun occurs, Gen. 37: 35, we find the pious Patriarch, saying, "*I will go down into Sheol, to my son mourning.*" How absurd to suppose that Jacob believed his beloved son to be in a place of torment! And how desperately wicked the language both of the holy Jacob and the patient Job, if we attach to the word Hell the modern meaning. The former exclaims, "*I shall go to Hell,*" and the latter prays, "*Oh that thou wouldst hide me in Hell till thy wrath be past!*" Job 14 : 13. In the views of our modern evangelical preachers, Hell is the very focus of the Divine wrath, yet Job prays to be hid in it, in order to escape that wrath! O how confounded is the language of Babel! Our modern Babel-builders have long pretended to speak a holy, ancient, and Biblical language, but God Almighty, in respect for the truth, has manifested their character by the confusion of tongues.

It is proper here to notify my readers, that in the Old Testament, the word Sheol, does not mean the place of separate spirits; for the writers of the Jewish scriptures had no knowledge of a future mode of existence. They neither feared nor hoped for any thing beyond the grave! Sheol therefore only implies the state of the dead, or that chaos of nonentity that was

supposed to follow dissolution. Neither friend nor foe, learned nor unlearned can put his finger on a single passage in the Old Testament and say, here is information, that man shall live again. Had the sacred writers ever thought that Sheol meant the abode of spirits, or had they believed in a separate state, they would not have declared, "there is no device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol. Eccl. 9: 10. In death there is no remembrance of God, and none shall give him thanks in Sheol, Ps. 6: 6. Sheol cannot praise God, Is. 38: 18. And that the dead know not any thing, Eccl. 9: 5. A man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all go into one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Eccl. 3: 19, 20. As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not! Job 14: 12.

We have shown that sheol, as a verb, signifies to ask or inquire; as a noun it conveys the idea of asking, or inquiry, and denotes that solicitous desire of man to know his fate or destiny after death. Hence we see that it differs radically from the hades of the Greeks, or the Hell of the moderns. Sheol, or Saul, was also a common appellative name in Israel. Their first king was so called, as also the great apostle of the Gentiles; but surely none would have been so wild as to have called their dear children by the name of sheol, or hell, had they conceived it to mean the accursed region of the damned! We therefore fairly and rationally conclude, from a full investigation of the passages, that the sheol or hell of the Old Testament denoted inquiry, a request, or figuratively, the invisible world, great solicitude, anxiety, or trouble: and any person accustomed to etymological investigation, will readily perceive how easily and naturally the figurative sense arises from the literal. In the figurative sense we understand it, Ps. 9: 17; 30: 3; 86: 18; 116: 3; and



similar passages. In some of the old English versions, the seventeenth verse of the ninth Psalm is thus rendered, "*the wicked go into hell,*"—i. e. into anxiety and trouble. This translation is perfectly harmonious with the revelation of God, and the experience of man. There is no peace, saith my God to the wicked; they are like the troubled sea; Is. 57 : 20, 21 ; into this hell Jonah went, when he endeavoured to flee from the Lord. The pains of this hell took hold of David when he went into it, by the commission of those crimes, which tarnish his character, and blacken his memorial to all generations. O sinner, thou canst only keep out of this hell, by doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with thy God.

But my audience may demand what is implied in the text, O sheol, I will be thy destruction. I answer, the Lord God will swallow up death in victory; and wipe away tears from all faces. Is. 25 : 8. God will dwell with men, and they shall be his people, and he will be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain. Rev. 21 : 3, 4. The Hell of the Bible is that anxiety and trouble which are the effects of sin; and follow as a consequence that vanity to which the creature is subject. Rom. 8 : 20. But the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, at the restitution, regeneration, or new creation of all things. The transgression shall be finished, sin terminate, death and hell be cast into the lake of fire to be destroyed, and evil be abolished from the empire of God!

#### HADES.

*Hades* from *a*, not, and *eido*, to see—signifies unseen, invisible; the invisible reception or mansion of the dead, where all departed spirits are supposed to reside, without any distinction whatever.—In the scriptures,

it is often personified as a king of terrors, or destroying monster, having his basileion, or kingdom.—Wisd. 1: 14. This is implied in the phrase, *heos hadou*, or *doma hadou*. Genesis 37: 35. Num. 15: 80. Is. 14: 11. Math. 11: 23. His *pulai*, or gates. Is. 38: 10. Math. 16: 18. His *puloroi*, or doorkeepers, Job 38: 17. His *cheir*, or hand, Ps. 59: 15. And his *kentron*, or sting. And notwithstanding the many have formed an unholy alliance, or covenant with him, to support his iniquitous administration, Is. 28: 15, yet he will be cast *eis ten limnen tou puros*, into the lake of fire. Here, my auditors, is the fortunate event my text contemplates when death and hell will be destroyed, and golden years return again.

Hades was generally considered by the ancients as a deep cavern, or dark region, located in the centre of the earth, by those who admitted the spherical form of the globe, but according to the vulgar notions of astronomy among the ancients, it was thought by the majority to be as far beneath the earth as the heaven was above it.—Hence Zophar, speaking to Job of the incomprehensibility of the Deity, says, it is high as heaven, deeper than hell. Homer, Hesiod, and Virgil, describe Hades as being as far beneath the earth as heaven is above it.

Tosson enerth' haideo hoson ouranos est apo gaies.—*Il.* 8, 16.

Tosson enerth' hupo ges, hoson ouranos est apo gaies.—*Theog.* 720  
 ————— tum Tartarus ipse

Bis patet in preceptis tantum, tanditque sub umbras

Quantus ad cæthereum cœli suspectus Olympum.—*Æn.* 7, 577.

Josephus, who borrowed his views from the Grecian traditions, which had been lately adopted by the Pharisees, tells us "*hades* is a subterraneous region, where the light never shines, and which must therefore be perpetual darkness. This region is appointed as a place of custody, in which the souls both of the righteous and unrighteous are detained. Into this region

there is only one descent, at whose gate stands an archangel with a host. The souls which pass through the gate go not all one way. The just are guided to the right, and conducted to a luminous region, which we call Abraham's bosom. The unjust are dragged to the left hand by the angels allotted for punishment, who reproach and threaten them by their terrible looks. This is evidently the view of hades exhibited in the parable, Luke 16.

From the time of the Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy, the hell of the ancient heathen was divided into two mansions; that on the right they called *Elysium*, from *a*, not, and *luo*, to dissolve, which they intended to signify eternal existence, and is derived from the same word which the apostle employs, Heb. 7: 16, to express endless duration. The Elysium of the Greeks, called by the Jews the bosom of Abraham was believed to be a pleasant and delightful place, abounding in all manner of delicacies; but its pleasures they supposed to be corporeal and sensual. The left hand department was appointed for the wicked. This mansion they demoniated Tartarus, either from the verb *tartarizo*, to tremble, or *tarasso*, to disturb. This was the lowest and most dreadful place in hell, in the opinions of the Greeks and Romans, and is that to which the Psalmist alludes, Ps. 86: 13. It is also mentioned from an apocryphal work, 2 Peter, 2: 4. The entrance or descent into this subterraneous region, the Latins supposed to be through the lake Avernus, in Campania, near the bay of Putelus, now called Lago d'Averno. The exhalation from this lake was believed to be destructive to all birds; hence called Avernus, from *a*, negatively, and *ornis*, a bird. This name, however, says Lucretius, was afterwards applied to all places or lakes possessing similar qualities.\*

\* *Nemo age Averna tibi, quae saint locaqueque lacusque.*—L. 6, 788

Strabo describes the country around this lake as abounding with fountains of warm waters, mixed with salt, sulphur, alum, and bitumen, which gave origin to the names of Phlegethon and Pyriphlegethon, two rivers of hell—so called from these warm, sulphurous waters. Of this passage to the infernal regions Virgil says,† the descent at Avernus is easy, and the gate of Pluto lies open night and day.

The Greeks had a passage into *hades* at Taenaris, a promontory of Peloponnesus, now called Capo Maina. Of this Virgil also takes notice, when he tells us that Orpheus having entered the passage of Taenaris, and the lofty gates of Pluto, he visited the shades and their terrible king.\*

We cannot refrain from viewing with a mixture of pity and ridicule, the foolish fancies of the ancients and moderns on the local position of hell. When our modern pietists of much devotion, little learning and much less sense, address the Maker, they look up, supposing him a venerable old man, commodiously seated in some lofty region in the Zenith, whilst they believe his Satanic majesty holds a commanding position in the Nadir, or regions directly beneath. Were these sages, who measure heaven and hell, and fix their stations in the vast empire of the Deity, to look into a book on astronomy, and there discover that the Zenith and Nadir changed places every twelve hours; so that the point directly above at noon, would be perpendicularly beneath at midnight, how would they be alarmed! Surely that man who looks up to find God, believes as much in a local and tutelar deity as the Israelites, when they adored the calves at Dan and Bethel!

† *Æ.* 6, 25.

\* *Tænariæ etiam fauces, alta ostia Ditis  
Ingressus, Manesque adiit regemque tremendum.—Geor.* 4. 467.

Though Hades has sometimes the signification of Sheol, and simply intimates the idea of an unknown and unseen state, or nonentity, yet it more generally denotes the abode of spirits indiscriminately. In the Septuagint it answers to sheol, and cannot therefore communicate any other idea than that of the Hebrew term. Therefore by Hades, many have understood the grave; and in that sense it is sometimes used by the Greek writers.

*Metros d' en hadou kai patros kekeuthotoin,  
Ouk est adelphos hostis an blastoi pote.—Sophocles Antig. 924.*

The Reformers generally maintained in their controversies with the Catholics, that hades simply denoted the grave, or state of the dead. Hence Corneil a Lapede, in Ephs. 4: 10. asserts that Calvin and Beza both denied the descent of Christ to hell; believing hades to mean no more than the grave. Indeed our orthodox commentators, on Acts 2: 27, are as strenuous advocates of the innocent meaning of the term, as any Universalist whatever: and the uniform testimony of competent judges, ancient and modern, affixes one meaning to the word hades, i. e. the invisible world, or abode of spirits. The Greeks assigned one hades to all that die: hence they often say, "pantas homas thnetous haides dechetai. Hades receives all the dead." Caius, a Roman Presbyter, adopts similar language. "En hadou sunechontai psuchai dikaion te kai adikon. The souls of both the just and the unjust go to hades." Job exclaims, "Sheol Bethni, hades is my house, 17: 13. Thou wilt bring me to the house appointed for all living."—30: 23. Both Homer and Euripides say of the dead in general, *kattelthein eis dom hadou*—they go to the house of hades: and the learned Wingate says, *haiden nekron chorion exponunt Geaeci*, the Greeks call the place of the dead, hades. Homer describing the rage of Achilles,

says, it sent prematurely to hades, the souls of many brave heroes.

Pollas d' iphthimous psuchas Haidi proiapsen.—*Il.* 1, 4.

Dr. S. Clark, in his sermon on Ps. 16 : 10, says, "In the New Testament, the word **hell** sometimes denotes a place of punishment for the wicked, in other places, the state of the dead in general. But this ambiguity is only in the Translation, and not in the original; for wherever a place of torment is mentioned, the word is always Gehennah in the original. But when only the state of the dead is intended, it is expressed in the original by Hades, a quite different word, which though translated hell, signifies only the invisible state. Accordingly the prediction, Mat. 11 : 23, thou Capernaum shalt be brought down to hell, means, that great and proud city should be leveled with the dust, and utterly disappear as those who are buried in the grave. When the rich man in hell, lift up his eyes, being in torment, Luke 16 : 23. The original only signifies that he was in the invisible world, wherein were Abraham and Lazarus; to which went Christ and the thief, and all that die, both righteous and wicked. When our Lord promises, Matt. 16 : 18, that the gates of Hell should not prevail against his Church, the words *pulai hadou*, gates of hell, strictly rendered, signify the passage to the invisible world, i. e. death; and the import of the promise is, that death itself, the utmost extent of all persecution, should never be able to suppress his doctrine or extirpate his religion from this world. Lastly, prophecy intimates, that death and hell will deliver up the dead, and be then cast into the lake of fire. Hence it is very evident that hell cannot mean either the place or state of the damned, but on the contrary, the state of death, or death itself, including all human woe, which then shall be no more. So in Ps. 16 : 10—

Acts 2 : 27 ; thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, plainly implies a solid faith on the resurrection of the body. From this explanation of all the texts which relates to this subject, concludes the Dr. it is clear the scriptures no where teach, that our Lord, by descending into hell, ever entered a place appointed for the punishment of wicked men, nor is there any thing in reason, from which it can, by any just consequence, be inferred."

[As Mr. Thompson has evidently been less explicit in this paragraph than the subject requires, we think proper to add a few remarks. As the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus is highly figurative, the term *hades*, signifying unqualified darkness, is obviously employed as an emblem of the spiritual darkness, which, as a *veil*, was covering the Jewish nation. As to *pulai hadou*, the gates of hell, used in Mat. 16 : 18, we further remark, that whatever signification this may bear in heathen, or Jewish-heathen mythology, we think *this application* of the phrase, is in this instance, very improper. The word gate, is not used in scripture exclusively, as the name of a door, or place of entrance. It frequently signifies, *court, power, dominion, and strength*, and is so often thus used, that two or three examples must be sufficient. "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22 : 17. Butterworth, in his concordance, quotes this very passage, Mat. 16 : 18, in the sense of power and dominion. Hence we infer, that the power of darkness, the strength of ignorance, shall not prevail against the kingdom of God, which is a kingdom of light. *Light*, and *life*, are opposed to *darkness*, and *death*, and the former will ultimately prevail.—*Editor.*]

Hence we may fairly and reasonably conclude, from the unanimous testimony of the most learned and impartial Commentators both ancient and modern, that **Hades** does not signify a place appropriated to the punishment of the wicked.

*GEHENNA.*

According to the testimony of the scriptures, and the best historians, Gehenna was the name of a valley, south-east of Mount Zion, which was the most southerly of those mountains, on which stood the once celebrated city of Jerusalem. The most remarkable declivity of Mount Zion looks towards the south-west, being formed by a deep ravine, called in scripture *Ge-Ben-Hinnom*, or the valley of Hinnom. This valley running from west to east, met on the south-east, the valley of Jehoshaphat, or as it is sometimes called, the valley of Kedron, from the book of that name by which it was watered. Here the horrid rites of human sacrifices were paid to Moloch and Beelphegor. The origin of the name is somewhat obscure. From Joshua 15 : 8, we should incline to think it obtained the name from some family called Hinnom, to whom it once belonged. Some think it was so called from the facts noticed Is. 66 : 24. The dead bodies of apostates and malefactors being exposed as a public example, might induce men to call the valley Hinnom, there they are, implying, there lie or hang the bodies of those vile transgressors who forsook the God of their fathers, and followed the vanities of the nations. But others, with more accuracy, derive the word from the Hebrew verb, *Hannam*, to yell, believing the valley to have obtained its name from the shrieks of the children sacrificed to Moloch.

St. Jerome, a native of Palestine, informs us, that the valley of Hinnom, called Gehenna in the New-Testament, was a fine and beautiful place, adorned with gardens and well watered with fountains. The grandeur of the scenery first invited the idolatrous Amorites, and afterwards the Jews, to erect here the standard of superstition. - Moloch signifies a king, and was, very probably, a brazen image, designed to represent the sun, seeing fire was so much used in his



worship. This opinion receives support from what is said by the prophet Amos, 5 : 26. Selden, who has given us a prolix account of this idol and the rites by which he was worshipped, adduces several testimonies to prove that the Phenicians and other nations, in the vicinity of Judea, actually sacrificed their children in times of calamity, to this blood-thirsty Demon. Hence the phrase "to pass through the fire," signifies to burn in sacrifice.—See Deut. 18 : 10, 2 Kings 23 : 10. Lev. 18 : 21. 2 Chron. 28 : 3. Jer. 7 : 31, 19, 5, and 32 : 35. Ps. 106 : 37, and Ez. 19 : 20, 21.

Bochart affirms, that all the people of the east, worshipped the sun, and consecrated to him horses which they believed to be nimble as the sun. And as it was a prevailing notion that the sun was carried about in a chariot—chariots were dedicated to him, and horses slain in sacrifice by the Armenians, Persians, and others: and for the same reason, the idolatrous kings of Judea, were drawn out at the eastern gate of the city, which looked towards Tophet, to salute the sun on his appearance above the horizon. Accordingly, we find that when they worshipped, they turned their faces towards the east—Ez. 9 : 16. The sun, as an object of idolatrous worship, was adored under the names of Molech, Adrammelech, Baal, and Bethshemesh, 2 Kings 23 : 5, 11. The following passage from Diodorus Siculus, L. 20, will show to what an enormous extent the fanatical reverence for this fiery god had prevailed among the people of the east. "When Agathocles, tyrant of Sicily, besieged Carthage, the inhabitants imputing the calamity to the displeasure of Saturn, to whom they had lately sacrificed supposititious children ; or such as they had privately purchased, whereas formerly they had burnt to his honour the best of their offspring : reflecting on these things, and seeing the enemy encamped at their very walls, they were seized with religious dread, for having profaned

the honours of the gods, and in haste to rectify their errors, they chose two hundred of the noblest children, and sacrificed them quickly. Many others, accused of irreligion, gave themselves up willingly, to the number of no less than three hundred! For they had a brazen statue, stretching out his hands towards the ground, in such a manner, that the child placed in them, tumbled down into a pit full of fire."

The following extract from D. Kimchi on 2 Kings 23 : 10, will tend to explain the tabernacle of Moloch, mentioned Acts 7 : 43, " Our Rabbins of happy memory inform us, that although all other houses of idolatry were in Jerusalem, Moloch was without it. His image was made hollow, and sat within seven chapels. Whoever offered a flower, they opened to him the first of these; whoever offered turtles or pigeons, they opened to him the second; to him that offered a lamb, they opened the third; to him that offered a ram, they opened the fourth; to him that offered a calf, they opened the fifth; to him that offered an ox, they opened the sixth; but whoever offered his son, to him they opened the seventh." Fabius also informs us that " the image of Moloch was made of brass, curiously contrived with seven cells, probably to represent the seven planets; and the offerings being put into these receptacles, they were shut, and all were burnt to ashes, while the people danced about the idol, and beat timbrels or tabrets to drown the cries of the tormented." Who can fail to observe the striking similarity between those horrid monsters of antiquity, who burnt their children while they danced to the sound of the timbrel; and those modern advocates of a still more horrible Moloch, who tell us they shall sing in heaven, while their children shriek in the unquenchable fire of an endless Hell! Let not the reader be surprised, for all this is perfectly orthodox, and agreeable to the language of the holy fathers. " How shall I

laugh, exclaims Tertullian, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many monarchs groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness ; so many magistrates liquefying in fiercer fires than ever they kindled for christians : so many sage philosophers blushing in red hot flames !”

**TOPHET**, like Gehenna, is somewhat of dubious signification. In certain passages of scripture it clearly implies the name of a place ; and from what is said of it, Is. 30 : 33, many have supposed it to mean hell, or the abode of the damned. Indeed, Dr. Campbell thought that in the latter age of Jewish history, the word *Tophet*, was exclusively used to denote the hell of the moderns. Of this opinion I was also, during the early part of my ministry.—But how great was my surprise when I first read Jer. 19 : 14. “ Then came Jeremiah from Tophet, whither the Lord had sent him to prophesy !” What, said I, Jeremiah in hell ! and sent there to prophesy ! But on further inquiry, I found Tophet to be the name of a place in the valley of Hinnon, near the city of Jerusalem, 2 Kings 23 : 10, Jer. 7 : 31. The children of Judah built Tophet in the valley of Hinnon, for the express purpose of burning their infants to Moloch or Baal, when the good feelings of their nature had become extinct, by the baneful influence of superstition ; but the Jehovah of the Jews declares, the wicked thought never entered his heart to build a place for the burning of his offspring, see Jer. 7 : 31, and 32 : 35. Tophet was a great image erected to Moloch, hollow within, and prepared for the reception of those innocent victims, which were committed to the flames, as expiatory sacrifices to appease the wrath of this senseless god of consuming fire ! O ye worshippers of gods, whose very bowels emit columns of liquid flames, and whose breath is a stream of brimstone, think of horrid Moloch. Consider also, if the worshippers of the apocalyptic beast, be not tormented as the Jews were, by the slavish dread of a terrific monster !

Jewish writers in general are of opinion, that Tophet received its name from *Toph*, a drum, because that instrument was used to drown the cries of those infants, who were sacrificed to Moloch ; but Le Clerc objects to this etymology, because it does not appear that large drums were known to the ancients ; and the sound of the less, called *taber*, used in dances, was not sufficiently loud ; and for the large we are indebted to the Arabians, who first brought them into Spain. Though this objection does not seem very forcible, yet it is more reasonable to believe that Tophet signifies a fire-stove, and that the large hollow image of Moloch was so called ; and probably that part of the valley of Hinnon, where the image stood, bore the same appellation. There is little pleasure in describing scenes of horror, but it may be useful to show us the evils of a false religion, and inspire us with grateful emotions for the enjoyment of the true. Be it known then, to the disgrace of the Jews, that although in possession of the knowledge of the one only true God, like modern Christians, they were too much inclined to the worship of idols ; and having consecrated the solar fire as a deity, they erected Tophet as an altar to one of those agents, which God employs for the benefit of the world. An idol of brass, having the head of an ox, but the body of a man, was made to represent the fiery god ; and the idol seated on a throne of brass, a crown was placed on its head, and its hands extended to receive their gifts. But what gifts were deemed most acceptable ? Ah ! had the fruits of the field or herds of the stall sufficed, it would have been well, but cruel Moloch cried for blood ; and nothing less than the tender pledges of conjugal love, could glut the rapacity of this wrathful deity ! The hollow idol was heated to redness—the parent, by a refinement of cruelty, in order to acquire the summit of sanctity, must become the priest

—himself must place his darling in its arms ! No bewitching smiles or mournful cries must drive him from his purpose. His heart must be steeled against every tender impression, and a most complete conquest obtained over the strongest feelings of humanity. Fortunately, the shocking scene was of short duration. The sacred drums, impiously so called, drowned the cries ; and whilst the bodies of the innocent children became the victims of a merciless superstition, their souls reorganized, were received to the embraces of a kind and merciful God !

To prevent the continuance of this horrid practice, Josiah defiled this valley, by making it a common depot for the filth of the city, and the bodies of those criminals which were refused the rites of burial. 2 Kings, 23 : 10. This valley was also made the place of execution for all who were condemned to be stoned or burnt to death by the supreme court at Jerusalem, called the Sanhedrim. According to the Jewish law there were nineteen offences, which subjected the criminal to suffer death by stoning ; and ten, which were punished by burning to death, in the fire of Gehenna. Many of those who were stoned to death, were also hanged, and their bodies left to be meat to the fowls of heaven or the beasts of the field. Gen. 40 : 19, 2 Sam. 21 ; 9. Jer. 7 : 33, and 19 : 7. Burning was performed either by roasting in the fire, Jer. 29 : 22, or in a furnace, Dan. 3 : 23, or by pouring melted lead down their throats. Lightfoot, from the Talmuds, informs us, that this last punishment was performed in the following manner. "The criminal being made fast, a towel was put round his neck, and two men taking hold of the ends of the towel, one pulling one way, and the other the opposite, they forced him by strangling to open his mouth : then a third poured boiling lead down his throat and burnt his bowels."

Some have thought from the peculiar use of the valley, Gehenna became proverbial to express any great punishment, or afflictive dispensation ; and might therefore be used by our Lord, to designate the torments of Hell in another world. In favour of this supposition, they refer to the Targum on Gen. 3 : 24, and 15 : 17. But the Targums were not composed till long after the Jews had mixed in captivity, with the Pagan nations, and learned of them their fabulous ideas concerning the state of the Ghosts in Hades.

Nothing can be more clear than what has been asserted by Le Clerc and Gibbon, that from the time the Jews received the Sinai dispensation of the Law, till the Babylonian captivity, the hopes as well as the fears of the Jewish nation, were confined within the narrow compass of the present life. But after the Jews were restored by Cyrus, and became divided into sects, the Pharisees received under the name of traditions, the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, with several other speculative tenets from the Philosophy or religion of the eastern nations. Gibbon's Rome, vol. 1. ch. 15. Plato, in Tim. et de Repub. uses such language as to manifest, that he and Socrates borrowed their ideas of future rewards and punishments from others ; and Suidas informs us they borrowed from the Egyptians. But notwithstanding all the influence of the Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy, supported in this instance, by the combined interests of Priestcraft and Kingcraft, Cicero, a most consummate philosopher and statesman, who flourished about fifty years before Christ, declares, Tuscul. Quest. L. 1. S. 10. that the old fables of the Elysian fields and Pluto's kingdom, were grown ridiculous, and abandoned to the poets and painters ! Moreover, it is extremely futile, to refer to Jewish Targums for support to a doctrine denounced by the Jewish scriptures. Had the Targums taught the doctrine alleged, though it were

only as a Jewish tradition, surely we would much more reasonably expect to find it in the Mishna, which was the grand repository of all their traditions. Yet so far from supporting the doctrine, the quotations of Dr. A. Clarke on Mat. 12 : 32, show that both the Babylonian and Jerusalem Gemara assert, unequivocally, that death wipes off all stains, even the sin of blasphemy !

We are perfectly in accordance with Dr. S. Clark, and Dr. Campbell, in saying that Gehenna is the only word, in the New Testament, that signifies a place of punishment, but we deny that place of torment to have any longer an existence in the vast universe. In order to exhibit the sandy foundation on which these learned advocates of an invisible Gehenna, have built their chimerical palace for Pluto, I shall examine all the passages where the word Gehenna occurs in the New Testament. In reading the Greek Testament we meet with the word Gehenna just twelve times ; and the following are all the passages in which it is found. Mat. 5 : 22, 29, 30—10 : 28—18 : 9—23 : 15, 33. Mark 9 : 43, 45, 47. Luke 12 : 5, and James 3 : 6. In two of these Mat. 33 : 15, and James 3 : 6, the Drs. accede that the word must be understood figuratively. The other ten are divisible into three classes. The first class includes those passages where Christ cautions his disciples against the sin of apostacy, and refers to the mode of punishing such offenders among the Jews by burning them in Gehenna. This class includes Mat. 5 : 29, 30—10 : 28—18 : 9. Mark 9 : 43, 45, 47. Luke 12, 5. The second class includes only one passage. Mat. 5 : 22, where he describes the danger of him, who preferred a charge of apostacy against another ; and the third or last contains only one, also, namely, Mat. 23 : 33, where our Lord demands of the scribes and Pharisees, how such serpents as they, could escape the punishment of Gehenna. Hence the illustration of one passage will suffice for the whole, with all intelligent and candid persons.

In Mat. 5 : 22, Jesus, in allusion to the punishment of crimes in the valley of Hinnom, speaks of the fire of Gehenna, which is very unwarrantably translated, hell fire. In this passage, three offences are noticed, and three degrees of punishment proportionate to the crimes. 1. Anger and its consequences, for which an appeal might be made to the judgment, or less Sanhedrin, consisting of twenty-three Magistrates, whose power extended to many capital offences, and the infliction of punishment even by strangling or beheading. 2. Contempt, expressed by the opprobrious title of Raka, or Shallowbrains; for which the offender might be arraigned before the Council or Grand Sanhedrin, which consisted of seventy-two Elders, whose business was to take cognizance of capital offences only, and especially those committed against religion; and to receive appeals from the lower council, for the Grand Sanhedrin alone had power to inflict the punishment of stoning or burning alive. 3. The third offence consisted in mortal hatred or enmity, expressed by the term, Moreh, or apostate. The crime of apostacy was generally punished by roasting or burning alive in Gehenna; and the force of our Lord's words will appear, more strikingly, when we reflect that every person, who accused another of apostacy, if he failed to prove the charge, suffered the punishment due by the law to the guilty, and was consequently burned instead of the accused. No wonder then, that our master should say, whosoever shall call his brother moreh or apostate, shall be in danger of the fire of Gehenna. We also hence see the propriety of the admonition in the 29th verse and collateral passages, to abandon every thing, though dear as a right hand or eye, rather, than by apostacy expose the life to destruction, in the fire of Gehenna. The common translation of Mat. 5 : 22, and the doctrine generally deduced from it, are alike contemptible and ridicu-



lous ! What ! our Lord sentence another to hell-fire, for an offence of which he himself was frequently guilty, see Mat. 23 : 17, 19. Luke 11 : 40, and 24 : 25. The word hell occurs twelve times in the New Testament, as the translation of Gehenna : but surely no honest man would have used the former word to express the idea of the latter. Hell means a concealed place ; but Gehenna was the valley of Hinnom, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, well known to all the inhabitants of that city. There is, therefore, no affinity in the terms, nor in the ideas suggested by them ; and accordingly the best versions retain the word Gehenna, wherever it occurs in the Greek.

Notwithstanding, as Gehenna is called the place where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, Mark 9 : 43—49, some farther explanation may be necessary. From this passage it has been argued, that “our Lord calls the fire, into which the wicked shall be cast, unquenchable ; and speaks of Hell as a place where the worm dieth not ; and that to show the perpetuity of the punishment of the wicked, he adds, every one shall be salted with fire.” But “this argument, says Newcome, is founded upon a false interpretation of the metaphors, which are here employed ; and is altogether fallacious. Jesus only speaks of the wicked being cast into the valley of Hinnom, into the unquenchable fire, where the worm dieth not. Yet in the valley of Hinnom, the worm died when its food failed, and the pile on which human sacrifices were burnt to Moloch, was often extinguished. Salt being a preservative of food, was among the Jews an emblem of virtue and knowledge, by which the mind is purified, Col. 4 : 6.” God says of the fire on the Levitical altar, it shall never go out. Lev. 6 : 13. That he would kindle a fire in the gates of Jerusalem that shall never be quenched. Jer. 17 : 27. Ez. 20 : 47, 48. The smoke of Idumea was to go up for ever, and

its fire not to be quenched. Is. 34 : 10. Yet these fires have all ceased to burn many hundreds of years ago.

There were many circumstances which caused the valley of Hinnom to obtain the title of a place "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." In Gehenna, 185,000 of the army of Sennecharib fell by a fiery pestilential disease, and thereby the prophecy, Is. 30 : 33, was almost literally fulfilled. For this king of Assyria, Tophet was ordained, and the breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone enkindled the fire for the destruction of his army. At the time Jerusalem was taken by the Babylonians, thousands of slaughtered Jews were thrown in heaps in this valley, according to Jer. 7 : 33, and 19 : 7. It was the place of public execution for criminals, and a common depot for not only all bodies refused the rites of burial, but also for all manner of pollution. To prevent noxious vapours from proving injurious to the health of the city, a fire was kept continually burning to consume the bones, decayed bodies of the slain, hanged, gibbeted, and the common filth of the city, which being largely supplied, caused the fire to obtain the epithet, unquenchable. Dead bodies exposed to the influence of the atmospheric air, soon became putrid and clothed with worms ; hence the valley received the name of the place where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched, Is. 64 : 24, Mark 9 : 44. But how wild is it to suppose the existence of a place like Gehenna, in another world ? Can fire and worms subsist together ? Can worms eat spirits, and fire burn incorruptible bodies ? No ! Let man be immortal, and all the fires of a thousand Hells shall be unable to injure him !

#### *TARTARUS.*

Though some might consider an explanation of this term essential in a discourse of this nature, yet we

m it almost entirely unnecessary, because the word  
 er occurs in any part of scripture universally ac-  
 wledged by christians. The second Epistle of Pe-  
 especially the second chapter, has been disputed  
 all ages ; and the probability is, that if genuine,  
 apostle, without approving the fanciful notions of  
 Heathen, might cite a commonly received opinion,  
 argue from acknowledged principles. When we  
 ited of Hades, we there observed that Tartarus was  
 posed to be the lowest and darkest department of  
 t subterranean region. From what is said 2 Peter  
 4, 17, and Jude 13, Dr. Campbell, Ewing, and  
 ers, suppose Tartarus to be the dungeon or prison-  
 ise of Hades, where the ghosts are reserved in  
 ins, or solitary confinement, might we not ask these  
 es how spirits disembodied can be chained, or what  
 rs or walls can confine immaterial beings? But  
 r orthodoxy must avoid interrogation as well as de-  
 tion. It seems then that while Hades was esteem-  
 d kind of Debtors' prison, Tartarus was regarded  
 he solitary cells of criminals. But though super-  
 on's fancy paint her gloomy scenes in different  
 des, still Hades and Tartarus were considered as  
 and the same, and never were, nor are they yet,  
 ievd, by the learned, to be the abode of final  
 tchedness. To this opinion Dr. Campbell fully  
 es, and the best Lexicographers define the words  
 ordinglly. Tartarus, says Phavorinus, "*aer hupo-  
 is kai anelios,*" "*subterranean air, where the sun  
 ies not ;*" and Stephanus defines Hades "*hupo gaias  
 is skoieinos—a dark place under the earth.*"  
 We have now finished our investigation concerning  
 import of the Hebrew and Greek terms translated  
 l, in the common English version, and venture to  
 clude, that not a word in all the Greek and He-  
 w scriptures, signifies a place of punishment for the  
 ked after death. On fable, on pagan fable alone,

have orthodox divines built the antichristian dogma of Hell-torments.



## SECTION II.

### HELL DESTROYED.

Lecture on 1 Cor. 15 : 55. O Hell, where is thy Victory. By Rev. J. S. Thompson.

Brethren in the Gospel of Christ, and Fellow heirs of the heavenly inheritance—You have heard of the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men, and have been induced to admit that such a dispensation merited the title of Evangelical, good news. But when this grace of God displays its glories by triumphing over sin, death, and hell—you are constrained to exclaim with Paul, it is the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Herein you behold it unbosom the eternal and unchangeable love of God towards mankind, by forming them in goodness, directing them in wisdom, glorifying them in power, and performing all things, for the exaltation of his own glory, and the eternal beatification of all his intelligent offspring. I know not with what feelings you have assembled this evening—whether you are disposed to hear what God the Lord will say, or determined to hold the vulgar opinions for the sake of popularity : O my God, save me from being a dissembler, a sycophant and bigot. Let me die an independent man, that my death may be glorious ; but may I never live an hour in sinful conformity, alike detested by God and honest men. The reading which I have adopted is supported by the Greek text, the best translators and commentators of ancient and modern times, and is the reading found in the margin of many of our Bibles. The word *Hades*, which occurs eleven times in the New Testament, is rendered hell in all excepting my text, where it is

translated grave. In this the crafty translators, whose heads and creeds were equally full of hell and damnation, betrayed their attachment to the pious frauds of antiquity, and their disposition to save from ruin their favourite system. They perceived that if the word Hades should be translated hell, in the text, the doctrine built on this supposititious foundation would come to nought. Hell having lost its victory, and death its sting, universal salvation must follow ; and the Pagan doctrine of hell torments, which had been introduced into the christian system, be for ever neglected. Beholding the inevitable catastrophe which would befall the whole system, rather than admit that the good news would extend to all people, they exposed themselves to the just charge of corrupting the word of God —2 Cor. 2: 17.

Awful as the terms, death and hell, may sound in your ears, my text unfolds the grace which will triumph over sin. It is an abyss which will swallow up death in victory ; it is a key which shall unlock the gates of Hades, and let the prisoners go free. Death being the wages of sin, followed it as a consequence ; but sin being destroyed, death and the grave must cease to devour, and hell herself be robbed of her prey.

Friends, I undertake to disprove the wicked doctrine of hell torments. If I succeed we shall rejoice together that men are now delivered from that which held them, all their lifetime, in bondage through fear of death, I shall achieve for you a more glorious liberty than that of which a Washington could boast, and introduce a new epoch in history, more important than ever has yet been commemorated by the offspring of Adam. Great God favour my efforts !

The doctrine of Hell torments is drawn from false premises, these are that 1. sin is infinite and eternal, 2. the eternal purpose and pleasure of the Deity is,

that men continue to insult his character and government, that he may have the honour and satisfaction of damning them to new and untried scenes of torture, during his own lifetime. The absurd doctrine of infinite sin depends on two others equally absurd and monstrous, namely, there shall be an eternal law of prohibition, and an eternal propensity or liability to sin, therefore an eternal hell. An everlasting hell was built by Paganising christians on the supposition that sin is infinite, which they supposed to be the violation of an infinite law, whose penalty was eternal damnation. Now if sin be infinite, it must be so either in the parts, or in the aggregate ; if not in the parts, it cannot be in the whole, for infinity can never be shown to consist of parts. If thus one sin be infinite, and infinity cannot be augmented, then all the sin committed since Adam, amounts to just nothing ; for his sin being infinite, could not be augmented ; and therefore, joy to a world of sinners ! they have nothing to fear. Moreover, if infinite sin merits infinite punishment, then one sinner deserves all the punishment of an eternal hell—and God himself cannot prepare more than infinite punishment ; consequently there never could be more than one sinner, nor more than one sufferer in the universe. It would be absurd to suppose that God ever gave such a law—there is no intimation of it in the Bible ; infinite sin is nonsense, and infinite punishment is equally ridiculous. Now if such be the law, purpose and disposition of the Deity, no man but a mean, ignorant hypocrite, would say he deserves better treatment than the insults of the wicked or the curse of the damned !! But I shall plead, on behalf of the God and Father of my master Christ Jesus, not guilty—and endeavour to remove the reproach from his character, by demonstrating the falsity of the charge from the evidences of Almighty power and love, derived from the voice of reason and the testimony of Revelation.

In all the descriptions of the divine law given in the sacred oracles, it is uniformly represented as a rule of life, and all its promises and threatenings are commensurate with the present imperfect state of existence. The law was not made for a perfect man ; but for the lawless and disobedient ; and there is no intimation in the Bible of disobedience ever having entered the world of spirits. All moral evil or imperfection, is confined to the carnal and terrene existence, and can never pass the gates of death. The whole testimony of God on this subject, is summarily expressed by Paul in one brief sentence, "HE THAT IS DEAD IS FREE FROM SIN," Rom. 6 : 7. The supposition of man's liability to sin in another mode of existence is irrational and anti-scriptural, and also repugnant to the moral change, which all human beings experience in death, and the wicked thought that God's pleasure is the destruction of his creatures, is denounced by the oath of Jehovah and the mission of Jesus, Ez. 11 : 1 Tim. 2 : 4. John 3 : 17. and 1 John 4 : 14.

If all sin originate in the earthly or sensual body, will not the dissolution of this earthly body terminate the reign of sin ? Again, if the condemnation due to sin be protracted one year after sin has ceased, what assurance have we that condemnation will ever be removed ? May not the same disposition in Deity that leads him to punish sin one year after it cease, induce him to punish eternally ? If man be freed from temptation or liability to sin, at death, ought any thing less than actual experience or the plain testimony of God, induce us to admit, that man can suffer after death ? These questions are designed for the consideration of those who believe in purgatorial or disciplinary pains after death, as well as for the awakening of those who dream of everlasting Torments.

An endless hell is useless, even according to the opinions of its advocates. They affirm, men will ever

be atoning for their sin, but never succeed to expiate even the least crime they may have committed.—Hence the punishment of hell must be inflicted to gratify a malignant and revengeful passion in the Deity. Sure nothing less than pure malevolence could inflict pain for no other purpose than the gratification of incensed wrath. If the torments of hell could answer any good purpose, we could admit them; but they are neither for example nor correction, consequently, they are the offspring of free, unmerited malevolence! Who can address a prayer to Jehovah, and call him father, believing that he prepared hell for man, whom, unasked, he had thrown into existence, knowing that he would terminate his course in the terrific regions of despair. O Calvinists, what think ye of your God, who begets children, **makes a fire for them,** and burns them to death? Nay, that is nothing; **he immortalizes their existence to please himself with their contortions!** O Arminian, what better is your **God,** who makes man, prepares the fire, clears the way, and sits calm and composed while he beholds his creatures going into the fire, and for ever writhing in the liquid flames!!

Some of my auditors, who revolt with horror from the doctrine of an endless hell, are still inclined to approve the doctrine of Purgatory. This dogma originated as far as we can ascertain, with the Platonic philosophy. He taught that there is in matter a certain refractory force, which resists the will of the great Artificer. Out of the soul of the universe, which had itself become contaminated by material mixture, God formed inferior souls, numerous as the stars, and sent them down to the earth to be imprisoned in bodies. But the soul being immortal, by disengaging itself from animal passions and rising to the contemplation of a world of intelligences, might regain its original habitation. Matter can never suffer annihila-



tion; the world therefore, shall be for ever; and by the action of the animating principle, it accomplishes certain periods in which every thing returns to its ancient place or state. See Enfield's History of Philosophy.

The Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines had been admitted into the traditions of the Pharisees before the time of Christ—John 9: 2. Their ideas of punishment were Platonic, and those of a resurrection Pythagorean. Josephus tells us that in the region of Hades, angels are appointed as guardians of the souls, who distribute temporary punishments to them, agreeable to every one's behaviour and manner. Virgil causes Anchises to teach this doctrine to Æneas.\*

For sin are various penances enjoined,  
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind,  
Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,  
Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.  
The souls thus cleansed, to blest abode repair,  
And breathe in ample fields, the soft Elysian air.

In these lines Virgil describes the threefold means of removing the pollution of the sinner; First, by the winds; Second, by water; and Third, by fire. That after they had undergone purification they were introduced into the fields of the blessed. Origen adopted the Platonic doctrine and enlarged on it, and hence it became the prevailing sentiment among the christians of the third century.

The description of the infernal regions had been abandoned to the fancy of painters and poets, who peopled them with so many phantoms and monsters, who dispensed their rewards and punishments with so

\* "Supplicia expendant, aliae panduntur inanes  
Suspensae ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto  
Infectum eluitur seclus, aut exurit igni.  
Quisque suos patimur manes. Exinde per amplum  
Mittimur Elysium."—Æneid, 6, 740.

little equity, that a doctrine, the most congenial to the human heart, was disgraced by the absurd mixture of the wildest fictions. The doctrine of a future state was not held in repute by the polytheists of Greece and Rome. They believed the providence of the gods to be visibly displayed on the theatre of the present world; therefore they neither feared nor expected a future state of existence.

The doctrine is inferred from the abuse of the terms, Hell and damnation. We have shown that the word Hell, in its modern signification, is totally abjured by the spirit of prophecy and the testimony of Jesus; and consequently it is a violation and corruption of divine truth, to place such a word in the Bible. We shall now show that it is equally abusive to intrude the word damnation, on the sacred records of life and immortality. From Krino, to distinguish or judge, is derived Krites, a judge or critic; Krisis, a distinguishing, a judging, or determining; and Krima, a decision or sentence. But if Krisis or Krima mean damnation, then Krino, must mean to damn, all judging must be damning, and every judge, a damned person! Let us however admit the reading of Mat. 23 : 33, and John 5 : 29, "damnation of Gehenna,"—"Resurrection of damnation," and then let us translate accordingly the following passages, where the same word, Krisis, occurs. John 5 : 22, the Father hath committed all damnation to the Son. Ver. 27, given him authority to execute damnation—Verse 30, my damnation is just—John 16 : 7—11, the comforter will reprove the world concerning damnation, because the prince of this world is damned. Judé 14, the Lord cometh to execute damnation on all! Again, we shall take the word Krima, and translate it damnation. John 9 : 39, for damnation I am come into the world—1 Peter, 4 : 17. Damnation must begin at the house of God! Lastly, let us take the

word damn. Mark 16 : 16, he that believeth not shall be damned. John 8 : 10, 11, hath no man damned thee—neither do I damn thee—Mat. 12 : 41, 42, the men of Nineveh shall rise and damn this generation—the Queen of the South shall damn it. In these passages the Greek word is *Katakrino*, but the simple verb *Krino* is also rendered to damn by our translators, 2 Thes. 2 : 12. God shall send them delusion, that they all may be damned. Now we shall use the same liberty in a few instances. John 5 : 22, the Father damneth no man—3 : 17, the Father sent not the Son to damn the world. John 12 : 47. If any man hear my words and *believe not*, I damn him not ; for I came not to damn the world, but to save the world. But some may be disposed to exclaim, stop, you abuse the scriptures ! Nay rather, I would show you how you have abused them, by putting into them, the pagan and diabolical terms, Hell and damnation—I therefore conclude that there is no word, in the original Scriptures, that can, with even a shadow of propriety, be used to signify the punishment of Hell, which is what is generally meant by damnation.

The doctrine of future rewards and punishments, was built on the supposition of the immortality of the soul ; a doctrine as fanciful as any of which the reveries of imagination can boast. All the phenomena from birth to death, are repugnant to the immateriality and immortality of the human soul ; and compel us to admit with Lucretius, what all experience demonstrates, that the human mind grows and decays with the body.\* God has given us reason to distinguish, and senses to perceive and reflect ; but this very reason shows the absurdity of embracing an opinion of spirit, which none of these senses will support. This doctrine was invented in Egypt, the mother of super-

\* *Quoque pariter cum corpore et una crescere sentimus, pariterque sensuere mentem.*

stition, and brought by Orpheus to Greece. Thence it passed to the Romans; and being so admirably adapted to flatter human pride, Indians, Scythians, Gauls, Germans and Americans, eagerly received the dogma. The hypothesis of future punishment served two important purposes; first as a reply to the Atheists, who objected to the unequal distribution of good and evil in the present state; secondly, to restrain the manners of men, through the fear of being miserable in another world. Legislators believing the doctrine to act as a powerful charm, used their utmost exertions to give it publicity and influence. Hence Polybius blames the great men of his time for teaching the common people to despise the fables of the poets, and represents them as useful fictions. This doctrine was received by the Pharisees under the reign of the Asmonean princes, as well as several other articles from the philosophy of the eastern nations, such as fate, predestination, angels and spirits. See Gibbon's Rome, vol. 1. chap. 15.

Though the philosophers sometimes pretend to countenance the dogma of future punishment, yet they taught that death would terminate all our sufferings; and in order to reconcile the minds of men to bodily dissolution, they affirmed death would either be an utter extinction of being, or a change for the better, for with one voice they all rejected every kind of future punishment. Pythagoras taught that all souls were a portion of the great soul of the universe, and discarded the notion of future punishment, as a vain terror.—Plato sometimes favours the representations of the poets, at other times despises them, as conveying too frightful ideas of futurity.—Cicero not only disavows, but even ridicules the doctrine of future punishment, and represents it to be opinion of the philosophers, that the gods are never angry, and therefore incapable of hurting any person what

Josephus appears to have had clear ideas of the origin of the doctrine, for, describing the religion of the Essens, he says " they had the same notion as the Greeks, who allowed the islands of the blessed to their brave men, and the regions of the ungodly in hades to the wicked, who, *as their fables relate*, are punished there. Hence their dehortations from vice, and exhortations to virtue, whereby the good are bettered by the hope of reward after death, and the vicious restrained by fear of torment. These doctrines lay an unavoidable bait for such as have once had a taste of their philosophy."

As our Lord delivered some of his discourses in the vicinity of Gehenna, a reference is made to that valley three times in the gospel history. But will any one pretend that the Jews believed, there would be a place in another world like Gehenna, in the neighborhood of their city? Did our Lord ever inform his hearers that after death men would be put into a place like Gehenna? Answer these questions in the affirmative, and show the proofs, or for ever abandon the wicked dogma. To what part of the universe can we look for the modern hell, whose elements are fire and flame, the abode of creatures totally abandoned by God; where infinite wrath perpetually abides; where nothing can be felt but inexpressible torments—nor heard but incessant groans and curses to all eternity? O ye Pagan fabulists and worshippers of Moloch, give to your gods the glory due to their deeds; but do not blaspheme our God also! In vain do paganizing Christians tell us of bible hells and evangelical torments. O, if there were not a single sentence, in all the bible, on behalf of salvation, but that psalm, 145: 9, " his tender mercies are over all his works," it alone would suffice to water out all the hells of the universe!

**Punishment** in another state of being was never

threatened, by God, as the penalty of any law which he ever gave to mankind—therefore it cannot be inflicted.—Deity cannot inflict a punishment for the breach of a law, which has never been promulgated; nor for the violation of a law, to which man was incapable of yielding obedience. Now where, in the volume of revelation, has God published a law, the penalty of which is damnation, in a future mode of existence? Our eagle-eyed, evangelical preachers, have discovered this heavy threatening in the phrase, “thou shalt die!” If so, then why are they not afraid, for the threatening is unconditional? If to die, means to die spiritually and eternally, then all who die must undergo the penalty; and be for ever abandoned of God to the regions of despair, where all the guilty ghosts of Adam’s race must for ever shriek and howl,

Beneath the weight of heavy chains,  
 Tormenting racks and fiery coals;  
 And darts to inflict immortal pains,  
 Dipt in the blood of damned souls!!!

Had the heathen poet heard these heralds of damnation proclaim the corruscations of divine wrath, he would doubtlessly have cried out

—Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ—Æn. 1, 11.

Can heavenly minds such dire resentment show,  
 Or exercise their spite in human woe?

Surely these advocates of endless misery, must be unbelievers themselves, otherwise they would fear to add to the revelation of heaven, lest God should add to them the plagues written in his book. But perhaps they are of the same mind with their pious ancestors, that God will never bring men to account for pious frauds or useful corruptions of the sacred text! O for the day when every man will speak the truth to his

neighbour, and the priest's lips keep knowledge, that the people may learn the law from his mouth !

In the annals of history, we read not of a more unprovoked hatred, and a more base crime than that of Cain. Abel had brought his offering to the altar of the most high God, and presented it with affections of gratitude to the sovereign of heaven, and love to all his creatures. His sacrifice was accepted ; Cain's heart boils with indignation—the venom of his spleen had almost destroyed him ; nothing can glut his vengeance, till he dyes his hands in his brother's blood ! Surely the thunders of the Almighty will not sleep, nor his lightnings cease to play, till the wretch be hurled into the hottest of Tartarcan flames. Yet strange to relate, the gracious God of heaven only threatens him with temporal banishment, from the society of his brethren or father's family. O Cain, had you lived in the days of orthodoxy, they would have told you such news as would have harrowed up your spirits ; for to all the temporary pains threatened by God, they add eternal misery, in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone !

When God gave the law on Sinai, amidst thunders, lightnings, tempests, and smoke, we might have naturally expected, that if he ever intended to denounce damnation, fire would have proceeded from fire, and smoke from smoke ! But will any man be so wild or fanatical as to assert, that the Jewish law contained any such threatening as eternal misery ? No Jew, previous to the Babylonian captivity ever imagined that God would punish him, in another world, for sins committed against the Mosaic institution. The heaviest penalty ever threatened in the Jewish law, was the loss of life or the dispersion of that nation. Shall it be pretended that God concealed the pains of hell, till the sinner was snared and taken, and then inflicted the never-ending torments of a merciless burning

fire ! God forbid, that I should so blasphemc my Creator's character and government.

Can it be admitted that the glorious gospel of the blessed God contains those dreadful denunciations, unknown to the Mosaic dispensation ? Surely not. Jesus is the mediator of a better covenant, founded on better promises. The law is called the ministration of death, and the gospel the ministration of life ; can then the ministration of life, unfold the horrors of an eternal death, unknown to that very dispensation, which was emphatically denominated the ministration of death ?

Reviewing, on this part of our subject, what is called Evangelical preaching, we may apply to modern preachers, the language of God by the prophet Jeremiah ; Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard ; they have made my pleasant portion a wilderness. Chap. 12 : 10. They think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams. Behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say he saith. Jer. 23 : 27—31. Often have I challenged these dreamers to produce a single passage from the sacred scriptures, wherein God had threatened man with punishment after death ; but though my request has frequently caused the little divines to rage, yet it always proved a sovereign anodyne to all my philosophical and literary opponents. Indeed I have fully come to this conclusion, which I deem perfectly correct, that were it not for ignorance, fanaticism, and the love of gain, there could not be found a single advocate of hell torments !!

The law killeth, but the gospel or spirit of life quickeneth. Like the good God from whom it sprang, it is a fountain of living waters whose streams magnificently flow in glorious abundance, producing life and purity throughout the vast empire of the universe. The excellence of the new covenant and its superior-



ity will appear, by considering that all the promises are absolute and unconditional ; and therefore incapable of mutation. From the first proclamation of the gospel, all the blessings of it were pronounced to be free grace, flowing from an impartial God, and therefore for the whole family of the great universal Parent.

When Jehovah said to Adam, "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" when he promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that in their seed, i. e. Christ, "all the families of the earth shall be blessed," were not these promises unconditional? Is the law, says Paul, against these promises of God. Gal. 3: 17, 21.—God forbid! The law which was 430 years after, cannot disannul the covenant of God in Christ, that it should make the promises of none effect. Micah, addressing the great God, says, "Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn to our fathers from the days of old." Micah 7: 20. Jehovah never can change, therefore his truth and covenant shall endure for ever. Men may err through ignorance, from the right way, and God may chasten them with rods, yet will he never make void his covenant, nor change that which he has spoken, but his faithfulness will remain to all generations.—Ps. 89: 30, 35. I will make a new covenant saith the Lord, not according to the covenant I made with Israel when I brought them out of Egypt: I will print my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people; they shall all know me from the least to the greatest, for I will remember their sins no more.—Jer. 32: 31, 35. Heb. 8: 8, 13. God's record concerning his Son, is that we, the whole offspring of Adam, have eternal life in him. The unbeliever attempts to make God a liar, by not believing God's report; notwithstanding, the unbelief of man

can never make the word of God of none effect. The gift of God which comes to all men, is eternal life; and when Jesus our life shall appear, we shall be like him; for he will change our vile bodies into his glorious image, and so we shall be ever with the Lord.—John 3: 2. Phil. 3: 21.

Punishment in the future world is inconsistent with the justice of God, and the changes to which the human body is subjected. Such are the laws of animal economy, and the transmigration of matter, that pain must immediately follow the vicious act as its consequent, or otherwise it cannot with propriety be inflicted. Through the afflux and deflux of particles, the human body is perpetually changing, and must entirely change every five or six years; therefore God has ordained that the righteous are recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked; they have no rest day nor night, but are continually tormented. In a word, the wicked are turned into hell, i. e. trouble, fear and pain, from the day they assume the character, till they cease to be wicked—then, and not till then, shall they enter into rest. O the riches both of the goodness and wisdom of God.

Some may ask shall not the wicked be put into hell after death? Is not this the meaning of the Psalmist, Ps. 9: 17? I answer, no; the Pagan hell was after death, but the biblical hell is in this state of being. Poor mistaken man, no longer dream that thou canst sin wilfully, and yet escape the just chastisement of the Lord. His hand will find thee out. His eyes run to and fro through the earth, beholding the righteous and the wicked, and men will distinguish; they must see, if guided by truth and light, that God maketh a difference between him that serveth the Lord, and him who serveth him not. Mal. 3: 15.

**In this body dwell those propensities which induce man to sin.—Bodily appetites and passions entice the man. Sin and suffering follow unlawful indulgence. In the self-same body in which man offends, in it he shall undergo the reward of his folly, and there is no respect of persons.**

The doctrine of the resurrection prohibits the doctrine of future misery. Many have supposed that God will raise the dead in similar circumstances to those in which they departed this life, but the supposition is heathenish and anti-scriptural. Paul treats largely of the resurrection, but never intimates that any should have reason to dread the consequences. He affirms, that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Death was the wages of sin ; it followed as a consequent, but grace reigning through Jesus, the common Lord and Redeemer of man, abounds to the obliteration of guilt, and the introduction of everlasting righteousness ; abolishes sin and its consequences, disease and death ; brings immortality to light, and passes upon all men for justification of life, which the Son of God imparts to every man without exception. In the history of the resurrection Paul does not contemplate moral character, nor distinguish parties. Therefore, he adopts the human body, as the subject concerning which he predicates all he says, concerning a future state of being. This body is committed to the earth in dishonour, it is raised in glory ; in weakness, but raised in power ; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body ; it is sown in corruption, but raised incorruptible ; a mortal body, but raised immortal. All must be changed. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. As we have borne the image of the earthly, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly. Our first state of being has been earthly, carnal, sensual, fleshly, corrupt and mortal ; but our second mode of being, shall

be heavenly, spiritual, intellectual, incorruptible, and immortal. O glorious state of unchangeable, unmixed felicity. When shall we enter into it and see the joys of our Lord! Rejoice, believers. Rejoice in the Lord, his beloved disciple informs you, when Jesus appears, you shall be like him, i. e. he shall change your vile body, and fashion it like to his glorious body, by that power by which he is able to subdue all things to himself—Phil. 3 : 21. Jesus, the faithful and the true witness, testifies, that in the resurrection, men shall be as the angels of God! Luke 20 : 36. Blessed Saviour, never did the base notions of the resurrection proclaimed by pretended orthodoxy, enter thy mind; nor were they known to thine apostles. On the contrary, they proclaim glory, honour, and immortality to every soul of man, every son and daughter of Adam without distinction, as God's free gift to the whole human race. See Rom. 2 : 9.

No rational man could ever have indulged in opposite sentiments, had not his mind been abased by superstition and dishonourable views of God. There could be no proportion between the finite feeble acts of men, and interminable pain or bliss—for the evil or good which man may perform in this life, is abundantly recompensed. The future state of existence is entirely of free, sovereign, and unmerited favour; and as God is impartial, he bestows it on all his intelligent offspring indiscriminately. In this appears the character and conduct of a truly benevolent father; he was able to impart blessings and happiness to all his offspring, he showed his impartiality and wisdom in doing so. The Diatheke, testament, or will which he made, bequeathed eternal felicity and immortal happiness to all the legatees; and his wisdom and power provided the means, as Omniscience saw necessary, to place every one in full possession of the inheritance.—O how inexpressibly better are the

promises of the new covenant, than those of the old. These were conditional and temporal, but eternal and universal honour to the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth ; the promises of the new and well ordered covenant are absolute and eternal. The crown is incorruptible, and fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. All the men in earth, or devils in hell, if such beings and place exist, could never touch that crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge will give in the day of the resurrection and restitution. Gospel hearers, the heavens must retain Jesus till the time of the restitution of all things, but the apostle tells you that he expected the Lord Jesus from heaven to change our vile bodies and make them like his glorious body. The change and restitution are the same. At that happy period, foretold by the prophet,

His own soft hand shall wipe the tears  
From every weeping eye,  
And pains, and groans, and griefs, and fears,  
And death itself shall die.



### SECTION III.

Further remarks on the words Sheol and Hades. Reasons for disbelieving in the modern use of these terms, urged from scripture usage.

BY THE EDITOR.

That Sheol, Shaal, Shaul, or Saul, which is the same word in a different dress, should signify a place of never-ending torment, requires *proof*. Inference, unless the grounds of inference are immutable, amounts to little. Where the importance of inference relates to the greatest possible consequence, analogy must be obvious, and the conclusion irresistible, ere we can

give it credence. We hardly need repeat that *Saul*, the very word in question, was a common name in Judea where the import of the word *Sheol* was well understood. Let us then ask, if the word conveyed to the minds of the Jewish people, the same idea which is attached to it in modern days, would they have adopted it as an appellative? Has any one professing the Christian name, and believing in the horrid doctrine of endless misery, ever brought his child to the altar, requesting it to be named *Hell*? You must answer, instinctively, No. But do we learn by the scripture, that those to whom were committed the oracles of God, believed in a future, interminable punishment? Not a word in scripture appears like it. Nay, the use of the term in most, if not all instances, utterly *forbids* the idea. The meaning in nearly every instance, is fixed by the context, and the known usages of the people. None but a mad man, or an infuriated fanatic, would contend that the patriarch Jacob expected to go to his son Joseph in the *hell* of modern christendom; nor would any man in his senses contend, that Job would request to be hidden in the Christian hell, from the wrath of Jehovah. For, if the wrath of God be exhibited in more dreadful terrors *out* of hell, than *in* it, those who would drive sinners into heaven by the terrors of hell, have not given the most terrible description with which they are threatened in scripture.

But a previous question remains to be settled. Did the Jews believe in the *immortality* of the spirit? The question is important. If we have no evidence that they did, the use of any words found in their scriptures cannot be a foundation for giving credit to the dogma of endless misery. Suffering may be commensurate with existence, but cannot exceed it. *Ergo*—those who did not believe in endless existence, cannot believe in endless torment. Consciousness is

necessary to suffering, or more philosophically speaking, to misery. But on what authority are we to pronounce that the Jews believed in a future, fixed state, of interminable duration? It is utterly opposed by their history, and even the Pharisees who are supposed to have believed in such a state of being, are far from stating the fact. That they believed in the Pythagorean philosophy is pretty evident. That allusion is made to this philosophy in the ninth chapter of John, no less than twice, can easily be seen. "And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man that was blind from *his* birth. And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" Is it possible to refer this simple question to any other source than the Pythagorean philosophy? How could the disciples, or any others, suppose that nonentity could offend? The question suggests the answer. They supposed a previous state of existence, in which crimes were committed, which were to be punished in this state of existence. And the question most evidently includes the principle of the transmigration of spirits into different bodies. True, indeed, the idea of *identity* is necessary to understand the justice of punishing a spirit and body in connexion, the latter of which had no previous existence, and could not therefore stand connected in a relation to the spirit which ought to render it liable to misery, as a consequence of transgression. Some might indeed object, that to punish a *spirit* which had previously animated another body, but had lost its consciousness, is not according to our ideas of *divine* rectitude. And the argument is strengthened, when we reflect, that no human being, has the least recollection of any previous state of being. But, perhaps the *fallacy* of all this singular jargon is supposed to be ~~intended~~ intended by the doctrine of original sin, as holden by ~~the~~ *adherents* of divinity. We grant, indeed, that the

moderns are not a whit behind their progenitors in certain points of mystery, but we are not therefore ready to justify the follies of one generation, by the fashionable frailties of another.

But the reply of the self-righteous Pharisees, to him who had received his sight by the instrumentality of Jesus, leaves no doubt that the metempsychosis, more properly than the resurrection, was the principle held by the Pharisees. "Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?" That this is a proof of the prevalence of the Pythagorean philosophy, is gathered from the preceding question of Christ's disciples. If *they* gave credit to such fancies, no wonder those who were less conversant with the master of assemblies, should support so unfounded a theorem. But the supposition is strengthened, when we perceive that the Scribes and Sadducees, who had equal opportunities with the Pharisees, believed in neither angel nor spirit. This is certainly strong circumstantial evidence, that neither the law nor the prophets reveal a future state of being. But the fact may easily be settled. If the law, or the prophetic writings, intimated in undisguised language, a state of immortal being beyond the grave, how can we maintain the integrity of that scripture which declares that Jesus brought life and immortality to light through the gospel? When others can settle this question to their own satisfaction, we shall be induced to hear with complacency, any arguments which they may use for our conversion. At present, we believe that a state of immortality was not known under the Mosaic dispensation: Our readers are in possession of the facts from which we thus judge. To their own good sense we leave the subject.

Hades, is most evidently the word used by the Seventy in translating the Hebrew word Sheol. By what means the sense of a passage is altered in a



ation, is not distinctly perceived. That translation miss the sense, and that the corresponding terms in translation do not always convey the exact idea of the original, is very evident. But every man of sense must see that the errors of any version cannot consist of any palpable contradictions, nor can a version, however long it may retain its empire, imbecillitate the sense of the original. Who for instance, will not see that the common version of Mat. 26 : 45, 46 ? " Arise up now, and take *your* rest : behold the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. RISE, LET US BE GOING." Who does not see the utter inconsistency of this version with common sense, and the whole context ? If the corresponding text, Mark 14 : 41, 42, imports the same contradiction in terms, an account of the same thing by Luke, 22 : 46, redeems the subject from reproach, by a fair exhibition of the sense, as connected with the subject, and the context. " And he said unto them, Why sleep ye ? rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation."

As the true sense of this subject is so obvious that we cannot miss it, we beseech those who believe in the infallibility of translators, who were under the influence of king-craft and priest-craft, to pause one moment before they draw a conclusion on any important subject, based on the supposed meaning of any word or particular phrase ; and more especially, when the present use of the term is such that a very different sense must often be given, or the connexion left in confusion.

We have already seen in a former section that the word *hades* does not *exactly* correspond with *Sheol*, and the difference is of little importance. That neither word is used to express the idea which long use has attached to the term *hell*, as used among Christians generally, is certainly obvious, by the examples

already given. The etymology of the words makes this not less apparent, than their use at and before the time when they were used in scripture. Added to this, the very singular facility with which the translators accommodated the version to their views, by a rendering of the words so variously as to *hide* the meaning of the original by dexterous management, and we have a clue to the means by which the doctrine of endless torments came into general use. But men of research have explored this mystery of iniquity—the orthodox are assisting to pull down their own babel—and the *Light of Truth* shall yet shine into the dark corners of the earth, and liberate the minds which have long been chained in the thralldom of ignorance and superstition.

To all this, some may reply, that in at least *one* place in the New-Testament, the word hell is most evidently used to denote a place of interminable misery. The parable of the Rich man and Lazarus is that to which we have alluded, which shall be cautiously examined. That the parable indicates misery, or suffering, is granted; but that this is to be endless, or in a future state of being, is neither said, nor intimated. Let those who suppose this parable to uphold the tenet of never-ceasing misery, put their finger on the phrase which supports this idea. We have in vain looked for it in this passage, and we trust others will look, for it with no better success.

If we mistake not, the Catholics look upon this parable as a proof of purgatorial purification. But will Protestants admit this? But why not? It certainly comes as near the proof of purgatory, as of an endless hell. But it may be well for us to recollect that orthodox critics give up *hades*, as a place of punishment in a future state. The ignorant and the obstinate cling to *hell* with such pertinacity, that it really seems they are as unwilling to part with the idea of a state of end-

less misery, as a state of bliss, from whatever word it may be rendered. Hence, the word hell, wherever it occurs, and in whatever connexions, to their imagination, always conveys the same idea. But let us reject all preconceived opinions, and carefully examine the chapter in which the doctrine of unmerciful punishment is supposed to be taught, for if not taught in this passage, it *finds no resting place in the New-Testament*. If the passage really inculcates the doctrine for which it is used, it is clearly a history of *facts*, and *hell* is thus determined to be a place of punishment in a future state of being. We shall now if you please, sit down to the task in good earnest, examine it as plain matter of history, and endeavour to canvass it fairly and amply as the opportunity will permit. That this may be done in the most acceptable manner, and enable every reader to judge for himself at the moment of reading, we shall cite the whole in connexion, commencing Luke 16 : 19.

“ There was a certain Rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day : and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man’s table : moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom : the rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and seeing Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried, and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue ; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things ; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, be-

tween us and you 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. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house ; for I have five brethren ; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets ; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham ; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Having by this time, carefully examined this as historical fact, what information have we obtained ? We have read of a rich man, well fed and well clothed, a circumstance of frequent occurrence, even in our day. We also learn that a beggar, full of sores, was laid at his gate, who desired to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. Both these men died. The one, even without the rite of sepulture, as we can perceive, was carried by *angels*, and deposited in the bosom of Abraham, the grand Patriarch of the Jewish nation. A very singular *fact*, if it be one, to say the least. The rich man was buried, and lifting up his eyes in torment, saw the polluted carcass of Lazarus in the *bosom* of Abraham. He recognized the venerable Patriarch as his Father, but *not Lazarus as a brother*, nor did he request an act of favour to be performed through him as such. His susceptibility of suffering through the medium of his bodily organs appears not to have experienced any change—it seems to be still as subject to the influence of *material objects* as at any former period. His complaint of suffering applies particularly to the tongue, by the use of which, however, he appears to converse with much freedom. The modesty of his request is most certain:

ly as unobtrusive as was that of Lazarus on a former occasion ; he merely solicits that the beggar might be sent to dip the *tip* of his finger in water, for the purpose of *cooling* his tongue. Astonishing that he should make this request ! Why ask for a mere drop ! and where was the water to be obtained ! in hell ?—But the Patriarch appears to be taking his ease within hailing distance, and on the same *level* too, for all the verbs used indicate motion in a horizontal direction. Not the least intimation is given that one is *up*, while the other is *down*.—But let us notice the reply. Son, *remember....remember* what ? that he had been “ a sensualist, a hard hearted, unfeeling glutton ! ” No, not a word like this. What then ? Son, remember, that thou in *thy life time* [he is dead now] *receivedst thy good things*. Very well, and were his good things ill-gotten gain ? Had he extorted under false representations—or under the convenient mask of long faces and long prayers, the last penny from the needy ? Had he taken the last mite from “ the widow weeping over her *helpless* orphans ” to replenish the *treasury of the LORD* ? No such abominations are laid to his charge, nor is a *vestige of crime alleged against him*. It is not even said of him,

“ And for a mantle large and lang,  
He cloak'd him in religion.”

His character and conduct, for any thing which appears to the contrary, were unexceptionable. He received his good things from the author of all good, and not one intimation is offered, that he had either misimproved, or enjoyed them thanklessly. But one trait of character is discoverable in the whole affair, and that is *kindness to others*, even in the midst of his sufferings. This differs entirely from the orthodox representation of the damned in hell.

The former situation of Lazarus is brought in contrast with his present state. He had in his life time, received his evil things, but not through the means of the rich man. He is dead, and "the dead know not any thing," but still, he is comforted. No eulogy is pronounced on the *piety* of his former life, no self-gratulation on account of the *discriminating grace* which selected him as a monument of God's sparing mercy, while others no better than himself, were consigned to realms of hopeless wo, for the glory of God's vindictive justice; nor do we learn that pæans of praise were sung for joy, while contemplating the damnation of the sufferer. The comforted and the tormented had changed conditions. One received consolation; the other was miserable.

For any thing which appears to the contrary, the *dead* retained the use of all their faculties, with the identity of their bodily organs, as completely as at any former period of their existence. The flame in which the rich man was enveloped, seems not to have impaired, either his vision or his speech. He recognized both Abraham and Lazarus; they seem to converse with as much propriety as people do on this mundane sphere; nor were the pains of the sufferer sufficient to interrupt a regular succession of ideas, nor the usual mode of expression.

But another consideration presses hard on the subject. Not a word is heard of the resurrection, nor of a general judgment. The transition appears to be instantaneous. No invitation—*Come ye blessed!* No sentence—*Depart ye cursed!* No reason given for the contrast which was both sudden and great, between their present and former circumstances, save the implied *equality* which was effected by the change.

But a reason is given why Lazarus *could not fulfil* the request for relief. A great gulf was fixed between them. This appears to have escaped the notice of

the petitioner. Abraham was not "higher than heaven," that the rich man should inquire, "what shall I do!" Nor was he, in comparison with Abraham, "deeper than hell." The *gulf* was fixed, so that they who *would* go hence to you *cannot*! Marvellous indeed! what, were any *disposed* to pass from the Abrahamic, the comforting portion of *hades*, or hell, to the opposite side of the gulf? So the language would import, as clearly as that the rich, or more properly reduced man, would exchange places with Lazarus. This indeed he did not ask. But was the rich man *alone*, or "in hell with the damned?" If this be pure history, determine for yourself, why he should rather say *I am* tormented, than *we are*?

But the knowledge of this gulf forecloses all intercession in his own behalf. He now solicits that Lazarus may be sent to his *father's house*, to his five *brethren*, of course to the children of Abraham! For what end does he request this? "That he may testify unto them." For what purpose? "Lest they also come into this place of torment." What was to be the burden of his testimony? The same which Moses and other prophets testified; for Abraham says, "They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them." What then was their testimony? Did they in one instance threaten an endless hell, to the chosen, but stiff-necked Israelites? I answered unhesitatingly, NO. They testified of the coming of the Just One, the Messiah, the Shiloh, the desire of all nations, who should finish transgression, and bring sin to an end. Abraham is therefore very properly represented as saying, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." How clearly this was verified in its fair and scriptural import, will be seen in its proper place.

We have now traced the subject in its leading points, **if not to the extent of its various ramifications, and we**

have seen that as a whole, it has no possible claims to stand in the rank of realities. The first part, indeed, which describes the characteristics of the two men, would by itself require no illustration to make it appear as a history of facts; thus to lead the mind unconsciously into a train of ideas by the use of easy similitudes, is the very object of parables, and is the mode by which wise men in all ages have imparted useful information. But what shall we say of the remainder of this chapter? Does it agree, or rather, does it not disagree, not only with the testimony of our senses, but with the most obviously literal declarations of scripture—and that too without exhibiting as a consequent moral, either warnings or encouragements? Considered literally, it is a perfect blank. Thus idly amusing the populace with sounding brass, was not the method in which our Master spent his precious time.

Those who still pertinaciously adhere to this portion of scripture as a relation of facts, may perhaps fancy with Tertullian, “the shape and corporeal lineaments” of departed spirits, and that they “do yet preserve the shape or character of the body to which they were united;” but why not also adopt the reveries of Pythagoras, on the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls? Each boasts antiquity for its origin, and each may claim equal authority from scripture. Thespicias, indeed, “returning to life, represents the colour of souls, and saith there be scars and ulcers of their passions left upon them, by which they are discerned.” But have you any belief in all this sublimated nonsense?

But a circumstance of no inconsiderable importance in this discussion, settles the character of the passage beyond controversy. The fact to which I allude is quoted by Mr. Balfour from the celebrated Dr. Whitby, on this passage, which I give you verbatim. “We



find this very parable in the Gemara Babylonicum, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his Joma." Now the very circumstance of finding it primarily used as a parable, in a work written long anterior to the Christian dispensation, and its repetition by our Saviour without the least intimation of change from a figurative to a literal construction of the language—is very conclusive evidence that he used it as a parable, and in no other sense. What was its use as a figurative representation will be seen in the sequel. But when such critics as Campbell, Doddridge, Chapman, and other commentators, are compelled to consider this subject as entirely figurative, the conclusion that their judgment is founded on irresistible testimony is obvious, it is inevitable. But the strength of this is increased, when we recollect that this is the only place in the New-Testament, where HADES, here rendered hell, is connected with punishment! In allusion to this fact we conceive the present subject particularly interesting.

You are already aware that hades, and not Ghen-na, is the word rendered hell in the passage before us. Of this word Dr. Campbell says: "In my judgment it ought never in scripture to be rendered hell, at least in the sense in which that word is now understood by Christians." This orthodox Doctor gave this opinion with the most convincing data.

Notwithstanding the labour already expended on the negative side of this subject, we shall state a reason sometimes urged in favour of a literal interpretation of the passage, which shall be fearlessly met, and fairly investigated. The objection arises from the fact, that it is not introduced as a parable. This objection is easily repelled by a direct appeal to the commencement of other parables. To begin then with this very chapter. It commences with the parable of the Unjust Steward. To the use of this as a parable.

we think no one objects. But where is its imagery? It is as bare of figure, as is the skeleton tree of foliage, in the depth of winter. Nothing connected with it, but looks more like fact than figure, if we except its application, and even that is ambiguous. Not so with the parable under consideration. Here the imagery is brilliant, and the scope extensive. But we will now call your attention to the comparison. "There was a certain rich man, which," is the introduction to the first. "There was a certain rich man, which," is the introduction to the one under examination. What a remarkable coincidence. Not a word is said of either as a parable—their commencement is the same. The parable under discussion is full of imagery, and as history, is equally full of improbabilities, not to add impossibilities—the other, destitute of imagery, is taken for granted as parable, nemine contradicente; and why? It does not militate against any preconceived opinions. Were no other fact preceptible, the very reason which is objected to the one as figure, is demonstrably evident as the other is concerned. But though this is considered as an entire answer to the objection now stated, you may compare at your leisure, Mat. 13: 44, 45—47—49, where you may find parables introduced in as abrupt a manner as the one under consideration. See also Mat. 20: 1. the parable of the labourers; also Mat. 25: 1. respecting the ten virgins, and that of the talents, v. 14. with others *ad libitum*. Of those in Mat. 13. it may indeed be urged, that "All these things spake Jesus to the multitude in parables, and without a parable, spake he not unto them." But you ought to perceive that this includes in the most ample form, the very subject under examination. The multitude was contradistinguished from the disciples; this was spoken to the Pharisees; ergo, to the multitude. It is then a parable.

Having already shown, and, as we trust conclusively, that a literal understanding of this subject involves the most palpable absurdities, we shall now turn your attention to what is believed to be its true meaning. The rich man will now be considered as a type of the Jewish nation, and Lazarus as an emblem of the Gentile world. That this is the import of the passage, we shall now endeavour to make obvious.

The parable represents these two as contradistinguished each from the other,—the one rich, and the other poor. That this relates to spiritual privileges, in which the Gentiles were far behind the Jews, is a position which is soon illustrated. But perhaps we may first inquire into the propriety of using the singular number when speaking of the whole people. Let us then recur to scripture authority for a precedent. Deut. 32 : 9, to close of the 15th verse.

“For the LORD’s portion is his people ; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness ; he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings ; So the LORD alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields ; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock : butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys of wheat ; and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape. But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked : thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness ; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.”

Here we observe, not only that the Lord's people are spoken of collectively in the singular number, but that they are represented as rich, even in the good things of this life through the favour of our heavenly father. Nor is this more evident than that **HE** was equally rich in spirituals. Paul, in answer to the question—What advantage then hath the Jew? replies, —“Much, every way; **CHIEFLY**, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” And again;

“Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.”

The clothing of the rich man, thus considered, is described, Exod. 27 : 2, 4, 5.

“And thou shalt make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, for glory and for beauty. And these are the garments which they shall make; a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a brodered coat, a mitre, and a girdle; and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office. And they shall take gold, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen.”

Thus was the rich man, the high priest and representative of the Jewish people, clothed in purple and fine linen; and that both he and the people fared sumptuously every day, we may learn by the daily sacrifices, and more specially by the peculiar demonstrations of divine favour which are expressed as follows: “And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.” What nation, then, was like that nation, “whose God was the Lord?” We see the propriety of representing the Jewish nation as a *man*, a *RICH man*. His clothing and his fare are described

in the scriptures of truth, and to this the parabolic language of our Saviour agrees. But the life of this privileged man closes. The law, which had been a lamp to his feet and a lantern to his path, had been made void by vain traditions. He had neglected attendance on those oracles of divine wisdom, which had been his life, and he is now dead. The legal dispensation had ceased. Having misimproved his talent, the kingdom of God was taken from him and given to another, bringing forth the fruits thereof. He was consequently shut out into utter darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Blindness in part had now happened to Israel, and shall continue until the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in. He was therefore buried in the darkness expressed by an apostle—Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. He now saw Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom. Thus was the prediction of the Saviour fulfilled, recorded Luke 13: 28, 29, 30.

“There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.”

It was at the close of the Mosiac dispensation, when the master of the house, the high priest of our profession, had shut the door on the Jews, and opened it to the Gentiles, that those which had been the first, and highly favoured people, became the last; and the Gentiles, who had been the last, were in the same sense made the first. The Gentiles came from the four quarters of the earth, and found life in the dispensation of

the Gospel, the same gospel which had been preached to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

We have before said, that this is the only passage in the New-Testament, in which hades is connected with punishment. You will recollect that the original term signifies unqualified darkness. If this is a parable, hell is here used to signify mental darkness, as it literally signifies physical darkness. Thus does the figure completely correspond with the fact. Hence it is obvious, that as the Jewish nation looked to the righteousness of the ritual law, which consisted of carnal ordinances, so the rich man in the parable calls to his father after the flesh for assistance. Having rejected the counsel of God against themselves, and refused to submit to the rule of a suffering Messiah, they judged themselves unworthy of eternal life, and the angels, or ministers of the gospel, turned to the Gentiles, who were thus brought into the life of the gospel, the faith of Abraham.

To exhibit the force of Abraham's closing reply to the rich man, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," let us refer to John 5 : 45, 46.

"Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me : for he wrote of me."

But what says Paul to the Romans on this subject ?

"For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy."

It hence appears obvious, that the unbelief of the Jews, and the faith of the Gentiles, were simultaneous. The one died to all which distinguished them as rich in their life time—the other died to their idola-

trous worship, and to their ignorance of the true God, and no wonder the Apostles exclaimed in astonishment, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Thus the rich man died, and was buried—the poor man needed no burial, he came to life—the life of the new dispensation.

In speaking of this passage literally, notice was taken of the entire want of character from which to infer the cause of the sudden change of circumstances related of these two men. As a figure, it is truly characteristic of the relative situation of the two grand divisions of men. Not only were the Jews highly privileged as a people, but their *exclusive* claim to these privileges was so deeply rooted, that even the apostles of our Lord, had strong doubts of the propriety of teaching the way of life to the Gentiles. Nay, the Saviour of men, while under the Mosaic dispensation, afforded strong evidence of this exclusive spirit. His disciples were forbidden to preach to the Gentiles, and he declared himself not sent, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. True, after his resurrection, the commission was extended to every creature; yet before his crucifixion, he declared it not meet to give the children's bread to dogs, alluding to the case of the Gentile woman. Here then is a case in point. The woman answered—"Truth Lord, yet the dogs eat the crumbs which fall from their master's table." What a singular coincidence! The Jews, and even Christ, at that time, considered the Gentiles as dogs.

That the Gentiles, who are here represented in the character of a beggar, were poor in the same sense in which the Jews were rich, will hardly be disputed, when reference is made to Eph. 2: 11, 12.

"Wherefore remember, that ye *being* in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without

Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

The poor man is represented as outside the rich man's gate. "Without are dogs." He is also said to be full of sores. If being strangers from the covenants of promise, and without hope, does not sufficiently point out the moral ulcers of the Gentile world, we know not in what language to describe it. But Isa. 1 : 5, 6, in full to the purpose.

"The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head *there* is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises, and putrefying sores: they had not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment."

That the exclusive spirit of the Jewish nation was highly provoked by any intimation of granting their privileges to the Gentile world, is manifested by their conduct to the Messiah, on his hinting the change which was about to take place between these two grand divisions of men. They thrust him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. What, did the Spirit of Pharisaic pride, which says, "Stand by thyself—I am holier than thou;" prompt them to *murder*? It did—nor is this a solitary instance.

"And he said unto me, depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the *Gentiles*. And they gave him audience unto this *word*, and then lifted up their voices, and said, away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live."



But perhaps you are ready to inquire, What is meant by the dogs licking his sores ? we conceive it points to the instructions of the heathen philosophers, which might palliate, but could not heal, their moral diseases. " Life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel." The death of the poor man was the close of his dispensation of misery. The life time in which he had received his evil things terminated, and he was brought by the angels, or messengers, or ministers of the gospel, into the glorious life, and light, and liberty of the new dispensation. He came from darkness into the light of divine truth, he was not buried. The rich man died to the light, and was buried in darkness as profound as that from which Abraham was taken—he was therefore *buried*—he is buried still. He listened not to the voice which said, Turn ye, turn ye, O house of Israel, for why will ye die ? But the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob. The vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel 37 : will yet be fulfilled.

" Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel : behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost ; we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live ; and I shall place you in your own land : then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken it saith the LORD."

That the primitive preachers of the gospel were termed angels, will not admit of disputation, and that they were commissioned to turn the Gentiles from a

state of mental darkness and moral degradation, to the light of the gospel, is evident from Acts 36 : 17, 18.

“ Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith which is in me.”

Perhaps you are by this time ready to inquire what is meant by the great gulf, which completely precluded the possibility of passing to and fro. I presume it means no more than the determination of God, who hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear unto this day. This prediction will most surely be fulfilled, and nothing but the necessary time to bring in the fulness of the Gentiles is now wanting to close the glorious promises respecting this people. Do you learn that this can never be passed ? on what page of scripture do you find it written. The Jews were to bow down their back alway, but a deliverance is nevertheless promised. That which cannot be performed to-day, may be accomplished to-morrow. That which was broken from its own olive tree can be grafted in again, and so all Israel shall be saved, and the top stone of salvation shall be brought forth with joy, crying grace, grace. Christ said to his disciples, as he did to the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come—but the question of a disciple, elicited an answer of peace. But instances of this description are so common, that you will hardly need a repetition in this place.

You may also be ready to ask, who were the five brethren of the rich man. Whether the number five has here any special reference to any definite portion of men, is not perhaps certain. But it is certain, that as the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin were count-

ed but one, so the ten tribes would, in the same ratio, number five. That the Samaritans, or ten tribes, were acknowledged by the Jews as children of Abraham, is evident, notwithstanding they had no dealings together. And that they felt them nearer of kin, and nearer in feeling, than others called Gentiles, is more than probable. And as the ten tribes never did oppose the gospel as did the Jews, so it might be said, they had not come into the place of torment into which unbelief has brought the Jews. Hence the whole is easy of understanding. *The rich man did not consider Lazarus as his brother*—but he saw him in a situation as he supposed, to render assistance. The perplexity of the Jews was great. They were tributary to the Romans, and continually expected a conquering Messiah, who should rescue them from this state of vassalage. The time of his coming, was at the advent of Christ, and hence they would take him by force and make him a king; hence also, the populace cried, Hosanna to the son of David—and the same populace cried, *crucify him*—his blood be on us and on our children.

But after all which has been said on this citation, some may yet inquire, how comes it about, that so many learned men still persist in using this text as proof of interminable misery? We answer, first, by inquiring whether circumstantial testimony, and that very equivocal, is sufficient to outweigh the phalanx of facts which guard this passage from perversion? If you answer, Yes—you are prepared to believe in the infallibility of Popes, and Synods, and Councils. If you reply, No—the question is answered, and the subject is put to rest.

But again—If the tenet is true, merely because many believe and teach it, why not always go with the current of public opinion? On this principle, the Jews were justified in their persecution of Christ and his

disciples, and you would thus commend the maxim, that the voice of the people is the voice of God. Numbers would thus sanctify error, and that may be orthodox to-day which will be the most damnable heresy to-morrow. On this principle too, the multitude might say to the few who think—Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further. Every advance which has been made in knowledge would thus be an advance in error, and we might be persuaded to retrace our steps from civilization to the most heathen barbarism.

We have now looked again at the words *sheol* and *hades*, and at their use in the scriptures. We have taken one instance of the use of the latter, and that the strongest instance in the New Testament, and on examination, found it wanting, as a support for the vulgar but popular error of endless misery. Scripture, reason, analogy, are all against it, as a term expressing a place of punishment posterior to this mode of existence. We find it used figuratively as an emblem of the shutting up of the Jews from the privileges of the gospel kingdom, and of the entrance of the Gentiles into this kingdom. It is thus, that it fulfils the predictions of the Bible, and affords strong reason for trusting in the fulfilment of every other prophecy yet to be accomplished.

In confirmation of what has been advanced on this passage, we shall quote from Dr. Campbell, with some remarks on the quotation from Mr. Balfour's Inquiry. Of the word *αἰς* he says—

“Here it is represented as a place of punishment. The rich man is said to be tormented there in the midst of flames. These things will deserve to be examined narrowly. It is plain, that in the Old Testament, the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery. It is represented to us rather by negative qualities than by positive, by its silence,

its darkness, its being inaccessible, unless by preternatural means, to the living, and their ignorance about it. Thus much in general seems always to have been presumed concerning it, that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad. In most respects, however, there was a resemblance in their notions on this subject, to those of the most ancient heathen.

“ But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathen, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman ; as they had a closer intercourse with Pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Saviour’s time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner ; but the general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide. The Greek HADES they found well adapted to express the Hebrew SHEOL. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters. And though they did not receive the terms Elysium or Elysian fields, as suitable appellations for the regions peopled by good spirits, they took instead of them, as better adapted to

their own theology, the garden of Eden, or Paradise, a name originally Persian, by which the word answering to garden, especially when applied to Eden, had commonly been rendered by the Seventy. To denote the same state, they sometimes used the phrase Abraham's bosom, a metaphor borrowed from the manner in which they reclined at meals."

On the above Mr. Balfour remarks as follows:—

"How did the Jews in our Lord's day, come to consider Hades as a place of punishment for the wicked? That a change in their opinion on this subject, had taken place from what is contained in the Old Testament is evident; for he says,—“on this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Saviour's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets.” Well, how did this change in their opinions taken place? Was it by some new revelation which God made to them on this subject? No such thing is stated by Dr. Campbell, but the reverse. He thus accounts for the change of their opinions. “But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathen, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a closer intercourse with Pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the deceased were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in

the same manner; but their general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide."—This statement is surely too plain to be misunderstood. How much plainer could he have told us, that a punishment in Hades was a mere heathen notion, which the Jews learned from their intercourse with them? Could this have been more obvious had he said so in as many words? We presume no man will deny this. He not only declares that neither Sheol nor Hades is used in Scripture to express a place of punishment, but he shows, that the Pagan fables teach it, and the Jews learned it from them. What are we then to think, when this is the account of the origin of the doctrine of hell torments by one of its professed friends? Had this statement been given by a professed Universalist, the cry would be raised that it was a mere fabrication of his own, in support of his system. But no, this is the statement of the learned, and acute Dr. Campbell, late principal of Marischal college, Aberdeen, who lived and died, a celebrated theologian in the church of Scotland. It is notorious, that in this quotation he declares, that the Jews derived these opinions from their intercourse with the heathen. Where they got those opinions he does not inform us. Had they been from divine revelation, the heathen ought to have learned them from the Jews. But here the matter is reversed. The heathen it seems anticipated divine revelation, as to the doctrine of punishment in Hades. They revealed it to the Jews by means of their fables. The Jews it is said,—“did not adopt their fables, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner, but their general train of thinking came pretty much to coincide.” That man must be very dull, who does not learn from this, that the doctrine of torment in Hades, had its origin in heathenism, and, that the Jews were ignorant of it, until they learned it from the heathen.—From all this,

will it be easy for any one to resist the conviction, that to this popular opinion, which the Jews had imbibed from their intercourse with the heathen, our Lord alluded in his parable, of the rich man and Lazarus? Such were the popular notions of the Jews in our Lord's day; and to what else could he allude? The Old Testament, as we have seen, taught no such doctrine, and in the parable it is not introduced as a new revelation to the world. It is merely brought in as a part of its imagery, and that without asserting its truth, or exposing the erroneous notion which people had imbibed. He no more attempts to correct this Pagan notion, than the common opinion, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity.

“Dr. Campbell further declares, that though the Jews did not adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, yet their train of thinking pretty much coincided with theirs. “The Greek Hades they found well adapted to express the Hebrew Sheol. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters.” They did not adopt the terms Elysium, or Elysian fields, to express the regions of good spirits, but he says, “they do not seem to have declined the use of the word Tartarus” to express the unhappy situation of the wicked in an intermediate state.”

Le Clerc, as quoted by Rev. Mr. Balfour, gives us the Pagan notion of punishment in a future world, in the following words:—

“Though enough has been said, showing that punishment in Hades was a heathen notion, and not sanctioned by divine revelation, it may be of some use to see what were the views entertained by the ancient heathen about Hades and Tartarus. M. Le Clerc, in his Religion of the Ancient Greeks, p. 147—154. thus writes:—“In general, the doctrine of a future life has



been adopted by all nations, at least by all those that deserve to be cited as examples. Legislators considered it as the most effectual curb for restraining the passions of men, and they have employed every argument to establish this salutary doctrine, as we may be convinced by attending to the descriptions which the ancients have left us of hell.

“ This word signified among them the residence of souls. Thither, after death, they repaired in crowds to receive remuneration for their deeds. Minos sat as judge, and as the names were drawn out of the fatal urn, he distributed to each his merited punishment or reward. Pluto, seated on a throne of ebony, presided over the infernal regions ; because, as we have already observed, in the symbolical region of the ancients, part of which was dedicated to the worship of the stars, winter was the night of nature, and because the sun at that time took the name of King of the Shades. For this reason Pluto, who represented the sun, makes so important a figure in mysteries destined to describe the empire of the dead. The gloomy region was situated at an immense distance, far beyond the limits of this universe. According to the author of the Theogony, [Hesiod, Theog. v. 720.] ‘ as far as the heaven is distant from the earth, so far is the earth removed from the dark abyss. A mass of iron, falling from the top of the starry heavens, would take nine days and nine nights before it reached the surface of the earth ; and it would require the same time in falling from thence to Tartarus,’ the place destined for the punishment of the wicked.

“ This frightful abode was said to be twice as deep as it is distant from the brilliant summit of Olympus. It was surrounded by a triple wall, it was bathed by the flaming waters of Cocytus and of Phlegethon, and towers of iron guarded the entrance. The cruel Tysiphone watched night and day at the gate, armed

with serpents, which she shook over the heads of the guilty. Their groans, the doleful cries, mixed with the sound of their stripes, cause the wide abyss to resound. There are for ever shut up the impious Titans, and those no less audacious mortals who dared to resist the divinity; Tityus, Ixion, Pirithous, and the impious Salmoneous. Perjury, adultery, incest, and parricide, are likewise punished; and those whose life has been sullied with odious crimes; those who have not respected the ties of blood, who have waged unjust wars, who have sold their country; those who have dared to commit enormous wickedness, and enjoyed the fruit of their crimes, are all consigned to the most cruel torments.

“A less rigorous fate was reserved for him who had been guilty of smaller offences, or who, having committed crimes, had given signs of repentance. It was necessary that he should be punished till he had expiated them; but when he had been in some sort regenerated and cleansed from the impurities contracted by guilt, he was admitted into the abodes of the blessed.

“That place of delights was admirably contrasted with the dismal regions of Tartarus. The ground sparkled with gold and precious stones; its fertile plains were watered with a multitude of never-failing streams, which maintained a perpetual verdure. The flowers of spring were mixed with the rich fruits of autumn. A sky for ever serene and unclouded, a sun and stars from which incessantly flowed streams of living light; and, in fine, all the objects which the most brilliant imagination could conceive, were collected to embellish those happy plains. They were inhabited by virtuous men, the friends of justice, who had served their country, and cultivated the useful arts; they tasted a pleasure which nothing could embitter: and the remembrance of the virtues they had

practised on earth was for them a continual source of felicity. In the midst of the unmingled pleasures they enjoyed, they exercised themselves in the occupations which during life had obtained them the gratitude of their countrymen. The legislator contemplated the principles of that august and eternal law of which he had before but a glimpse; and the assembly of the just that surrounded him, were attentive to his instructions. The sight of arms, even in the bosom of peace and tranquillity, recalled to the remembrance of the hero those battles which he had fought in defence of his country; while the poet, who had consecrated his harp to the worship of the gods, celebrated anew, in celestial strains, the power and benignity of the immortals.

“ We may conceive what impression these images would make on the mind, when unceasingly presented to the eyes from earliest infancy. It is not to be doubted, that if the hope of felicity unclouded leads to virtue, the idea of endless punishment must have a still stronger influence on the conduct. The religion of the ancients, which to us appears of so light a nature that we are apt to believe its only end was to flatter the senses, yet employed the most proper means for restraining the outrageous multitude. It alarmed them on all sides with the most frightful representations. A poet of antiquity [Lucretius, lib. 5.] paints, in the strongest colours, that continual terror which takes possession of the human heart, which disturbs and poisons the pleasures of life, and which in every part of the earth has erected temples for the purpose of conciliating the gods. Plato, in the beginning of the first book of his Republic, represents an old man seized with fear at the approach of death, and full of inquietude with regard to objects that never occupy the season of health. Then it is, says he, that we reflect on our crimes, on the injustice we have committed, and that

often, in our agitation, we start in our sleep, and are frightened like children. As soon as some were found among the ancients who had overcome these fears, it was pretended that such had never existed among them: we might as reasonably judge of the public belief at this day, by the opinions in which some modern writers have been pleased to indulge themselves. The testimony of those of antiquity who opposed the prejudices of their times, their very attempt to dissipate those fears, and to turn them into ridicule, rather proves how deeply they were rooted. Observe with what solicitude Lucretius every where endeavours to burst the bonds of religion, and to fortify his readers against the threatenings of eternal punishment. The observation of Juvenal, so often cited, that nobody in his day believed in the fables of hell, is that of an enlightened mind, which takes no part in the opinions of the vulgar. The same thing is to be said of what we read in Cicero, and in some other writers, on the same subject: and when Virgil exclaims, 'happy the man that can tread under foot inexorable Destiny, and the noise of devouring Acheron,' he indicates, in a manner sufficiently precise, that it was the province of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, riveted by education.

“Those who were unable to conquer these vain terrors, found consolations of a different kind. Religion stretched forth her kind hand to encourage their hopes, and to relieve their despondency. When remorse had brought back, within her pale, an unfortunate wanderer from the paths of justice, she informed him that, by a true confession of his guilt, and sincere repentance, forgiveness was to be obtained. With this view expiatory sacrifices were instituted, by means of which the guilty expected to participate in the happiness of the just.”

To rebut what has been said, by orthodox commentators, in the present section, proof of the reverse must be given, and all the researches of these able scholars must be given to the winds.



#### SECTION IV.

Further examination of the subject. Appeal to the Scriptures relative to the first transgression.

BY THE EDITOR.

We learn by the preceding section, that the *use* to which *hades* has been applied, is of heathen origin, to which the Catholic tenet of an intermediate state, suited to purgatorial discipline, also owes its parentage. Orthodox writers of much learning and diligence, are given as authority, whose testimony as to matters of fact will hardly be disputed. They give up every word, as expressive of future misery, save *Gehenna*. But do a majority of Christian readers, know the radical difference between the various words which are rendered *hell* in our common translation? Most certainly not. The clergy, who ought, and many of whom *do* know better, seldom, if ever, attempt to set their hearers right respecting these things. The reason is very obvious. Once give them a clue to the truth, and they will be less ready to receive the dogma of endless misery, which needs all their ignorance and prejudice for its support. Exhibit the ignorance, or malversations of the translators, and implicit faith in the traditions of the fathers, will vanish. Hence, those who have done so much for the cause of truth, while it militates so apparently, against their own prejudices, deserve the greater praise.

But, if *Sheol*, or *Hades*, originally signified a place of wretchedness in a future state of being, is it not most astonishing, that we never read of its creation?

If it is in the universe of God, it was either designed from eternity, or was an accident, growing out of circumstances unseen by Jehovah when he brought the material earth on which we live from chaos into order. But we neither hear of its creation, nor of its existence, from the records of truth. No threatening of this sort is recorded in the Old Testament. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," contains no intimation of this sort. Nor does any word, or circumstance, relating to the first transgression, or its effects, produce any thing like it. No awful denunciation of implacable vengeance, and never-ending torment, are recorded as being fulminated by Almighty wrath:—No fear of such a consequence is recorded as the result of disobedience.—Adam is represented as being ashamed, and gave this as a reason for hiding himself. Shame was the consequence of guilt. But, were he in dread of ceaseless misery, could he so deliberately have made his excuse? and had the threatening been as our modern clergy represent it, is it within the scope of probabilities, that he was so little concerned as to the result? But suppose it should be objected that he did not fully understand the threatening, let us inquire, if the Father of our spirits *could* give a law to man, involving such awful consequences, while man was totally ignorant of the effects which must follow the breach of that law? Impossible we can come to such a conclusion, without charging God with deliberate malice, and the most abominable deception. But the event shows that this was not the case. All, on the part of Jehovah, exhibits the utmost benignity. "Adam, where art thou?" The answer *proved* him guilty, for shame was recognized as the legitimate result of transgression? No: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." But was not the man cursed also? No; and how was the ground cursed? It was to produce thorns and thistles. The

*man* was to eat bread in the sweat of his face. Necessity was laid on him to labour, and the consequence was to follow—how long? “Until thou return to the ground—for dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return.” Here was all the penalty threatened, comprised in two words—labour and shame. But we may be told, and indeed we *are* told—that “all mankind by the *fall*, lost communion with God;” let us ask, however, where is the proof? We read nothing like it here, for the *fall of man* is not once mentioned in the Bible. Nor yet do we learn from that book, that man lost communion with his Maker. Indeed, the very reverse is proved in the history of the primitive offence. But we are also met by the declaration, that the first offence against the law subjects all men to the “wrath and curse of God,” and that from the same authority. But is this worthy of more credit than the former? Where is this related? The orthodox catechism contains it, but the warrant is not found in the book of revelation. Nothing like it is stated as the consequence.

Perhaps the objector will grant that he cannot find all this in so many words, and may be willing to waive these declarations as untenable. But others of equal consequence may be started. He may presume we will grant, that in consequence of sin, we are all “made liable to all the miseries of this life, and to death itself.” No, we are not ready to allow this neither. *Many* of the miseries of this life, have no possible connexion with transgression. Our constitution renders us liable to many evils, in no way connected with the subject. Those nerves, and that fine sensibility of feeling, which were the inlets to the most exquisite pleasure, make us susceptible of the most excruciating torture, aside from the evils of moral pollution. Nor is the latter position a whit more tenable. That man was made immortal, incorrupti-

ble, and by moral degradation became the subject of dissolution, is a most palpable solecism. His corruptibility proves the reverse. Endless life, in this state of being, was never promised as the consequence of obedience. The very expression, until thou return to the dust, is strong corroborative testimony, that the original plan was precisely that which the event displays. His mortality is a demonstration of the fact, that he was made *liable* to dissolution. We grant an apostle inform us, that death passed upon all men, as all have sinned; but the same writer informs us, that to be carnally minded is death. But besides this, the context shows, that he alluded to moral, and not to natural death.

But one objection still remains. We are told, that all men, in consequence of sin, are "made liable to the pains of hell for ever." Now we doubt this; first, because we do not find it in the oracles of God; and, secondly, because David, on whom the pains of hell had taken hold, declares that God had delivered his soul from the *lowest* hell. But as the word sheol, hades, or hell, no where occurs in the history of the first transgression, those who wish to maintain the principle for which they contend from the use of the word, will be under the necessity of seeking for it elsewhere



## SECTION V.

Quotations from Dr. Campbell relative to Sheol and Hades, and Mr. Balfour's deductions from them. Further remarks by the Editor.

On a subject so long and so generally misunderstood, and of such immense importance, no person can rationally be blamed for giving line upon line, and precept upon precept. The most close, the most ample examination of the subject, even to prolixity, is evidently erring on the safe side. If truth should always be the object of research, the greater the subject, the more importunate should we be to find it. If the scriptures have been made to speak a language foreign from their true meaning—if they have been wrested from their original meaning, either through ignorance or design, the sooner, and the plainer, these errors are exploded, the better.\* We shall now quote a few extracts from Dr. Campbell, who being in the orthodox ranks, and an accomplished scholar, would be careful not to state as facts, any thing to discredit his own system of faith, but on the most undoubted authority. Speaking of *hades*, he says—

“As to the word *adēs*, which occurs in eleven places of the New Testament, and is rendered *hell* in all, except one, where it is translated *grave*, it is quite common in the classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament. In my judgment it ought never in Scripture to be rendered HELL, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians.—In the Old Testament, the corresponding word is *Sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used *adēs*. This word is also used sometimes in rendering the

nearly synonymous words or phrases *bor* and *abne bor*, *the pit*, and *stones of the pit, tsal moth, the shades of death, dumeh, silence*. The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark and silent, about which the most prying eye, and listening ear, can acquire no information. The term *αἰδης Hades*, is well adapted to express this idea. It was written anciently, as we learn from the poets (for what is called the poetic, is nothing but the ancient dialect) *ab privativo et video*, and signifies obscure, hidden, invisible. To this the word *Hell*, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed. The word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects."

On the above quotation, Mr. Balfour offers the following remarks :—

I have made this long quotation from Dr. Campbell at the outset of my remarks for several reasons.

It shows that Sheol of the Old Testament, and Hades of the New, both translated by our English word hell, do not signify a place of endless misery for the wicked, but simply the state of the dead, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. It follows of course, that wherever those two words are used in Scripture, though translated by the word hell, we ought not to understand such a place of misery to be meant by the inspired writers. Inattention to this has led to a misunderstanding of many parts both of the Old and New Testaments.

It establishes also that our English word hell, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded to Hades and Sheol, and did not, as it now does, signify a place of endless misery. It denoted only what was secret or concealed. This we shall show more fully

afterwards.\* What we wish to be noticed here, is, that the people generally have connected the idea of endless misery with the word hell, but it is evident that it is a very false association. It is beyond all controversy, that the word *hell* is changed from its original signification to express the idea.

It is also obvious from the above quotation, and from other authors which might be quoted, that *Ge-henna* is the word which is supposed to express the idea of a place of endless misery. The correctness of this opinion we shall attempt to consider afterwards. At present it need only be observed, that if the opinion be correct, it is somewhat surprising that the English language had no word to express such a place of misery, but the word *hell* must assume a new sense to accommodate it with a name.

I shall only add in regard to the statements, made in the above quotation, that they are not opinions, broached by a Universalist, which he found to be necessary, in support of his system. No: they are the statements of Dr. Campbell, who was not a Universalist. Nor are they his own individual singular opinions, but are now admitted as correct by learned orthodox critics and commentators.

If the doctrine of eternal misery was not revealed under the Old Testament dispensation, it follows, that it, as well as life and immortality, was brought to light by the Gospel. If it be allowed that this doctrine was not revealed under the Mosaic dispensation, it is very evident that persons could not be moved with fear, to avoid a punishment, concerning which they had no information. If it be said, that it was revealed, we wish to be informed in what part of the Old Testament this information is to be found.

It seems then to be a conceded point, that neither *Sheol* of the Old Testament, nor *Hades* of the New, so often translated *hell*, means, as is commonly be-

lieved, the place of eternal punishment for the wicked. From the concessions made in the foregoing quotations, most people would deem it proper, for me to decline the labour which Dr. Campbell calls *endless*, to illustrate by an enumeration of all the passages in both Testaments, that those words do not signify this place of punishment for the wicked. Unwilling, however, to take this matter on trust, I have submitted to this endless labour, and shall proceed to bring forward all those passages.

The word *Sheol* in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, occurs, sixty-four times. It is rendered by our translators, three times *pit*, twenty-nine times *grave*, and thirty-two times *hell*.

We cannot forbear the gratification of noticing, in this place, the high desert of Mr. Balfour, in submitting to the astonishing labour, which the celebrated Dr. Campbell termed endless. Few men have either the ability or the means; and fewer still the *courage*, and the persevering diligence, which this Inquiry exhibits. It is a specimen of fair and logical reasoning, of which the greatest man who ever breathed our atmosphere need not be ashamed. It is a chain of facts and corresponding deductions, from which is no appeal. The premises are undoubted, and the conclusion irresistible. After requesting the reader to examine carefully the remarks which precede this paragraph, we would call his attention to the following, from the same author.

“Let us attend to the texts in which it is translated *pit*. In Numb. 7 : 30, 33, it occurs twice. Speaking of Korah and his company, they are said to go down, “quick into the pit.” What is said in these two verses, is explained by the earth opening her mouth and swallowing them up. Had *Sheol* been translated *hell* here, as in other places, according to the common acceptance of this word, Korah and his company went

down alive, soul and body, to the place of eternal misery. But this would be contrary to common belief, for it is allowed, that men's bodies do not go there until the resurrection. All that seems to be meant in this account is, that they were swallowed up alive, as whole cities have been by an earthquake, and that without any reference to their eternal condition. This, I presume, is the view most people take of this judgment of God upon those men. Job 17 : 16, is the only other text in which Sheol is rendered pit. It is said, speaking of men,—“ they shall go down to the bars of the pit.” What is meant, is explained in the very next words,—“ when our rest together is in the dust.” As it would be a mere waste of time to make any further remarks to show that Sheol, translated pit in these texts, does not refer to a place of eternal misery, let us bring to view all the texts in which this word is translated *grave*. The first three places then, in which it occurs, are, Gen. 35 : 35. ; 43 : 38, and 45 : 29. noticed already by Dr. Campbell in the above quotation. Had Sheol been translated hell in these texts, as it is in many others, Joseph would be represented as in hell, and that his father Jacob expected soon to follow him to the same place. In like manner, it would make Hezekiah say, “ I shall go to the gates of hell.” And to declare,—“ hell cannot praise thee.” See Isai. 38 : 10, 18. I may just notice here, that, if those good men did not go to hell, it would be difficult to prove from the Old Testament, that Sheol, or hell, was understood to mean a place of eternal misery for the wicked. But further, let Sheol be translated hell, instead of grave in the following texts, and we think all will allow, that the idea of a place of future misery, was not attached to this word by the Old Testament writers. Thus translated, it would make Job say, chap. 17 : 13,—“ if I wait, hell is mine house.” And to pray, chap. 14 : 13,—“ O that

that thou wouldst hide me in hell." It would also make David say, Psalm 83 : 3.—" My life draweth nigh unto hell." And to complain, Ps. 6 : 5,—" in hell who shall give thee thanks."

After a critical discussion, Mr. B. proceeds—

" David says, Psalm 31 : 17,—" let the wicked be ashamed and let them be silent in hell." In some of the preceding texts we read of persons being brought up from it. Thus, 1 Sam. 3 : 6,—" the Lord killeth and maketh alive : he bringeth down to hell and bringeth up." And again, Psalm 30 : 3,—" O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from hell." But what this means is explained in the next words,—" thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit." In these passages the language is evidently figurative. It is evident, that by hell could not be meant a place of endless misery, nor could these passages be understood literally ; for surely David, nor no one else, was ever brought down to such a place, and afterwards brought up from it. We find Job says, ch. 7 : 9,—" he that goeth down to hell shall come up no more," which contradicts what was said in these passages about persons being brought up from hell. But what Job means, is plain from the next words, " he shall no more return to his house." But further, if Sheol was translated hell instead of grave in the following texts, it would make the sacred writers represent all men as going to hell. Thus it is said, Psalm 69 : 48,—" what man is he that liveth and shall not see death ? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of hell ?" Notwithstanding this, David says, Psalm 49 : 15,—" But God will redeem my soul from the power of hell." By comparing these two last texts, it is evident that "*hand of hell*," and "*power of hell*," mean the same thing. We have also a proof, that Sheol did not mean a place of eternal misery, but the state of the dead ; for death and Sheol are words used

to express the same idea. Besides, we know for certainty, that no man can deliver himself from the power of death, or hand of the grave ; but surely all men do not go to hell, or a place of eternal misery ? Again : if Sheol is translated hell instead of grave, it makes Solomon say, Eccles. 9 : 10,—“ there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in hell whither thou goest.” But are there none of these things in the place of eternal misery ? To answer this in the negative, would be to contradict common opinion on the subject. But this can be affirmed concerning the state of the dead, and shows that Solomon, by Sheol, did not understand a place of endless misery, but this state, or as Job calls it, “ the house appointed for all the living.” Here “ there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom.”

“ But further ; if Sheol indeed means *hell*, in the common sense of the word, very strange statements are given in the following passages. It is said, Prov. 1 : 12,—“ Let us swallow them up alive as hell.” And in Job 24 ; 19, it is added,—“ drouth and heat consume the snow waters, so doth hell those who have sinned.” Again, Psalm 49 : 14,—“ like sheep they are laid in hell ; death shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning ; and their beauty shall consume in hell from their dwelling.” And, Psalm 141 : 7,—our bones are scattered at hell’s mouth as when one cutteth and cleaveth wood.” Now, I ask every candid man, whether all these statements do not perfectly agree with understanding Sheol to mean the grave, but are contrary to truth, to understand them of hell, or a place of eternal misery. Such an idea does not appear to have entered the minds of the Old Testament writers. Does any man believe that people’s bones are scattered at the mouth of the place of eternal misery ?

and does this place consume persons in it as drought and heat consume the snow waters ?

It is not generally noticed by most readers of the Bible, that our translators have rendered Sheol both grave and hell in the same passage, and speaking of the same persons. An example of this occurs in Ezek. 31 : 15, 18. In the 15th verse it is rendered grave, and in verses 16th and 17th it is twice rendered hell. Besides, observe, that what is called grave and hell in verses 15th, 16th and 17th verses, is called in verse 18th, "the nether parts of the earth."—Another example we have of this in Isai. 14 : 3—24. In this passage, too long for quotation, is given a description of the fall of the king of Babylon. Any one who reads it, may see that things are stated which forbid us thinking, that by Sheol, translated both hell and grave, a place of eternal misery was intended. But it is well known that detached parts of this passage have been so applied. The persons represented as in hell, are said to be moved at the coming of some other sinners to the same place of misery ; and as saying to them—"Art thou also become weak as we ? Art thou become like unto us ?" But the passage needs only be read by any man of ordinary sense to convince him of the absurdity of such an interpretation. But further : in Prov. 30 : 16. Sheol, or hell, is represented as never satisfied. And in Cant. 8 : 6. jealousy is said to be "cruel as Sheol, or hell." All this may be said of the grave, but how it could be said of a place of eternal misery, I cannot perceive. Had our translators rendered Sheol hell in the following passage, it would have given such a plausible aspect to it, as meaning a place of misery, that it would not have been easy to convince many people to the contrary. Thus it is said, Job 21 : 13. speaking of the wicked,—“they spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to hell.” Had this been done, people would have quoted it as decisive in proof of the



doctrine of eternal misery. Why it was not rendered here hell instead of grave, I know not, but sure I am, it is as strong as any of the texts in which it is rendered hell, to prove this doctrine.

The last passage in which Sheol is translated grave, is Hosea 13 : 14,—“ I will ransom them from the power of the grave. I will redeem them from death ; O death I will be thy plagues ; O grave, or hell, I will be thy destruction.” On this text I beg leave to make the following remarks.

1st, If Sheol, translated grave, and in other places hell, means a place of eternal misery, it is evident from this passage, that men are to be ransomed from it, and it destroyed. “ I will ransom them from the power of hell,” and, “ O hell, I will be thy destruction.” It will be easily perceived, that those who believe Sheol to be the place of endless misery, ought to give this up, for if they do not, they must admit, that neither the place nor its punishment is to be of eternal duration. If Sheol, translated pit, grave, and hell, is relinquished, as referring to such a place, it follows, that no such doctrine as this was known under the Old Testament, as taught by the inspired writers. Dr. Campbell, and others, as we have seen in the foregoing extracts, give up Sheol, and contend that Gehenna is the place of eternal punishment for the wicked.

2d, In the passage under consideration, there seems to be a double kind of proof, that Sheol does not signify hell, but the grave or state of the dead. The first clause of the verse,—“ I will ransom them from the power of the grave,” is explained by the second, “ I will redeem them from death.” Death, in this last clause, answers to, or is synonymous with, grave in the first. But again, it is equally evident, that death in the third clause, is equivalent to grave in the fourth. This kind of parallelism is common in the Old Testament ; attention to which is of importance in under-

standing the precise import of many expressions there used. As this text is quoted in the New Testament, and must again be brought to view, we shall for the present dismiss it.

These are now all the passages fairly before us, in which Sheol is rendered grave in the common version. Some may be disposed to ask,—why did not our translators render Sheol hell in all these texts, as they have done in many others, which we shall presently introduce? The answer to this question is of easy solution. It would have been absurd, nay, shocking to all our best feelings, to have rendered Sheol hell in many of the above passages. For example, it would not do to represent Joseph in hell, or a place of endless misery. No one could bear to hear, that Jacob expected soon to go to the same place. And surely it would never be believed that Job ever prayed,—“O that thou wouldest hide me in hell.” In short, it never could be admitted, that David, Hezekiah, and others, could have spoken about *Sheol* as they did, if they attached the same ideas to it as we do to the word *hell*.

“Had our translators rendered Sheol uniformly by the words pit, grave, or hell, we would have been less liable to mistaken views on this subject. Let us, for example, suppose that they had always translated it hell. We, in reading our Bibles, must have seen from the context of the places, from the persons spoken about, and other circumstances, that a place of eternal punishment could not be meant by this word. The Old Testament saints expected to go to Sheol, yea, prayed for it; but what should we think, to hear Christians now speaking about hell, as they did about Sheol? For example, would it not astonish us to hear a professed saint, pray,—O that thou wouldest hide me in hell, or in the place of endless misery? But why should it astonish us, if they meant by Sheol

what we now do by the word hell? Take only a single example of this. If Jacob meant by Sheol what we now mean by the word hell, why ought the following statement to surprise us?—A Christian loses a son, and refuses to be comforted by his family. He says, “I will go down to the place of endless misery unto my son mourning.” Concerning another beloved child he says,—“if mischief befall him by the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the place of endless misery.” This would be strange language in the mouth of a Christian in our day. But it ought not, if we indeed contend, that Sheol or hell, in the Old Testament, had any reference to such a place of misery.

The attention of the reader is now particularly turned to the passages in which the words Sheol and Hades are translated *hell* in our common version. The careful examiner will notice, that the translators have frequently put *grave* in the margin, where *hell* is found in the text, thus strengthening the arguments already used for the exposition of these words. Why they have done this, is not very problematical. Of these instances Mr. Balfour thus speaks:—

“Who, for example, does not perceive this in Psalm 16: 10. “for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.” This is quoted, Acts 2: and applied to the resurrection of our Lord. It may surely be asked,—was our Lord ever in hell, the place of eternal misery? When he said, “Father into thy hands I commend my spirit,” did his father send him to hell? This, I presume, will not be pretended. Where, it may be said then, was our Lord’s soul not left? He was not left in the state of the dead, or in *Sheol* or *Hades*, which are only two names for the same place. The Lord did not suffer his Holy One to see corruption, but raised him again from the dead.

“But again: was Jonah in hell, when he said, chap. 2: 2,—“out of the belly of hell cried I, and thou heardst my voice?” I have always understood, that in *hell* prayers were unavailing. But if Jonah was in hell, this is not true, for he not only prayed there, but was heard and delivered out of it. It deserves notice, that our translators, Gen. 37: 35. aware that it would not do to send Jacob to hell, translate Sheol grave; and here, thinking it rather strange to represent Jonah as praying in hell, they put grave in the margin.—But again; are we to conclude, when it is said, Psalm 55: 15,—“let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into hell,” that David prayed that the persons of whom he spoke, might go down quick, or alive, into a place of endless misery? As this was not a prayer very suitable for the man after God’s own heart, we find our translators again put grave in the margin.

“Having seen from Psalm 16: 10. that the Saviour is represented as having been in hell, we need not be much surprised at what is said in the following passages, which refer to him. Thus, Psalm 18: 5. it is said,—“the sorrows of hell compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me.” See also 2 Sam. 22: 6. and Psalm 116: 3. where the same language is used. In this text, “sorrows of hell,” and “snares of death,” are convertible expressions, and seem evidently to refer to the Saviour’s sufferings. I am aware, that it hath been held as an opinion, that our Lord actually went to *hell*, and suffered its pains for a season. This opinion was probably founded on these passages. In the present day, I presume the man is not to be found, who would risk his reputation in defending it.

That Sheol, translated hell, means the grave, or state of the dead, is, I think, obvious. Thus, Solomon, speaking of a lewd woman, says, Prov. 7: 27,

—“her house is the way to hell;” which he immediately explains, by adding, “going down to the chambers of death.” This is, if possible, still more evident from chap. 5 : 5,—“her feet go down to death,” which is explained by the next words,—“her steps take hold on hell.” The same remarks apply to Prov. 23 : 13, 14.—as the state of the dead was concealed from the eyes, or knowledge of all the living, its being known to God, is stated as a proof of his perfection in knowledge. Thus it is said, Job 26 : 6,—“hell is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering.” And again, Prov. 45 : 11. “hell and destruction are before the Lord, how much more then the hearts of the sons of men.”

“*Sheol*, whether translated pit, grave; or hell, is represented as below, beneath, and at a great depth. Persons are always spoken of as going down to it. It is contrasted as to depth, with heaven for height, the extent of both being alike unknown. Thus it is said, Prov. 15 : 24,—“the way of life is above to the wise, that they may depart from hell beneath.” And,—“it is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?” Job 11 : 8. See also, Amos 9 : 2. And Psalm 139 : 8. where similar language occurs. See also Dr. Campbell’s dissertation quoted above, on all these texts. But not only is *Sheol*, *hell*, represented as a great depth, but we read of the lowest *hell*. Thus in Deut. 32 : 22. it is said,—“for a fire is kindled in mine anger and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains.” Here, as in other places, for *hell* in the text, our translators put *grave* in the margin. Should we understand *hell* in this text, to mean the place of eternal misery, it is implied, that there is a low, and lower, as well as lowest place of misery for the wicked. Accordingly, it has been

common to assign to notoriously wicked men the lowest hell. But whatever sense we put on the phrase, "the lowest hell," it is the same place of which David thus speaks, Psalm 86 : 13,—“for great is thy mercy towards me : and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell.” Was David ever in the lowest place of eternal misery? But here again our translators for hell in the text put grave in the margin. The fact is, the language in the above texts is used figuratively, and it would be absurd to interpret it literally. See the foregoing dissertation of Dr. Campbell in proof of this.—When we read of the lowest hell, which implies a low, and a lower, is not this mode of speaking used as a contrast to the expression highest heavens, which implies a high and a higher heavens? We read also of the third heavens, which clearly implies two more. I would therefore suggest it for consideration, if the expression “lowest hell,” did not originate, from the dead being sometimes cast into pits, the depth of which was as little known, as the height of the highest heavens. When the common honours were paid the dead, they were put in caves, or vaults, or decently interred under the earth. But when persons were deemed unworthy of funeral honours, were they not cast into pits, the depth of which, was sometimes unknown? Did not this unknown depth give rise to the expression *depths of hell*, just as the unknown height of the *highest heavens*, gave rise to this expression?

“In Isai. 5 : 14. it is said,—“hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure ; and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it.” This may be said with respect to the grave, but surely with no propriety could it be said of a place of eternal misery. Speaking of the proud ambitious man, it is also said, Hab. 2 : 5,—“who enlargeth his desire as

hell, and is as death, and cannot be satisfied." In this text, death and hell are used as convertible words to express the same thing. In Prov. 27: 20. it is said "hell and destruction are never full." Similar things are stated above in the texts where Sheol is translated grave, as in these passages, and show, that the same was intended by the inspired writers, although the original word is differently rendered. The context of all these texts sufficiently show, that the grave or state of the dead is meant, and not a place of eternal misery. Indeed, let any one read Ezek. 32: 17—32. and observe, that all the dead are represented as in hell, and as speaking out of the midst of hell. Their graves are represented as about them; that the mighty are gone down to hell with their weapons of war, and that their swords are under their heads. All this description agrees very well with the ancient mode of placing the dead in their repositories, but it is contrary to common belief, that a place of eternal misery could be referred to. Does any one believe that the mighty of this earth have their swords under their heads in such a place?

"As Sheol, the grave, or hell, was the most debased state to which any person could be brought, hence I think God says, reproving Israel for their idolatries,—“and didst debase thyself even unto hell.” Isai. 57: 9. And as death and the grave are of all things the most dreaded by men, it is said of some, that they,—“have made a covenant with death, and with hell are at agreement.” This language, expresses in a very strong manner, their fancied security, but which were only vain words, for it is added,—“your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand.” Isai. 28: 15—19.

“The last text in which Sheol is translated hell, is Psalm 9: 17,—“the wicked shall be turned into hell,

and all the nations who forget God." [An old version thus gives this passage—"The wicked shall go into hell."] There is no text in which the word Sheol occurs, which has been more frequently quoted than this, to prove that by hell, is meant a place of misery for the wicked. The wicked are the persons spoken of, and they are said to be, or shall be, turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God. Plausible as this appears to be, we have only to consult the context, to see that no such idea was intended by the inspired writer. The Psalm in which the words stand, is treating of God's temporal judgments upon the heathen nations. We think if verses 15—20. are consulted, this will sufficiently appear. What leads people to think that this passage refers to eternal misery, is, the false idea which they have attached to the word hell. They have associated a false idea with this word, and in this text they conclude that it is taught. But surely no one, who has attended to all the above texts, can continue to believe that Sheol here, has such a meaning. It is the same hell into which the wicked are turned, where Jacob said he would go down to Joseph mourning. It is the same hell in which the Saviour's soul was not left. It is the same hell David prayed the wicked might go down quick, or into alive. When once I can believe that David prayed the wicked might go down alive to a place of endless misery, and that Korah and his company did go there alive, it is possible I may believe that the text before us contains the answer to David's prayer. But it will not be easy to produce evidence of this. The fact is, it would prove too much for even those who take this view of it. It would prove that all the heathen nations must go to eternal misery, a thing which few are prepared to admit. Ask the question of the most zealous advocates of the doctrine,—are all the heathen nations turned into eternal misery? They hesitate, they falter to



any, *yes*. But why do they so? for if Shoel means such a place, the passage is plain and explicit in declaring it.

“It perhaps may be objected to this view of the text, —are not all good people turned into Sheol, or the state of the dead, as well as the wicked? why then is it said the wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God? The answer to this is easy. Though all good people in David’s day, went to Sheol, as well as the wicked, yet not in the way he is here speaking of the wicked. David is speaking of God’s public judgments on the heathen, and by those judgments they were to be cut off from the earth, or turned into Sheol. It is one thing to die, and quite another to be cut off by the judgments of God from the earth. That the Sheol or hell here mentioned, was not a place of endless misery for the wicked, see Ainsworth on this text, and on Gen. 37: and Psalm 16.—I shall only add, if all the wicked, yea, all the nations who forgot God in those days were turned into a place of endless misery, upon what principles are we to justify the character of God, or of all good men, for their want of feeling towards them, or their exertions to save them from it? We are told that the times of this ignorance God winked at: that he suffered all nations to walk after their own ways. If all the heathen nations were turned into a place of eternal misery, neither God, nor good men felt, or spoke, or acted, as if this was true.

“I have now finished what Dr. Campbell calls an endless labour, namely, to illustrate by an enumeration of all the passages in the Old Testament, that Sheol, rendered pit, grave, and hell in the common version, does not signify a place of endless misery. What he stated concerning this in the above extract, we think is strictly correct. Before closing my remarks on all these passages, there are a few facts and observations,

which have occurred in the examination of them, which deserve some notice.

“1st, The word translated everlasting, eternal, for ever, is never connected with Sheol or hell by any of the Old Testament writers. If they believed that this was a place of punishment for the wicked, and that it was endless in its duration, it is somewhat surprising that this should be the case. Every one knows, that these words are very often used there, but not in a single instance do the inspired writers in any way use them, when speaking of Sheol, or hell. So far from this, in some of the texts, it is said, hell is to be destroyed. We may then make an appeal to every candid mind, and ask, if hell in the Old Testament refers to a place of eternal misery, how are we to account for this? The fact is certain. To account for it, I leave to those who believe this doctrine. We read to be sure in books, and we have heard also in sermons, of an *eternal hell*, but such language, is not found in all the book of God, nor did it ever drop from the lips of any inspired writer.

“2d, Another fact equally certain is, that not only are the words eternal, everlasting, or for ever, omitted in speaking of Sheol or hell, but this place is not spoken about, as a place of misery, at all. Whether Sheol is translated pit, grave, or hell, in not one of the passages; is it described as a place of misery for the wicked, or for any one else. Before there need to be any dispute, whether the punishment in this place is to be of eternal duration, we have first to prove, that it is a place of punishment.”

That it is not described as a place of punishment, either short or long, is very evident from scripture language. We are informed that it is a place of silence, darkness, and ignorance, where is “no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom.” The manner in which the inspired writers of ancient times,

k of Sheol, or hell, in regard to themselves, render the subject palpably obvious. They speak of going to hell as a matter of course, as men now speak of death, or the grave. Could they have done this, the same views which modern christians have concerning it? Impossible. But, if the ideas of scribblers, relative to these words, were the same as those which we frequently hear from the pulpit, how shall we account for the incongruity of their expressions? Nothing which they say, intimates any idea as is generally attached to the words in former times. No word expressing endless duration is used in connexion. By what means then, are we to conclude they meant what they have not expressed? The truth is, that a departure from the *sense* of scripture, requires a departure from the *language* of scripture."

Whatever strength is gathered from preceding passages, are corroborated by a circumstance about which we cannot well be deceived. If the fears by which moderns are held in bondage, and frequently tormented to desperation, were harboured by the prophetic apostles, is it not beyond measure strange, that they have not somewhere expressed it? Do either of the writers of the sacred oracles, express a fear of eternal punishment, for himself, or others?—Who can affirm this? Do they anywhere express a belief that their writing, or preaching, would be availing to men from the horrors of an endless hell? No. Do they once intimate their fears for the safety of dead friends? No. But if they had these fears, and sorrows, they certainly had language in which to express them. We have accounts of the bereavement of parents, and friends, in very affecting circumstances, but not a word of these dreadful fears relative to their eternal welfare. In the affecting lamentation of David for the death of his parricidal son, not

a word escapes him which should lead us to conjecture that he formed the horrid idea of interminable misery. But if this was the current belief in those days, why was it not in some way expressed? We leave this for those to answer who think themselves competent to the task.

But does not Noah plead with God not to damn eternally the whole world of men? O no—he knew nothing about endless punishment in Sheol, or hell, and Gehenna was not then known. But Abraham knew that God was about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, and did he not plead for the people? Yes—but he never asked of Jehovah that they should be saved from a hell of future torment. He knew nothing of such a doctrine. The gospel, as preached to him, contained no *damnation*:—that has been added by his followers. The gospel with which he was acquainted, was *blessing* to the whole race of man, in these words—*In thee shall all nations be blessed*. Nor do we find in any other instance of exemplary destruction, that any person deplored the endless destruction of any individual, or nation, destroyed on account of his or their iniquities. But, if the doctrine were known in those days, why do we not learn this from Bible history? When the Ninevites were threatened with destruction, was a hint given, that a fearful and an endless hell, awaited them? Nothing like it is recorded of the preaching of Jonah. Nay, if endless misery were the threatening which he was commanded to preach, how does it appear that he was faithful to his duty? And further—if he knew this, what shall we say of his anger because God did not send to interminable destruction the inhabitants of a populous city? But was any prophet of the Lord ever sent with a threatening of hell torments, as a means of reclaiming the people? Every reader of the Bible knows better. The following extract from Mr. Bal<sup>o</sup>

four is worthy your careful attention, and to your better judgment we submit it.

“One thing we think must be admitted by all who have read the Old Testament with attention. It is this : good people in those days, do not appear to have had the fears and anxieties of mind which haunt men’s minds now, about their children, their relations, their neighbours, and a great part of mankind, as all going to a place of endless misery. You may read the Old Testament, until your eyes grow dim with age, before you find any thing like this there. How is this silence to be accounted for, if the doctrine of endless misery was known and believed ? If by Sheol they understood the same as men do now by the word hell, is it possible, that good people in those days could feel so easy on such a subject ? Whatever ideas they attached to this word, we think it is certain, they did not mean by it a place of endless misery.

The question is likely then to be asked, seeing that Sheol or hell does not mean a place of eternal misery, —what does it mean ? What is the idea which the Old Testament writers affixed to this word ? From the remarks already made, we think something has been said in answer to this question.—By Sheol, seems evidently to be meant, what Job calls, chap. 30 : 33,—“*The house appointed for all the living.*” And it is the same to which Solomon alludes, when he says, Eccles. 3 : 20.—“all go to one place.” The question still returns, What place is this ? What place it is, may be learned further from the following passages. In 2 Sam. 12 : 23. where David is speaking of his dead child, he says,—“I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.” This, it may be said, only provokes the question—where was his child ? In heaven, most people would answer, and some have quoted this text to prove the salvation of all infants. Nothing more, I conceive, is meant, nor could be rationally inferred.

from the text than this,—that his child was in the state of the dead, or in Sheol, and David, impressed with a sense of his own mortality, intimates, that he would soon follow him to the same place. So Jacob speaks of himself in a similar way in reference to his son Joseph. But further, we find in 1 Sam. 28 : 19. Samuel thus speaks to Saul, “to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me.” Where was this? It may be asked,—When Saul desired the woman to bring up Samuel, was it from heaven he expected him to come? Surely not; for in this case Samuel would have been brought down, not up. Was it then from hell, the place of eternal misery, he expected him to come? This cannot be admitted, for neither Saul, nor any one else, ever thought that Samuel was there. From what place then did Saul wish the woman to bring Samuel? I answer, from Sheol, the same place to which Jacob said he would go down mourning to Joseph. The same place in which the Saviour’s soul was not left. If Saul and his sons went to hell, a place of endless misery, it is certain Samuel was there before him. And it is equally certain, that if Samuel was in heaven, Saul and his sons were there soon after with him. But what appears simply to be meant is this,—Samuel was in Sheol, or the state of the dead, and the issue of the battle proved, that Saul and his sons were with Samuel, and with all the dead who had gone before them. As to the woman’s having power to bring Samuel from Sheol, we do not believe any such thing. We believe that she was an impostor, but this is not the place for assigning our reasons, or entering further into this part of the history of Saul. We have merely referred to it as showing what were the popular opinions in those days on the subject before us.

**SECTION VI.**

An examination of the only passage in the New Testament, where our Lord threatens the Jews with Gehenna punishment.

BY THE EDITOR.

As we are about to examine the most dreadful threatening which has been denounced against transgressors, let us come to the subject with minds solemnized by reflections on its vast importance. If this threatening is shown to require interminable misery for its accomplishment, our duty to ourselves, our country, and the world, calls upon us for its development. No circumstance, and no concern below the throne of God, should divert our minds from the most prayerful investigation, and the most untiring promulgation of the dreadful fact. Whatever have been our previous views of the subject, let us come to the examination with minds imbued with the love of truth, and a determination to sacrifice on her altar every prejudice, and every desire to turn away from what is contained in the oracles of God. If the *facts* be against us, we cannot reverse the determination of the Almighty—nor can we avoid the bright shining of the sun, by shutting our eyes on his refulgent beams.

The words under consideration are recorded by Mat. 23: 33. “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” We think every person will be satisfied, that if endless misery is not asserted in this passage, the doctrine is not taught in the New-Testament. In addition to the word Gehenna, which is here translated hell, and which Dr. Campbell *asserts*, is used to designate the place of endless misery, the word damnation is also added. Thus fortified with terrific horrors to the imagination of thousands, we venture to examine the citation fully and fearlessly, and to give our readers the result of the investigation.

We have already seen the concession of the learned, that neither Gehenna, nor any other word in the Old Testament, is there used to signify a place of endless, nor of limited misery, in any other world than this. It is past controversy, that if the ancient people of God knew no such place, they had no name by which to call it. The first question to be settled, is, how did those on whom Christ denounced this threatening, understand him? If we can learn the true answer to this question, the subject is closed, and the meaning demonstrated.

That we may gain the best light on the subject which our means will afford, we shall first present a few remarks from Dr. Campbell. He says,—“if the words and phrases employed by the apostles and evangelists, in delivering the revelation committed to them by the Holy Spirit, had not been agreeable to the received usage of the people to whom they spoke, their discourses, being unintelligible, could have conveyed no information, and consequently would have been no revelation to the hearers. Our Lord and his apostles, in publishing the gospel, first addressed themselves to their countrymen the Jews; a people who had, many ages before, at different periods, been favoured with other revelations.

“As the writings of the Old Testament are of a much earlier date, and contain an account of the rise and first establishment, together with a portion of the history of the nation to whom the gospel was first promulgated, and of whom were all its first missionaries and teachers, it is thence unquestionably that we must learn, both what the principal facts, customs, doctrines, and precepts are, that are alluded to in the apostolical writings, and what is the proper signification and extent of the expressions used.”

The good sense of this quotation is obvious, and we can render it no higher praise than by attending to its



instructions. We have then to inquire, what was the "received usage of the people" to whom Jesus addressed the words in question? This is easily answered by the fact, that Gehenna is "a compound of the two Hebrew words, *Ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem. That this valley formed a division line among the children of Israel, is evident by Josh. 15: 8. "And the border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom, unto the south side of the Jebusite; the same *is* Jerusalem: and the border went up to the top of the mountain that *lieth* before the valley of Hinnom westward, which *is* at the end of the valley of the giants northward." This is again mentioned in the same way, ch. 18: 16, and is occasionally noticed in other places of the Old Testament, in a way to put the subject of origin, as to the name, entirely out of dispute. Of the use to which they put this valley, we have already given abundant evidence. To a Jew, nothing could convey a more dreadful idea. Pollution and temporal suffering were the images with which the name was always associated, *after* it was used as a place of sacrifice for human victims, a depot of filth, and a repository for the carcasses of condemned malefactors.

As people have supposed that our Saviour used the term Gehenna as a figure to represent the sufferings of men in the invisible world, it may not be amiss to quote from the Old Testament, a prophecy which was on the eve of fulfilment when he delivered this threatening.

"The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Stand in the gate of the Lord's house, and proclaim there this word, and say, Hear the word of the Lord, all *ye of* Judah, that enter in at these gates to worship the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The

temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, *are* these. For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings; if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbour; *If* ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt: Then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers, for ever and ever. Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations? It is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? behold even I have seen *it*, saith the Lord. But go ye now unto my place which *was* in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel. And now, because ye have done all these works, saith the Lord, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not; therefore will I do unto *this* house, which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh. And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, *even* the whole seed of Ephraim. Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither left up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee. Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead *their* dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods, that they may provoke me to anger. Do they provoke me

to anger? saith the Lord: do they not provoke themselves to the confusion of their own faces? Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold, mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon that 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. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you. But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in the counsels and in the imagination of their evil heart, and went backward, and not forward. Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day; I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them; Yet they hearkened not unto me nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck: they did worse than their fathers. Therefore thou shalt speak all these words unto them: but they will not hearken to thee: thou shalt also call unto them; but they will not answer thee. But thou shalt say unto them, This is a nation that obeyeth not the voice of the Lord their God, not receiveth correction: truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth. Cut off thine hair, *O Jerusalem*, and cast it away, and take up a lamentation on high places; for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it. And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in

the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire ; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter : for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth ; and none shall fray them away. Then will I cause to cease from the cities of Judah, and from the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride : for the land shall be desolate.”

The reader is now requested to bear in mind the three last verses of this chapter, and while reading the 19th chapter, quoted below, notice the correspondence.

“ Thus saith the Lord, go and get a porter’s earthen bottle, and *take* of the ancients of the people, and of the ancients of the priests ; and go forth unto the valley of the son of Hinnom, which *is* by the entry of the east gate, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee ; and say, hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem : Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which *whosoever* heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents ; They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire *for* burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake *it*, neither came *it* into my mind : Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be

called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter. And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place ; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives ; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. And I will make this city desolate, and an hissing ; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished and hiss, because of all the plagues thereof. And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons, and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one of the flesh of his friend, in the siege and straitness wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their lives shall straiten them. Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, And shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Even so will I break this people, and this city, as *one* breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again ; and they shall bury *them* in Tophet, till *there be* no place to bury. This will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof, and *even* make this city as Tophet : And the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods. Then came Jeremiah from Tophet, whither the Lord had sent him to prophesy ; and he stood in the court of the Lord's house, and said to all the people, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, I will bring upon this city, and upon all her towns, all the evil that I have pronounced against it ; because they have hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words."

Having examined with good attention the preceding prophecies, we may be the better prepared to analyze

the threats of our Lord concerning Jerusalem. But first, let us inquire of what Jeremiah was directed to make Gehenna the emblem? Answer. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, even so [as Jeremiah was to break the bottle] will I break THIS PEOPLE, and this CITY, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again; and they shall bury *them* in TOPHET, till *there be* no place to bury. Thus will I do to this place, saith the LORD, and to the inhabitants thereof, and *even* make this city AS TOPHET." Gehenna then, was made an emblem of *pollution*, and *temporal misery*, and we shall soon see how our Lord applied it.

In the verse preceding the one under special consideration, the Jews are directed—"Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." What was this measure? Let the context answer:

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

The man who does not see that the threatening to make the city desolate, is a repetition of the prophecy by Jeremiah, is most certainly a dull scholar: That Christ here alludes to this prophecy, is evident, from his description of the *catastrophe*. But let it be particularly noted, that this punishment is denounced

against the Jews and their chief city only. It has no allusion to the punishment of wicked men generally, and therefore the apostles of our Lord never preached it to the Gentiles. The Jews, as a people, most evidently understood the language, for it was that of the prophets, and they must have understood it as they did the words of their prophecies. And that they did so understand it, is evident by the fact that Christ does not intimate any other meaning; nor do they express any surprise as they undoubtedly would, had he conveyed any ideas to their minds which were not usually associated with the language in common use.

That our Lord was foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem by the sword of the Romans, will hardly be disputed, by those who will carefully consider the prophecies just quoted. How the Lord "made void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem," is evident by the result of the siege, as well as the manner in which the disciples were saved by *believing* the words of their master respecting the suffering of that devoted people. They fled from Jerusalem to Pella, being persuaded the day of vengeance had arrived, in which the wrath had "come upon them to the uttermost." Josephus, the Jewish historian, testifies that the horrors of the siege, described Jer. 19: 9, were literally fulfilled in the generation of the apostles. In this light we also view the declaration, "Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon THIS GENERATION." But was this generation to be known in another world, and was all the blood of the prophets to be required at the hands of the Jews who heard our Saviour, in another state of existence? Impossible, that so flagrant a breach of every just rule of criticism should be deliberately practised by honest and discriminating minds. But as the labours of the orthodox are generally more acceptable than those of Universalists, we will give the celebrated Dr. Adam

Clarke's Commentary on Mat. 5: 22. "whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire."

"*Thou fool*.—A rebel against God, apostate from all good. This term implied, among the Jews, the highest enormity, and most aggravated guilt. Among the Gentoos, such an expression was punished by cutting out the tongue, and thrusting a hot iron, of ten fingers' breadth, into the mouth of the person who used it.

"Shall be in danger of hell fire.—Shall be liable to the hell of fire. Our Lord here alludes to the valley of the son of Hinnom. This place was near Jerusalem, and had been formerly used for those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews had caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch. A particular place in this valley was called *Tophet*, the *fire-stove*, in which some suppose they burnt their children alive to the above idol. From the circumstances of this valley having been the scene of those infernal sacrifices, the Jews, in our Saviour's time, used the word for hell, the place of the damned. [This is a mere supposition without a fact in its support.] It is very probable, that our Lord means no more here than this: If a man charge another with apostacy from the Jewish religion, or rebellion against God, and cannot prove his charge, then he is exposed to that punishment, (*burning alive*) which the other must have suffered, if the charge had been substantiated. There are three kind of offences here, which exceed each other in their degrees of guilt. 1st. Anger against a man, accompanied with some injurious act. 2dly. Contempt, expressed by the opprobrious epithet *raca*, or *shallow brains*. 3dly. Hatred and a mortal enmity, expressed by the term *moreh*, or *apostate*, where such apostacy could not be proved. Now, proportioned to these three offences were three different degrees of punishment, each exceeding the other in its



severity, as the offences exceeded each other in their different degrees of guilt. 1st. The judgment, the council of twenty-three, which could inflict the punishment of strangling. 2dly. The Sanhedrim, or great council, which could inflict the punishment of stoning. And 3dly, the being burnt alive in the valley of the son of Hinnom. This appears to be the meaning of our Lord."

As no man will accuse Dr. Clarke of wishing to countenance Universalists, we hope the facts which he has stated, and of which he was fully competent to judge, will have their due influence. That the Jews understood our Lord, in the foregoing quotation, to threaten any thing more than "being burnt alive in the valley of the son of Hinnom," to which punishment the Sanhedrim could condemn them, no man, we believe, will venture to affirm. If he attached any other meaning to the term *γεεννα τον πυρος*, the burning of Gehenna, we have no means of ascertaining the fact. And can *κρισις*, *condemnation, judgment*, add to, or alter the place, or Gehenna? Nobody will pretend this. Why then, need we seek among the moderns, or the pagans of antiquity, for a meaning to certain words and phrases, not known to the Jewish Scriptures? The question is not, and cannot be, What do the moderns believe, or affirm, relative to these things? But, what did the Jews believe, and to what purpose did they apply them—and what was their understanding of the terms? We have seen by the Old Testament with what view the prophets used them, and of what they were made the emblems. If our Lord employed them in another sense, the fact has not come down to us, and analogy is utterly against it.

But, whatever meaning men may attach to the phrase damnation of hell, or punishment of Gehenna, one thing is well to remember—it was never threatened to any but Jews, nor to them but by our Lord. The

whole system therefore fails, as applied to the Gentiles. Few of the Gentile nations knew any thing about Gehenna, and none but Jews could be supposed familiar with their localities, and peculiar customs.

As this is evidently a prophetic warning of the destruction of the Jewish nation and polity, we may gain further information by consulting corresponding passages in the other evangelists. In Mark 13: 14, we read a quotation from Daniel, which will presently be examined. "But when YE shall SEE the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not (LET HIM THAT READETH UNDERSTAND) then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains." That this is an account of the same discourse noticed by Mat. 23: is too obvious to gainsay. But can we see the propriety of *fleeing to the mountains*, if the torments of hell in a future world, are threatened in this passage? A reference to Dan. 12: 11: will set us right in this matter, and point to the very time of Jerusalem's overthrow. "And from the time that the daily *sacrifice* shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, *there shall be* a thousand two hundred and ninety days." At what time was this to happen? Answer, v. 7. "When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these *things* shall be finished." But when? See v. 1.—"there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, *even to* that same time." But how does this settle it? Answer—By reference to our Lord's words, Mat. 24: 21. "For THEN [at the destruction of Jerusalem, when the power of the holy people, the Jews, should be scattered] shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor EVER SHALL BE." Could any thing be more definite? Such an entire destruction, so much suffering, had not

occurred before the time of our Saviour, and he declares should not again happen. Daniel then describes this very time, of which our Lord prophesied, as about to happen in that generation. The description is perfect, and the *time* of the accomplishment of the prophecies respecting that city, put beyond a cavil. How then does the tenet of endless misery gather an iota of strength from this passage? The *hope*, if so dreadful, so diabolical a HOPE could be cherished, is certainly a forlorn one.

In the account of this same prediction given us by Luke, we find no cause for variation in the views already given.

“ And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side; and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.”

We now ask why Jesus wept over the city? Was his grief occasioned by a prospective view of their sufferings in an endless hell? The enemies of his people would cast up a trench, besiege the city, and take it. That city, the pride of Palestine, and of the nations, with its temple, was to be razed to the ground, and great wrath was to be poured upon that people. But nothing is said of their miseries in another world. Nor did he, immediately prior to his crucifixion, utter a syllable like it. “ Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.” Why this weeping for themselves and children? On account of the desolation of the city, most

certainly, and the sore afflictions which are the concomitants of war, and the horrors of a siege. He knew that the delicate women would seethe their own children, and that the most dreadful tortures awaited them. And in Mat. 24: 19, 20, the reason of this admonition is made apparent. "And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days." The reason is obvious. "For then shall be great tribulation." Whether a combination of the horrors of war, famine, pestilence, and intestine divisions, were not sufficiently dreadful to render his commiseration pertinent to the occasion, let those judge, who have experienced but *one* of these evils at a time—or let him or her who can feel for other's wo, read the history of the Jewish wars, and judge righteous judgment.

But we think sufficient has been written, to convince every reasonable being, who is in earnest to understand the subject, that "damnation of hell," or the condemnation of Gehenna, has no allusion to future limited, or interminable punishment, and that the threatening was long ago fulfilled on the outcasts of Israel.

But we shall now notice some facts, to show that if the term Gehenna, always translated hell, in the common version, really signifies a place of inexpressible torture in a future state of being, it is certainly remarkable, that this word is not more frequently used in the New-Testament. The whole number of times which Gehenna is found in the New-Testament, is but twelve. That it was not used as many times as it *appears*, is evident from the circumstance, that the different evangelists relate the same discourses, and several are therefore a repetition. In the various places used, it is imputed to our Lord *eleven* times, and to James *once*. No other disciple of our Lord, nor one solitary apostle, uses it a single time, in *any* way. James, speaking of an unruly tongue, says it is set on

fire of Gehenna, or hell. In this case, it is so evidently used figuratively, that it needs no comment. But what shall we say of the messengers who were sent out into the world to preach the *gospel* to every creature? Is not the preaching of hell torments, *gospel*, or good news? If it were, why did they not thus preach? or if they did so preach, why do we not hear something about it? Let those who believe their master thus taught them, offer an excuse for their negligence.

But did Christ ever hint, that God had reserved to himself the privilege of inflicting endless pains on any of his creatures, either for unbelief, or an unholy life? No—never. In the passage which we have just examined, the affirmative method of asking the question, renders it certain they could not, by any means, avoid the punishment of Gehenna. Had they been able to avoid this catastrophe, the prophecy must have failed, and the 25th of Matthew, instead of proving Christ a true prophet, would have proved both him, and Jeremiah, and Daniel, false prophets!

In the next section, we shall examine all the remaining passages in the New-Testament where the word Gehenna occurs.



## SECTION VII.

The remaining places where Gehenna occurs in the New-Testament fairly examined.

BY THE EDITOR.

WHOSO READETH, LET HIM UNDERSTAND.

In our previous examination of Gehenna, we have endeavoured to show, that the Jews did not under-

stand a place of endless misery by the use of this word. It was in common use among the Hebrews as the name of a polluted place near Jerusalem, of which they needed no explanation. But if they did not impute any other meaning to the word, under the Mosaic dispensation, by what means should they gain the knowledge that the same word in the mouth of Christ, should be subject to a different definition? To those who profess to believe that the term conveyed to the Jews the same ideas which are attached to it by the moderns, belongs the burden of proof. We shall content ourselves with a demonstration of the negative.

A particular point to which we now wish to turn your attention, is the language at the head of this section. Christ, referring to the prophecy of Daniel, relative to the destruction of Jerusalem, points directly to the understanding which the Jews had of their prophetic language—*whoso readeth, let him UNDERSTAND*. But how were they to *understand*, by a reference to the language of their prophets, that which had never been predicted? Daniel predicted the overthrow and dismemberment of the Jewish nation, and the consequent dispersion of the people. This was to come upon them for their iniquities, and the description of their iniquities, and the consequences which would result from them, are the same, as given by Daniel and by Christ. The *time* is reduced to the most accurate certainty of which language is capable. The damnation of hell spoken of by Christ, is therefore the same to which the prophet refers. But this is so plain, that we doubt if any one who has intelligence and honesty will doubt it.

As Mat. 5: 22, has already received particular attention, we have but ten passages left for examination. To these then we shall attend, after a few explanatory remarks.

The term Gehenna, was never used but to the Jews, unless accompanied by an explanation. To the Gentiles it is never threatened in the New-Testament. Let every one examine for himself, the places where it is mentioned, and no reasoning of ours will be necessary, to demonstrate the fact. Our Saviour, indeed, was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and it may be contended that he could not be supposed to denounce a threatening to those who were not the subjects of his ministry. But what shall we say of the ministry of the apostles? Did they in a single instance, threaten the damnation of hell to their hearers, whether Jew or Gentile? Search their preaching through, as recorded in the Acts of the apostles, and not one instance can be found of this threatening. Whatever then be the meaning of the term, either the apostles were unfaithful or incompetent teachers, or the denunciation of suffering in Gehenna was not a part of their ministry.

But another remark, calculated to throw light on this subject, is, that in nine of the twelve places where Gehenna occurs, it is specially directed to his particular disciples. To them he spoke, as if it might be avoided, but to the unbelieving Jews, as their certain doom. But is this the practice of modern teachers? we all know it is not. Those who are in the churches are considered as *in* the ark of safety; while those who are *without*, are often mentioned as fit fuel for hell fire. Did John, the forerunner of Christ, once mention, even to the Jews, the punishment of Gehenna? No. True, he inquired, Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? But he never mentioned, that this wrath was to be exemplified in a coming state. The wrath to come, was the wrath coming upon the Jewish nation, from which the believers in Jesus escaped. Signs were given them, by which they well understood the calamities which were ready to be poured out on their country.

Let us now attend to Mat. 23 : 15. Here a *wō* is pronounced on Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites, who make their proselytes two fold more the children of hell than themselves. As we have already seen to what hell these Jews were liable, and which they could not escape, in the examen of the 33d verse of this chapter, perhaps very little will be necessary on this subject. Let it then be observed, that proselytes from another faith, are more frequently the recipients of unholy zeal, and blind fanaticism, than those by whom they have been converted. To ingratiate themselves into the good will of their spiritual fathers, requires a more constant regard to the prescribed regimen of the sect, and an over-solicitude for the well-being of the sect which they have joined, lest they be accused of lukewarmness. And in this view of the subject, we see how much more likely would be the opposition of proselytes to bring on themselves swift destruction, than that of even the Jews. No man in his senses, would contend, that if both Jews, and Gentile converts to Judaism, were to be endlessly miserable, the proselytes would be "doubly damned."

As to Mat. 5 : 29, 30, we cannot better express our own impressions, than by quoting from Mr. Balfour's remarks on them.

"What did our Lord mean by these offending them? It is well known that the word translated offend, signifies to cause to stumble, and is in some places translated a stumbling block. By their right eye or hand offending them, then, must be meant, their unsubdued passions and propensities causing them to stumble and fall from their profession of Christ's name. If these proved a stumbling block, or caused them to offend, they thereby exposed themselves to the punishment of hell fire. It was profitable, therefore, for them to subdue these, or to part with them, though dear to them as members of their bodies, than expose



themseves to such a punishment. This, so far, I presume, will be allowed as our Lord's meaning, whatever sense we give the word *Gehenna* or *hell* in this passage. Is it then asked—What does our Lord mean by *Gehenna* or *hell*? I answer, the very same punishment which he threatened the unbelieving Jews with, Mat. 23 : 33, when he said to them, “how can ye escape the damnation of hell?”—If his disciples indulged their lusts, and proved apostates from their profession, they should be involved in the same dreadful calamities with the rest of the Jewish nation. Accordingly, he said to his disciples, Mat. 24 : 13,—“he that shall endure to the end, the same shall be saved.” If the question is asked,—Saved from what? The context clearly shows, that they should be saved from all the temporal calamities foretold by our Lord, which were to come on that generation. All who did endure to the end of the Jewish state, were saved. M'Knight, in a note on Mat. 24 : thus writes :—“The people of the church in Jerusalem being ordered by an oracle given to the faithful in that place, by revelation, left the city before the war, and dwelt in a city of Perea, the name of which was Pella.” This oracle, perhaps, was no other than the information our Lord gave his disciples in Mat. 24. If they attended to it, they needed no other oracle. But I only notice this, without pretending to decide about it. As to his disciples, the following is very evident. Patient enduring to the end, was not only connected with their temporal safety, but attention to the directions given Mat. 24. If one of them, being in the field, returned back to take his clothes, the safety promised might not be obtained. No worldly consideration was to be an apology for a moment's delay, but with the utmost speed they were to make their escape. When our Lord spoke of the punishment of hell to the unbelieving Jews, he mentioned it as a thing they could not es-

cape. "How can ye escape the damnation of hell? They had nearly filled up the measure of their iniquity, and upon them was to come all the righteous judgments shed upon the earth. But when he spoke to the disciples about this punishment, he spoke of it as a thing they might escape, if they attended to the instructions which he gave them. See Matth. 24 : where he is at great pains in pointing out the course they should pursue, if they would avoid the impending destruction.

We then see a very good reason why our Lord said so much to his disciples about the punishment of hell, and so little to the unbelieving Jews. All that our Lord said about hell does not mean a place of endless misery, but the temporal calamities coming on the Jews, which he said about it is just what might be expected. But can it ever be rationally and scripturally accounted for, that our Lord should only once mention the damnation of hell to the unbelieving Jews, if by he meant a punishment in eternal torment? Does not this view rationally and Scripturally account for the very extraordinary fact, that not a word about hell or Gehenna is said to the Gentiles by any inspired writers? How is the fact to be accounted for on the common view given of the punishment of Gehenna? If my view be allowed correct, it rationally, and I think Scripturally, accounts for these things. That it does account for them, is some evidence that it is correct.

"Let us now consider the language of this passage and see if it does not confirm these views of the subject. It is said twice,—“and that thy whole body shall be cast into hell, or Gehenna.” This language is not in unison with the common ideas entertained of hell. Do we ever hear a preacher tell his audience that their “whole body shall be cast into hell, or body and soul shall be cast into it?” No ; the

How that the soul only goes there at death, and the body returns to the dust, and not at least until the resurrection, do both go there together. The phrase "thy whole body," appears to be of the same import with that expressed in another passage by the words "*soul and body.*" We shall show hereafter, that by the word *soul*, is not meant, as is generally believed, the *spirit*, which exists in a separate state from the body, but natural life. See on Mat. 10 : 28. below. Another thing ought to be noticed, that preachers now only threaten men with the punishment of hell if they continue in unbelief; but here our Lord threatened his disciples with it if they did not cut off a right hand, and pluck out a right eye; or, in plain language, did not part with every thing dear to them, rather than disobey the Saviour. Besides, he said most about hell to those in least danger of it, and only mentioned it once to those in the greatest danger.—The conduct of preachers in our day, about this, is precisely the reverse of his. All they say of hell is said to the wicked.

"By consulting the context of this passage, it will be seen, that there is nothing in it to support the idea, that hell is a place of endless misery. Any evidence it affords, rather goes to prove the view I have given of it. But as a consideration of it, would only lead to similar remarks made already, I pass it over."

As to Mat. 18 : 8, 9, these are so obviously of the same import, that any thing which can be said, would be a mere repetition. It may not be amiss, to state that the use of the term fire, as connected with God's judgments on the Jewish nation, is not a new application of the word for the purpose. Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Amos, Jeremiah, and David, all used it in this manner, and we have before seen, that if the Jews were not to understand the words used by Christ, as they had been accustomed to understand the writings

of the prophets, the labour of Christ must have been worse than vain. Nay, they must have been designedly obscured for the very purpose of deceiving the unwary.

Let us now quote 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, 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, 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-fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.”

Notwithstanding the length, and terrific appearance of this passage, whoever reads it may soon be satisfied that it is only a repetition of the same discourse noticed in Matt. 18: 8, 9. Commentators allow that Mark wrote at Alexandria, or at all events, out of Jewry, which laid on him the necessity of adding to the term Gehenna, *the fire that never shall be quenched*. This addition was not necessary in Judea, where every thing relative to Gehenna was known, while to Gentiles it was absolutely important for the true understanding of the language. Nevertheless, it is now considered as next to proof positive that a state of punishment in a post mortem state, is clearly taught in the New Testament. But this idea originates from a false view of the subject. The contrast exhibited is supposed to justify this view, which a brief examination will exhibit in a very different light from the

common sentiment. Christians have supposed that the phrases, to enter into life, into the kingdom of God, and into the kingdom of heaven, all allude to a state of immortal beatitude in a future world. That this is not their meaning, is soon made obvious, by a recurrence to the scriptures where they are used. Dr. Campbell says on this very passage, "they must lay aside their ambition and worldly pursuits, before they be honored to be the members, much more the ministers, of that new establishment he was about to erect." Mr. Balfour, on this passage, has the following:—

"Thus in Luke 21: 31, 32. "so ye, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled." It is evident from this passage, that the kingdom of God, in some sense or other, was not to come till the end of the Jewish dispensation. It was at this period to come with power, Mark 9: 1. and comp. Matth. 16: 28. See Whitby on these texts, who takes the same view of our Lord's kingdom which is here given. But in proof of this view of entering into Christ's kingdom, I shall here quote the following from Dr. Campbell's note on Matth. 19: 28. He 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* *γενεσις*, a remarkable restoration, or *renovation* of the face of things, was very suitably termed *παλιγγενεσία*. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said on 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.*

“Let us now apply these remarks to the texts under consideration. To enter into life, or to enter into the kingdom of God, is in the passage before us contrasted with going into, or being cast into hell. As the former does not mean to enter into heaven, the place of the righteous, but into Christ’s kingdom, or reign, in this world, so the latter cannot mean, to cast into a place of endless misery, but to suffer the punishment of which we have seen Gehenna made an emblem.” Understanding our Lord, “by entering into life,” or “into the kingdom of God,” in this way, what he says in this passage to his disciples, was pertinent, and peculiarly suited to their circumstances. It was “better,” it was “profitable” for them thus to enter into his kingdom with the loss of every thing dear to them, rather than retaining these, to be cast into hell fire, or to suffer all the dreadful calamities foretold by Jeremiah in the predictions considered above, and described by our Lord, Matth. 24. At the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the unbelieving Jews were to suffer the damnation of hell, and at this period all his disciples who endured to the end, were not only to be saved from this punishment, but were to enter into his kingdom, or reign with him; and the apostles to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But such of his professed disciples as did not cut off a right hand and pluck out a right eye, or did not endure to the end, should share in the same calamities, or suffer the punishment of

which we have seen Gehenna made an emblem by Jeremiah, and also by our Lord. Whitby, on Luke 21. 34—36. thus writes:—"Here our Saviour calls upon the believing Christians to take care, and use the greatest vigilance that they do not miscarry in this dreadful season, by reason of that excess and luxury which may render them unmindful of it, or those cares which may render them unwilling to part with their temporal concerns, lest they should be involved in that ruin which would come on others, as a snare, suddenly and unexpectedly; and that they should add to this vigilance constant prayer to God, that they may be found worthy to escape those tremendous judgments, and might stand safely and boldly before the Son of man, when he comes to execute them on the unbelieving Jews.

"It is easily seen that this passage not only agrees with the preceding texts, but also accounts for the fact why the Saviour should say so much to the disciples concerning hell or Gehenna, and so little to the unbelieving Jews. Besides, it also accounts for the fact which can never be accounted for on the common view of hell, namely, that not a word is said concerning it to the Gentiles. If the punishment of hell be as I have attempted to show, the temporal vengeance which came on the Jewish nation, all is plain, consistent, and rational. But how can it ever be accounted for on rational and Scriptural grounds, that no Gentile was ever threatened with such a punishment? We are sinners of the Gentiles, and are threatened with everlasting punishment in hell by preachers in our day. It becomes them to account for this, seeing they are without any authority either from Christ or his apostles for so doing. If *they* never said a word about hell in their preaching to the Gentiles, from what source of information is it learned that *preachers now* are authorized to teach such a

doctrine to them? Are we obliged to receive this implicitly on their *ipse dixit*?

Relative to the peculiar phraseology of this passage, the acute writer quoted above, says:—

“It is then, said of hell or Gehenna,—“where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Were these words understood *strictly*, and *literally* of a place of *endless misery*, it would prove that there is not only *material fire* there, but that there are also *worms* in hell. Some have maintained, and a few perhaps still maintain, that the fire of hell is a literal fire. It is evident that most orthodox preachers still continue to speak as if the fire of hell was real, literal fire. Why speak about it as such if they do not believe it to be so, unless they intend to practise deception on the people? But we presume no one ever believed that there were *worms* in the place called hell, or eternal misery. If such an opinion was ever held, we are ignorant of it. But why not believe that there are worms in hell as well as literal fire? for if Gehenna signifies a place of endless misery, it teaches *literal fire* and *literal worms* on the same authority? Besides, it is implied that the body is there, for worms to feed on, which they could not do on the spirit. I am fully aware that the worm that shall never die, has been long and universally interpreted to mean *conscience*, which is to torment the subject of it forever. But this is a *private interpretation*; for I do not know of a single text in the Bible, in which *conscience* is ever spoken of under the figure of a *worm*, either in this or a future state of existence. Unless then, something like proof of this is produced from the Bible, such an interpretation cannot be for a moment admitted. It may then be asked,—“what do these words mean?” Let us hear what Mr. Parkhurst says on the words,—“where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched.” He thus writes



on the word Gehenna :—" Our Lord seems to allude to the worms which continually preyed on the dead carcasses that were cast out into the valley of Hinnom, *γσηννα*, and to the *perpetual fire* there kept up to consume them. Comp. Eccles. 7 : 17. Judith 16 : 17. And see the learned Joseph Mede's works, fol. p. 31." Here then is a place where their worm dieth not, and the fire that shall never be quenched ; not in a place of eternal misery in a future state, but in the valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem. Let it now be recollected, that the valley of Hinnom was made an emblem of the terrible calamities which were to come on the Jewish nation. No place was so wretched and abominable as the valley of Hinnom, and no place known to a Jew, could be made so fit an emblem of such miseries.

" But we have something more to produce, and something which we think ought to be admitted as conclusive, in determining in what sense our Lord's words ought to be understood in this passage.—It is certain then, that our Lord here quotes Isai. 61 : 24. where it is said,—“ 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.”—A remark is made by Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing, p. 69. which very well applies here. He says,—“ 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 and necessary this passage from the Old Testament is, in explaining the words of our Lord before us. Suffer me then to ask,—did Isaiah mean a place of endless misery, when he said, “ for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be

quenched?" Was Isaiah so understood when he uttered these words? I have to ask further, did Jews so understand these words when they read them in the prophet? Yea, I ask still further, did Lord's disciples so understand the prophet's words when they read them there? Can any or all of these questions, with truth, be answered in the affirmative? As this will not be so much as pretended, how could it pass that they are made to mean a place of less misery when quoted by our Lord? By what rule of interpretation, do we make Isaiah, by these words, only to mean temporal calamities, but when our Lord quotes them, we make them to mean less misery? I urge this; on what grounds, on what authority do we make Isaiah and our Lord have two such different meanings to the same words? Yea, I press it upon all who regard the words of living God, to think how it was possible that Lord's disciples could understand him in this sense when those very words were understood by the Jews so very different a sense when they read them in the prophet? It is evident our Lord did not explain them in this new sense to the disciples, nor give the slightest hint that he made any alteration in the meaning of the prophet's words by quoting them. Until it is therefore proved, that by these words Isaiah meant a place of future endless misery, I might excuse myself from any further remark on them. But as they very strongly confirm the words of our Lord, I have given of Gehenna or hell, in the preceding passages, I proceed.

“ On this passage in the prophet, let it be remembered, that the chapter in which it stands, evidently relates to events which were to take place under the new gospel dispensation. The new heavens and new earth, mentioned verse 22, refer to this period, the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles, is re-

edly spoken of in the course of the chapter. But let us attend to the passage, and go over what is said in it, and if possible ascertain the meaning of the prophet. It is said,—“and they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me.” Let us ask here, who are the men referred to, and who are said to have transgressed against the Lord? I think the context shows them to be the unbelieving, disobedient Jews. Evidence of this will appear as we proceed. Again; let us ask, who shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the Jews who had thus transgressed against the Lord? The preceding verses *show* that they are the persons who *worship* and *obey* the Lord. But again; let us ask, to what place they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who have transgressed against the Lord? Not surely to a place of endless misery? The connexion of this with the next part of the passage shows that they shall go forth to the place where “their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” If it is said, by way of objection,—“is not this the place of endless misery, and is not this sufficiently obvious from the words, their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched? I must answer, it is not. We think this can be proved from a variety of evidence, which few, if any, will undertake to dispute. This we shall show presently is not the Scripture meaning of these expressions, but that they refer to temporal punishment and to the punishment of the Jews as a nation. Here I would only ask—do any persons go forth either from this world or from heaven to a place of endless misery, to look upon the carcasses of men who have transgressed against the Lord? Besides, is it not a very strange mode of speaking, to speak of the carcasses of persons in a place of endless misery? But if we understand this place to be as to-

phet, or the valley of Hinnom, all this may be literally and affectingly true. We have seen from the predictions of Jeremiah, that the Lord was to make the city of Jerusalem as tophet, and the carcasses of the Jews were to be meat for the beasts of the earth, and that they should bury in tophet until there should be no place to bury. Besides, we have seen from Josephus, the Jewish historian, that six hundred thousand of the carcasses of the Jews were carried out of the city and left unburied. It is evident then, if those who worshipped and obeyed the Lord, did not go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the Lord, it was not for want of opportunity. Suffer me, then, to ask, might not the worshippers of the Lord, or our Lord's disciples, literally go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the Lord? Yea, could they avoid seeing them, and looking on them, when they left the city and were saved from the dreadful vengeance of God which came on the unbelieving part of the nation? But it is added, "and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." This all will allow to be said to the same persons, who, in the former part of the passage, are said to have transgressed against the Lord. It will be allowed that the Jews had transgressed against the Lord in a very great degree. They had crucified the Lord of glory, persecuted the apostles, they pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. In this respect we see that the passage fully applies to them. Let us see how the last part also applies to them. "And they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." The phrase "all flesh," it could be easily shown, is used in Scripture to designate the Gentile nations. As one instance, among others which I might adduce to prove this, it is said,—“all flesh shall see the salvation of God.” Now it is literally

true that the Jews then were, and still are, in their descendants, an abhorring unto all the Gentile nations. They have been, and still are, a by-word, and a reproach, and an afflicted people, among all the nations of the earth. How long this is still to continue, God only knows. Sure we are, that the Lord is yet to have mercy upon Israel: they are still beloved for the fathers' sake. The deliverer is to come out of Zion, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

“ But let it be noticed, that it is three times said in the passage in Mark, where this passage from the prophet is is quoted, “ where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Let the question be asked, “ Whose worm shall not die ? We think the answer to this must be looked for in the prophet whose words our Lord quotes. The answer is, the men who have transgressed against the Lord ; their worm shall not die, and their fire is not quenched. Should we recur to the context of the passage in Mark for an answer to this question, the only antecedent to the word *their*, is the persons who should offend Christ's little ones, verse 42. This agrees to the answer taken from the prophet ; for the Jews were the greatest opposers and persecutors of Christ's disciples.”

Having already shown that temporal judgments are signified by fire under the old dispensation, we have now to show that the addition of *everlasting*, and the declaration that it *never shall be quenched*, do not furnish any additional proof of the proper use, of these passages, in the common mode of application. The prophet Isaiah furnishes us several specimens of this sort, which shall be duly noticed. “ And the strong shall be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench

them." *Isa.* 1 : 31. See also in the 34th chap follows :

"For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, a year of recompenses for the controversy of And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land th shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quen night nor day ; the smoke thereof shall go up l er : from generation to generation it shall lie w none shall pass through it for ever and ever. B cormorant and the bittern shall possess it ; the also and the raven shall dwell in it : and he stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the of emptiness."

Here we see that for ever, the same as everla is applied to the temporal judgments coming on salem, and that brimstone and burning pitch are as emblems of destruction, and that of a tempor ture. But what shall we understand by *for e* this place? answer, from generation to generatio whole time which these prophetic calamities w continue. Jeremiah, in predicting the affli which should come on this rebellious people, s ing of the fury which should be poured out them, says, "it shall burn, and shall *not be quenc* The same prophet, 4 : 4, says—"lest a fire sho kindled which *none can quench*." But it is per obvious, that he is alluding to temporal judgn But Ezekiel is very explicit, 20 : 47, 48. "An to the forest of the south, Hear the word of the I Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will kindle in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in and every dry tree : the flaming flame shall n quenched, and all faces from the south to the shall be burned therein."

Here then is the fire, the flaming flame, whic are twice told shall not be quenched. But doe

the whole scope of the subject show, that all the threat includes nothing beyond the sufferings of time? If everlasting burnings in prophetic usage did not signify endless misery, how should the Jews who heard our Lord, be supposed thus to understand him?

That Isaiah, in speaking of everlasting burnings, ch. 33 : 14, alluded to the hypocritical, wicked Jews, is very obvious by the phraseology. Sinners in Zion were said to be afraid, and fearfulness had surprised the *hypocrites*. That the sinners in Zion is a phrase peculiarly applicable to the Jewish nation, will not be disputed, nor will any man deny that the hypocrites noticed, are the same sinners before mentioned. All is then plain. The whole is applied to the Israelitish nation, and to *that alone*. This also agrees with the common language of our Lord, who brands them as hypocrites, and pronounces many woes upon them as such. On this subject, we shall take the liberty of again quoting Mr. Balfour.

“ Let us consider what kind of punishment the prophet, in this passage, is speaking about? It is not doubted that he does speak of punishment, for it is here alleged that he is speaking of future eternal punishment. But from what in the passage is this learned? It is learned, we presume, by those who take this view of the text, 1st, From the words *fire* and *burnings* being used. But we have shown above, that the word fire, is only a figure used in Scripture to describe temporal punishment, and is used to describe the temporal vengeance which came on the Jews, at the destruction of their city and temple. This we think is placed beyond all fair debate. 2d, We presume eternal misery is supposed to be taught in this passage also, from the word *everlasting* being applied to the word *burnings*. But that the word everlasting is applied to temporal punishment, and to this very temporal punishment of the Jews, is also

beyond a doubt. This has been partly seen already, and we shall see it plainly stated in the next passage. When in the passage before us it is said, "who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" it is just expressing, under another figure, what is expressed in the following texts: "how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" "who hath warned you to flee from the impending vengeance, or wrath to come?" That both referred to the same period we think may be seen from the context. See verses 11, 12, 18, 19. Something, then, must be discovered in this text more than the words *fire*, *burnings*, and *everlasting*, to prove that eternal misery in a future state is taught in it. Indeed we think had attention been paid to the figurative use of the word *fire* in the Old Testament, and the way in which the word *everlasting* is often used there, much perversion of the oracles of God might have been avoided. In confirmation of the view I have given of this passage, I may add the following. As in the passage, the condition of the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation is referred to at the destruction of their city and temple, so in the context the condition of our Lord's disciples is described. See verses 15—17. From verse 20, to the end of the chapter, the peace and prosperity of the Christian church is described. We have said enough to show that this passage does not teach the doctrine of endless punishment in a future state. We have also given what we conceive to be the general meaning of the prophet. Should we be mistaken as to its true sense, yet we think the other never can be proved from it. But as we do not wish to depend on any text of doubtful meaning in support of our views, we shall introduce the following, about which there can be no dispute.



“The passage I refer to, 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.” This passage affords no room for debate. The Jews are the persons spoken about : the punishment threatened, all will allow, is of a temporal nature : that it refers to the punishment which came on the Jews at the destruction of their city and temple, will not be doubted : and that it is said to be perpetual and everlasting, is in as many words declared. I may just notice, that the word *perpetual*, in this last passage, is the same in the original as the word *everlasting*, and is the same word which is translated everlasting, perpetual, and forever, in other passages. After attending to these texts we think it will no longer be doubted, that the temporal vengeance which came on the Jews at the destruction of their city and temple, is called *everlasting*, and also is described under the figure of *fire*. But did the Jews understand the words everlasting or perpetual to mean, in these texts, endless duration ? We presume this will not be affirmed. It may be asked, and it is a very proper question to ask,—How comes it to pass, that this punishment of the Jews, of a temporal nature, is described as everlasting, perpetual, as everlasting fire, and a fire that never shall be quenched ? To this I answer, that any one who has examined the Scriptures on the subject, knows, that *olm*, of the Hebrew, *aion*, and *aionion*, of the Greek, are often used to express limited duration. They are often used to express a shorter or longer period of time, as the subjects to which they are applied require. I might illustrate this by many examples, if it were necessary.”

dently had no belief in endless sufferings, why did the Saviour, instead of using the language of scriptures, give them to understand that his message was different from that of their prophets, though couched it in the same words? When any man give a rational reply to this question, we shall be to listen.

We shall now make a remark, on which we are persuaded very little room will be left for debate. *The language of the New-Testament is that of the Old.* Every careful reader must be sensible of this, and we believe the former will ever be well understood without a knowledge of the latter. The expression of Mr. Balfour, respecting this remark, is so complete to the purpose, that it ought to be cited in this place and never forgotten. *The Old Testament is the* GLOSSARY *of the language of the New.*

In examining Mat. 10: 28, let it be recalled that our Lord addressed his *immediate disciples*, in the following language:—"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Compare this with its parallel, Luke

As the great object of the Messiah was to close the old, and to introduce the new dispensation, of which the former was but a *shadow*, of GOOD THINGS to come, we find a great proportion of the New-Testament parables pointed to this event. As the revolution was to be so great, no wonder the Saviour so frequently cautioned his disciples to beware of the fate which was certainly coming on their country. In this light we view this discourse to his disciples. They were to endure persecution, and many trials, which an apostle calls "fiery trials;" but these cautions are so numerous that they need not be cited. The circumstance which may labour in the minds of some very honest people, is the use of the word *soul*, which is by common usage considered the *spirit*, or immortal part of man. The word will therefore be particularly examined.

The word ψυχη, *psuche*, here rendered soul, is thus rendered from *Nephish*, of the O. T. In speaking of this word, Mr. Pilkington has the following remarks. He says, it "is sometimes used expletively, sometimes means life, sometimes the whole man, and sometimes is applied to the irrational part of creation." Among its various uses we quote the following:—Gen. 12: 13, my *soul* shall live because of thee. 10: 20, let me escape thither, and my *soul* shall live. Exod. 12: 16, which every *soul* must eat. Lev. 5: 2, if a *soul* touch any unclean thing. 20: 11, if the priest buy a *soul* with his money. Num. 11: 6, our *soul* is dried away: 31: 23, one *soul* of five hundred, both of the men, and of the beeves, and of the asses, and of the sheep. Ps. 57: 4, my *soul* is among lions: 106: 15, he sent Jeanness into their *soul*. Mat. 2: 20, they are dead which sought the young child's *psuhe*, or *life*. 7: 25, take no thought for your *life*, *psuhe*—Luke 12: 23, the life, *psuhe*, is more than meat. But the cases are so numerous, that one has but to read and satisfy him-

self, that the principle laid down is correct. That the word is used expletively, or as might otherwise be expressed by the word unnecessarily, at least in our idiom, in one of these instances, is evident by comparing the different expressions of Matthew and Luke. One mentions the destruction of soul and body in hell, while the other speaks of God as being able to cast into hell. The *distinction* which appears to obtain between the terms soul and body, is a mere Hebraism, as is evident from Matthew's account, which is allowed to have been written in Hebrew. But let us suppose that both body and spirit, the corporeal and the intellectual part of man are here intended, and that by hell we are to understand a place of suffering in the coming life. Will this agree with the orthodox theory? Who of all our opponents, believes that a corruptible body, with an immortal spirit, will be consigned to literal fire in a future state? Not one thus believes. We know that the body is scattered among the elements of which it is composed, and that dust returns to dust. But perhaps those who see the difficulty in this view of the text, are ready to refer this to the resurrection-state. This is assuming too much, for not the least intimation is here given of a resurrection. But it is not said that God will do this. His *power* is represented, not his *designs*. But, even if this were admitted as a certain catastrophe, we have no data on which to build the doctrine of endless misery. Nay, if we understand *kill*, and *destroy*, as equally applicable to both body and Spirit, it is very evident that *annihilation* is more probably meant, than ceaseless misery, for not the least hint is given of their *after* existence, in either happiness or misery.

But let us inquire of Paul, if *psyche*, *life*, and *pneuma*, spirit, are both one. He speaks of dividing asunder of soul and spirit, Heb. 4: 12, and again makes the same distinction, 1 Thes. 5: 23. which may be exam-

and at your leisure. But one case more may be cited, which ought to put the subject at rest. Christ, when on the cross commended his *pneuma*, spirit, into the hands of his Father; while his *psuho*, soul, went to *tes*, in which place it was not left, for the body was raised by the power of God, and its *psuho*, life, restored.

But the context to the passage under consideration, is explicit as to the meaning of the word rendered soul. Mat. 10: 39. he that findeth his *psuho*, life, shall lose it. Here it is evident, that our Lord's meaning was this: he that refuses to believe me in the prediction of that destruction which was at hand, shall assuredly perish, while those who take my counsel shall be saved from the threatened evil. This we find true in point of fact. The unbelieving Jews, thought that if the religion of Jesus should prevail, the Romans would come and take away both their place and nation. His religion was a peaceable, non-resisting religion, and they expected a conquering Prince, who would free them from the Roman yoke. The dread-sufferings of the Jews when their city was taken, proved the words of the Saviour true.

One apparent difficulty remains yet to be solved. It may be asked, what are we to understand by the expression in Luke, which implies, that the destruction which God can effect, is *after* the body is killed. God, indeed, can do no more than *dissolve* the connexion between the body and its life, or in other words, destroy the body. God *can*, indeed, withhold his power, so that the life would be annihilated, and were we taught that God that he will in any instance thus act, we might indeed, strongly assert the doctrine of annihilation, but it would be doing nothing in favour of endless misery. No power but his who alone hath immortalized can preserve the spirit in an immortal state. But we must find some very different passage, on which to build either the one or the other dogma. But we shall

present a question worthy of due consideration. Does killing, or destroying the life, signify continuing it in existence in any state? When this can be duly answered, we will find time to re-examine the subject.

A vast deal more might be said on this subject, in illustration of the foregoing, but we refer the reader to Mr. Balfour's 1st Inquiry, and his answer to Rev. J. Sabine, as our room will permit no more than a single quotation.

“ We have now one remark to make, and we deem it conclusive on this subject. Supposing then that Gehenna, in the passages under consideration, does mean the place of endless misery. Let this be considered for argument's sake, a truth: yea, let it also be granted that the punishment of this place is of endless duration, I ask what follows from these passages? It only follows that the body, or if you please, body and soul, or the life, are destroyed there. It does not follow that the *pneuma, spirit*, or immortal part, has any concern in this punishment. No; for we have seen them expressly distinguished; and in these passages not a word is said about its being in Gehenna, or punished there. No: nothing like this is to be found in the Bible. We read there of *nephish, psuhe, soul*, or *life*, going to Sheol or Hades, and hear of its being destroyed in Gehenna; but do we ever read of the *pneuma, spirit*, being in any of those places? No; at death, it returns to God, who gave it. So far from the *pneuma, spirit*, being tormented, killed, or destroyed in Gehenna, or any of those places, it is never represented as being in them at all. We call on any man to produce an instance from Scripture where it is ever said the *pneuma, spirit*, is in Gehenna, or killed or destroyed in Gehenna. Though nothing like this is to be found in the sacred writings, yet people, from the passage we are considering, conclude that the immortal spirit of man is to be killed or de-

stroyed in Gehenna. Even in the parable of the rich man, it is not said his *pneuma, spirit*, was there, or tormented in Hades. No such representations are given in the Bible, either about Hades or Gehenna. But ought not such representations to be found there, if the common belief be the doctrine of Scripture? It certainly is the common opinion that the spirits of the wicked go to hell, at death. But from what part of the Scriptures do we learn this? If evidence of such a doctrine is to be found there, let it be produced."

James 3: 6, is the last place in which we find Gehenna in the N. T. And that it is here used in a figurative sense, no one will dispute. "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." In examining this passage, we believe few would be such fanatics, as to declare that the fire which kindles on the tongue, was lighted in a place of endless misery, or even in the literal Gehenna to which James alluded. Every one may see, that the apostle alludes to the impurities of Gehenna, with which the pollutions of the tongue are compared. But this is illustrated by other passages of scripture. For instance, we are told that iniquity burneth like fire; and Peter advises, that he who would see good days, should refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile. Our Lord also speaks of the tongue in a similar manner, when he says, that out of the heart proceed blasphemies, evil speaking, &c. But we need go no further into this subject than our own observation. How many families, churches, societies, communities, and whole nations are set on fire by the improper use of the tongue! Nay, look at the desolating wars which blacken the page of history, and the almost inextinguishable fires of wrath which are kindled by the

tongue, and then say whether James was correct, while picturing the effect of this member, by the pollutions and miseries of Gehenna, so well known to the Jews. The apostle was a Jew, and wrote to the Jews, as is evident by a look at his introduction. That he should draw an illustration of his subject from those circumstances with which those to whom he wrote were acquainted, is certainly very probable. The epistle was most certainly intended for the Jews, and for them alone; and not only for Jews, but for believing Jews. We have not a particle of evidence, that the Jews, in the time of the apostles, conceived any different idea from the use of the term Gehenna, than did their fathers: Nor have we the least intimation, that the writer intended his epistle for the use of the Gentiles. So far from this, that an examination will show that the peculiar situation of his countrymen at that time elicited the epistle. No evidence has yet been produced, that Gehenna was ever deemed, by the Israelites, the name of a place of punishment, excepting as understood by the valley of Hinnom.

In closing this examination, we have only to say, that as far as the arguments have gone, we have no fear of refutation. We believe that the facts produced, are indisputable, and that the inferences are perfectly conclusive. That we differ from highly respected names, is no just reason why the most obvious truth, and the most legitimate criticism, should be considered with an evil eye. Claiming no better rule than that laid down by Dr. Campbell, and others, we are willing that our production should be submitted to the strictest scrutiny. Dr. C. says—"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 long been established by ecclesiastical use, is very different from that which they have in the writings of the New-Testament." Again 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 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 now conclude this section, by two quotations from Mr. Stuart's Letters to Mr. Channing, which are worthy of perpetual remembrance. "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 every thing 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." "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."

**ADDENDA.**

We here take the liberty of inserting two extracts from Rev. J. S. Thompson's Christian Guide, being a new translation, and a select commentary. "Whosoever shall be unjustly angry with his brother, shall be accountable to the Judges; and whosoever shall call his brother vile man, shall be exposed to the sentence of the Sanhedrim; but whosoever shall say apostate wretch, shall be held a bond slave in the fiery Gehenna."

Appended to the above, is the following note for its illustration. "For the illustration of this obscure passage, which has long puzzled the Commentators, and spread terror in the ranks of the superstitious, there appears nothing more needed, than to simply state the facts to which our Lord alludes. Here are three degrees of crime mentioned, and three degrees of punishment respectively annexed to each, proportionate to the powers invested in the three courts of Judicature, held among the Jews. The crimes are; 1, causeless anger; 2, anger accompanied with expressions of insult and contempt; 3, hatred and detestation accompanied with execration. The two first are threatened with temporal punishment, or the animadversions of the Jewish tribunals; and it is highly analagous to our Master's reasoning, that the punishment annexed to the last, should be also temporal, seeing the crime was the same in nature, as the second, though somewhat aggravated. On the contrary, to suppose with many commentators, that for the little difference of saying *fool* instead of *simpleton*, our Lord should pass from such a sentence as a Jewish court could pronounce, to the awful doom of eternal punishment in hell-fire, is what cannot be reconciled to any rational rule of faith, or known

measure of justice. This opinion will be found untenable from attention to the construction of the Greek. In the former instances, the construction is ενοχος τη κρισει—τω συνεδριω, but in the third, it is εις γεεννα, implying that the person should be *held a bond slave*, in Gehenna. Now as Gehenna or Gehinnom, was a valley in the vicinity of Jerusalem, appointed by Josiah to be the desecrated spot for the deposit and combustion of the dead carcasses, and offal of animals, and other filth of the city, we must necessarily infer, that a great number of persons must be continually employed in carrying all kinds of filth of the city, and offal of the sacrifices into this valley, and in supplying fuel and attending to the fires. This employment must have been the most degrading, in the estimation of a Jew, to which any human being could be devoted; and if we admit, that in the days of Christ, the power of life and death was taken from the Jews by the Romans, as appears from their acknowledgment to Pilate: *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*, John 18 : 31, it will follow that sentence to the slavery of Gehenna was the deepest degradation to which they could consign their convicts. As it was not therefore in the power of the Jewish court, to *hang, stone, or burn*, the punishments were whipping, the stocks, and slavery, and these and similar punishments were all that Christ either meant or implied in this passage."

The following is the other extract, with its illustration, which are both submitted to the careful examination of the public, with our earnest desire that they may serve to free the mind from the difficulties which are often associated with this passage:—

"Ye have heard that it was said: Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say to you, Whosoever looks on a married woman to cherish impure desire, has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

Therefore, if even your right eye lead you to sin, put it out and cast it from you ; for it is more profitable for you to lose one member than that your whole body be cast into Gehenna. And if the right hand ensnare you, cut it off and cast it away ; it is better to lose one member, than that the whole body be cast into Gehenna."

"The meaning is, that it is better for a man to restrain and mortify the strongest and most impetuous passion of his nature, than endanger life and character by its indulgence. The sin of adultery was uniformly punished with death among the Jews, Levit. 20 : 10 ; Deut. 22 ; 22. In many cases, the sentence was executed by stoning to death in Gehenna. This was done in the following order. The first or chief witness, led the guilty bound to an eminence, and cast him down on a great stone at the bottom. The second witness stood prepared with another great stone to cast down on his breast. If he still lived, the spectators rushed towards him and stoned him till he died. Thus his body was cast into Gehenna. But in many instances adultery, as well as incest, sodomy, and bestiality, were punished by burning to death in Gehenna. Hence our Lord wisely and justly observed, that it was better to lose even a right eye, or hand, meaning merely the mortification of the most ardent desire, than to suffer the destruction of the whole body in Gehenna. Moreover, lest any should think his religion would afford a greater liberty for licentiousness, than the law of Moses, he cautiously warned them, that even the fostering of impure desire, in the manner described in the text, should be accounted equal, in turpitude, to the sin forbidden by the letter of the law."

We have now examined the original words rendered hell, in the authorised version, and find that they afford no ground for believing that the use of either

was ever applied by the N. T. writers, to a place of endless misery. As to Gehenna, the word to which alone the orthodox clergy of candour and information cling as to their dernier resort, we have not been able to ascertain that the O. T. writers ever used it in this sense. Under the new dispensation, we find that it is evidently used in the same sense as by the prophets, and in no instance, do we find that Christ used it in a *new sense*. No intimation is given, that he explained it as expressing a sense different from his predecessors, nor do we learn that his disciples, to whom he most frequently mentioned it, ever suggested that they understood it in a manner varying from the received custom. It was never used in the preaching of the apostles, to any one, whether Jew or Gentile, and but *one* of the apostles uses it at all, and he but *once*, and that to the Jews, and in a figurative manner. Added to this, the most able scholars freely grant, that no such meaning as that to which the moderns apply it, was known to the ancients. But besides this, no person has yet been able to show how Gehenna came to be used as we find it in modern practice: By referring to heathen opinions, we find indeed, something like it, but if we receive it from them, let us give it up as a doctrine of *revelation*. If however, the tenet of endless misery can be supported by the use of this word, it seems astonishing that the fathers of the Jewish church were left in total ignorance respecting it; and still more strange, that the head and great apostle of the new system, never revealed it to his disciples, to whom he gave extraordinary powers in proof of their divine mission.

Under all these circumstances, shall we say, on mere conjecture, that the use of this word justifies us in its common acceptation? We think no analogy justifies this course; and besides this, the immense importance of the tenet forbids the idea, that

it would so long be left in darkness. That false doctrines may grow out of true, and that false glosses may accumulate until the true meaning is obscured, will not be denied by those who are at all acquainted with history. But the charge of Protestants against the Catholic church is sufficient proof of this, as is also the reproof of Jesus to the Pharisees, who had made void the law of God by their traditions. But the labouring oar is in the hand of our opponents. Let them show that the terms which we have examined did originally signify as the moderns assert, and the victory is theirs. But we shall not yield the *palm* without due *proof*.

# LIGHT OF TRUTH.

---

## Book Third.

*Containing arguments to show that all souls of men are altered for the better beyond the grave,—made holy and endlessly happy.*

### SECTION I.

Statement of the argument—Home-made Scripture—No soul fit for heaven while in the body—The Almighty knew, of course decreed the destiny of all souls before he created them.

We have, we think, already refuted the doctrine, taught by some people, that justice requires the endless misery, or punishment, of any intelligent being,—but there is another doctrinal notion held by many, which we have not yet considered, in this work, which is, that, as many souls are going out of the body, and world daily, in a state of sinfulness, and unreconciliation to their Maker, and as there is no alteration in the soul for the better, beyond the grave, millions of millions of such must be miserable as long as God exists.

The conclusion to be inferred from the above named doctrines, on the supposition of its truth, is of serious consideration, and is the source of much misery, to thousands of men in this life, particularly of parents; we will, therefore, bestow some serious attention, on the subject, for the benefit of man generally—and with much propriety the writer can say,

“Homo sum, et humana a me nil alinum puto.”—I am a man, and nothing which relates to man, can be foreign to my bosom.

In the first place, we must remark, that the supposition, that souls do not undergo any alteration for the better, after the death of the body, is only a supposition. Should the supposition however, be supported by the testimony of divine scripture, we grant it would substantiate a very formidable, and perhaps, an unanswerable objection against the final holiness and happiness of all men. We have often heard the objection made, but have never discovered any evidence from scripture to support it. The opposers of the doctrine of universal salvation, being sensible of the want of scripture testimony to support their supposition, have very liberally, been at the expense of making some. The notable passage which they have coined and brought into very common use, is not to be found in the *divine* scriptures, but is often to be heard from the pulpit, is recited in their writings, and used in the arguments of the ignorant. It is as follows: “As the tree falls, so it lies—As death leaves us, so judgment will find us.” We will not, here, contend about a different explanation of this alteration of scripture, but will only say; that if the thing be true, according to the views of those who make the scripture, and its inference, viz. that souls cannot be altered for the better after death, all christian people must remain eternally as unsanctified, as they are in this world of carnality and infirmity, and of course be eternally miserable, as there can be no happiness without holiness.

This unavoidable consequence is a circumstance of which, perhaps, the reader has never before thought, and we are sure, that those who make objections to the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness, and particularly, the part we are now about illustrating,



are not aware. It is true, some christian professors believe in the existence of earthly perfection, to whom the arguments of scripture and reason would be of no value, their ignorance of the spiritual perfection of the moral law, and of their own hearts, is so great ; but most christians believe and feel, that the spirit, while connected with the body, is carnally affected, very wickedly inclined, and like the soul of the Apostle Paul, subjected to sin and death, and they know that "to be carnally minded is death," and that they cannot do the things that they would, but do those which they abhor. And yet those same people will believe, that, as they fall so they will lie, as death leaves them so judgment will find them : that there is no chance of an alteration of the soul for the better beyond the grave. We know that many of such believers have been taken out of the present state of existence, without a moment's warning, or time for preparation, with *all* their imperfections, of ignorance of the nature and character of God—of carnality—of their hearts full of the love of created and sensual objects—of selfwill, and pride ; and if no alteration can be effected, dreadful, indeed, will be the consequences to such souls. No situation in the universe can afford them a heaven—there is no happiness for unholy souls ; God himself cannot make them happy, until he makes them holy.

It may be suggested, by some, that, although *all* souls are not made holy during their present life, yet all whom God has ordained for eternal glory, in their next state of existence, he will sanctify, even in the hour or moment of their death, but cannot, or will not, after they have left the body. To this view of the subject, we object, and could assign many reasons why we dispute the hypothesis, but one or two will answer.

All persons will own, that the soul prepares itself for heaven, or that God prepares it, if it is prepared at all. Now if the soul prepares itself, it certainly has a much better opportunity, when not under the dying pains of the body—at which time very little advances can be made in the knowledge of the divine being; and yet it is absolutely necessary to know God and Christ correctly, to have life eternal. Read the words of the Saviour—"This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." If God prepare the soul for heaven, surely he can as well do it before the hour of death. But we contend that God does not, cannot operate on the soul to qualify it for heaven, while under the alarming influence of worldly sorrow, and animal fear. To qualify the soul for heaven, requires the presentation of divine truth to the reflection of reason, and the cordial assent of all the feelings of the soul, so as to enlist the best affections to God—to make the soul love God with all the mind and strength—and a time is required for this other than the dismal hour of death.

Secondly.—From the above remarks, we see, that no scriptures disprove the supposition, which we intend supporting; viz. that there can, and will be an alteration in the soul, for the better, after death—and we also see, that to deny the belief, would involve consequences we know not how to reconcile with our ideas of holiness, being the very essence of heaven, or happiness; we will, therefore, exhibit our favourite supposition, that an alteration does take place in the soul, for the better, after death. The reader will remark, that we do not pretend to argue, that there is any scripture direct to prove the point at issue, but we believe it to be a fact, and we think, we may with propriety, offer one supposition to another, and we think we can support ours with better reason, much

more pleasantly, with greater good to man, and comfort to the human family than they can theirs, who hold to the propriety of the existence of an eternal fire and brimstone, to torment the souls endlessly, in all who die without holiness, to which none can attain in the body.

First, then, in support of the doctrine, that the soul may be, and is altered for the better after the death of the body, we will reason from the nature of the soul itself. And here we must remark, that there are two opinions held by theologians, now, as was also, by philosophers of antiquity, relative to the origin of souls.

One of the opinions, thus held, is, the pre-existence of souls—that they did exist in a separate state in the exercise of all their faculties in perfection, long before they were connected with the mortal body, and from which state they fell by some deviation from the line of moral rectitude, and are now associated with flesh “whose foundation is in the dust,” by the order of divine goodness, for the purpose of purification, and introduction to an “eternal weight of glory.”

The other opinion is, that souls are produced by ordinary generation, of course come into their first existence at the formation of the body, but did not exist previously. Without approving, or disapproving either of the above noted opinions, we proceed to argue the point at issue, and will here remark, that if either of those opinions be true, we shall, under the circumstances, be supported in the belief, that the soul can, and will undergo, an alteration for the better, beyond the grave.

In the first place, we will take for granted that souls do come into their first state of existence, by means of ordinary generation. If this hypothesis be correct, we perceive that the Almighty is constantly producing intelligences whom he knows will in some

degree be miserable during their earthly existence, and the greater part of whom will be inexpressibly and endlessly wretched. For, as the orthodox assert that no mere man since the FALL has been able perfectly to keep the law of God, so our experience is the best rule of judging what will be in future. If the law of God must be perfectly kept, and no man in this state of existence is competent to keep it, then indeed, no man can in this life purify himself, fit for those mansions of perennial blessedness, which are without alloy, and without end.

Now, we will appeal to the good sense of the reader, whether he can believe that the Almighty, after having seen the continual failure of the soul to effect its own happiness during life, in its purification, so as to secure eternal happiness in the future state, and a salvation from endless misery, would still persist in affording man the power to propagate his kind, to be the instrument in the hand of God, of producing more and more intelligences, millions of whom he must know, will meet the same miserable fate of the vast numbers who have already left the body, and who are said now to be gnawing their tongues with pain. The reader we are sure, will say that he cannot believe, that an all-wise, all powerful, and all good being would do any such thing. It will not do to say, that the Almighty does not know whether the souls that are thus brought into existence, by his power, will fail of future happiness, or not; for he is all-wise, and as the divine scriptures state, "known unto him are all his ways from the beginning." Should any, however, have so low an idea of the God of all wisdom, as to suppose that he is ignorant, when he creates the soul, what will be its destiny, or what use it will make of its privileges, yet they ought to think that the experience which he has had, for these *six thousand years*, or as some will have it, of a hun-

dred thousand, ought to have instructed him, in this very important subject : but it is almost blasphemy to admit such a supposition, to accommodate the ignorance of any.

Now we will reason thus—The Almighty is continually, (by the means of the ordinary generation of man) producing intelligences, the present, but particularly, the eternal future happiness of whom he desires, and to secure which he has done, and continues to do much, as illustrated in his works of creation, providence and redemption—but according to the supposition which we dispute, will be granted in favour of but few only, because of the inefficacy of the means which he has provided for that purpose, or, the shortness of the time allowed in which to effect it.

Now it is certain, that to one of the above named causes, we must attribute the failure of the salvation of any soul who may be lost, and to no other cause whatever, for the divine scripture uniformly declares that it is the will of God to have all men to be saved, and that “Christ gave himself a ransom for all.” Now the reader may take his choice of the above noted courses to account for the damnation of any soul—If he says it is owing to the inefficacy of the means which God has appointed, he must then acknowledge that God could have appointed means sufficiently efficacious ; and that if he seriously wished the salvation, or purification of all souls in this life, he would certainly have done it, as he possesses the power so to do—but as he has not, (as it appears to us) we must conclude—“to justify the ways of God to man”—that the means which he has provided, are sufficiently efficacious. If then, we allow that the means which God has provided to effect the final purification and salvation of all souls, one of two inferences is unavoidable, either, that all souls ultimately, will be purified and saved, by them, while in this

body, or that the means will extend in their application and operation beyond the grave, to the benefit of those souls, who are not purified while in the body. The reader may choose which alternative he pleases; but we shall believe that the means which God has thought fit to use for the purification and eternal happiness of the soul, will be applicable to its benefit beyond the grave to those who are not purified while in the body, and we think none are.



## SECTION II

**Reasonable arguments offered**—The carnal mind the cause of sin—The facilities of the disembodied soul to attain holiness—No authority to believe God is limited in his designs with the soul to the time of this life—All believe the soul can exist after death with all its faculties,—why not then be improved by means.

First,—then, as remarked above, it appears pretty clear, from common observation, and even, from Scripture account, that many souls leave the body in a very wicked and unholy state of feeling,—with much enmity against God, entirely unreconciled to his will, of course without love to him, which is the very essence of heaven itself. Now although we will own, that the Almighty can eradicate any degrees of enmity from any soul, in any moment of time, and fill it with pure love to overflowing, yet we prefer believing, that he acts relative to the purification of the soul, in a regular and progressive manner. We are constrained to adopt this opinion, from what we see of the ways of God in his works, but in particular of the soul of man.

When we first discover the existence of the soul in the body, it appears to be small and feeble—grows by slow and progressive degrees, till at length it becomes, as it were, large and strong—capable of sustaining

much, knowing much, feeling much, and enjoying an eternal weight of glory in the future state.

Again we discover different degrees of intellectual improvement in this life, and that generally the most extensive is in proportion to the length of time allowed to make it, and the worth of means afforded. From these remarks, or rather from the principles upon which they are predicated, we infer, that the Almighty makes use of means, for the purification of all those souls—if any—that are purified and fitted in this mortal state, for heaven.

Secondly.—As we believe that all souls, ultimately will be made holy, of course eternally happy ; but cannot believe that all souls, if any, are made holy in any period of their mortal state, and know that holiness and happiness, are inseparably connected ; we must believe, that they can be altered beyond the grave, for the better—and that the means which God uses to purify them while in the body, and which proves partially efficacious, will extend in their operation to the next state of the existence of the soul that may need their application, and we believe all will.

To extend the argument, in support of our hypotheses, we will remark, that it is the doctrine of the scripture and of daily experience also, that it is owing to the influence of the carnal, or fleshly nature of man, or what ought to be called his animal spirits, that he departs from the divine law, nor loves God supremely, and that from the circumstance of the association of the soul with this body of sin, arise all the crimes and miseries of man. Now if this be the case with man, which no one, we presume, will deny, we ask, if it does not seem likely, that the soul could attend better to the means of purification when divested of this body, than it can while associated with it, and while under the influence of bad example ? We think it can.

When the soul is disimbodyed, it will not only be entirely clear from the influence of the earthly, carnal nature, which is directly opposed to the nature of God, but it will see as it never saw before. While the soul is confined to this body it has to grope in the dark, it sees "through a glass darkly," is often deceived—the light that may guide some aright, leads others to bewilder, and dazzle to blind; but when divested of its prison of clay, its sight will be clear, and its knowledge great. The Saviour said, "This is life eternal that they should know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou art sent." Now to have a correct knowledge of God, is to enable or cause the soul to love him, and "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." Now, "he that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love." Again, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." See 1 John. From these scriptures, it is plain, that the acquisition of divine knowledge is the means appointed by God for the purification, and eternal happiness of the soul, and it is evident enough that this knowledge is not, cannot be attained in this life, to any considerable perfection. If any do, we have never in all our religious observation discovered the effect, which such knowledge is said in scripture, to produce—such as "casting out fear," and other high attainments of heavenly mindedness. But if we will admit the testimony of the scriptures, we will believe, "we shall see him (God) as he is" when divested of the body, and "know that when he shall appear" to us, "as he is, we shall be like him" see 1 John 3.

Thus it is clearly to be understood, that no soul can attain to a correct knowledge of God while in the body, and yet such a knowledge is absolutely necessary to obtain the requisite qualification of holiness and eternal glory; but it is as clearly to be learned from scripture, that this knowledge is to be obtained by all

---



souls often they are divested of the body, and thereby enabled to see God "as he is," which sight will transform them and "change them into the same image, from glory to glory." We learn, from scripture also, that those, "every man" who have this belief of the Universalist—"this hope in him, purifies himself; even as he (God) is pure." Away then with the false notion, that the doctrine of universal salvation will encourage men in crimes, when the truth is "every man that hath this hope purifies himself." And when he is admitted to see God as he is will be made like him, and sustain an "eternal weight of glory." O! glorious hope, how it transports the spirit to things above! here it uncleaves the affections of the heart from earthly objects, and makes it willing, yes, even anxious to leave its clay, and journey to the heavenly worlds to see its father and its God.

The above evidences of Scripture testimony, and remarks correspond with the declaration of the Saviour to the Apostle Paul—see Acts 26: who was to be made the means of turning the people from darkness to light, to be sanctified by faith, by a correct knowledge of God. As remarked above, God makes use of the works of creation, of his providence, and the history of the events of redemption; that is, the manifestation of his love to man by the acts of the Saviour Jesus Christ, to bring the soul to know and love him while in the body, and we knew of no other way, for by nature, the world of man knows nothing about God, they are without God in the world—must be taught to know him, but all the teaching given in life is through the channel of human imperfection, and answers but little purpose, to that which will be taught to the soul in a disembodied state, under the full vision of the Divine being. Here it can see, and know more of the glorious character of the God of love, in one hour of time, than it could in many years in the

body, by the best facilities ever afforded to man. It can better appreciate his wisdom, and love—can discover that all the providential dealings of God towards it while in the body, flowed through the channel of God's love—can then learn that good was Jehovah in bestowing sun shine, and no less good in the storm and thunder.

The soul, in this unfettered state, can see the divine parent, without a veil between, can love him who is love, and adore him with its most warm and ardent affection—can join the rapturous song with every other creature, which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, in ascribing, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. 5.

And now what scripture, or reason, can we find to oppose the cheering belief, we have advanced for its support—that all souls will be altered for the better beyond the grave, in the future state ; we know of no scripture which can be brought for that purpose, and few reasons—all is on the side of the supposition.

If God sincerely wishes the eternal holiness and happiness of all souls, and no one will dare to say he does not ; nor can any believe that he lacks the power to accomplish the objects of his will ; it will then follow of course, that if his will in this respect is not accomplished, in one period and situation of the soul's existence, it can, and will be in another.

Why is it that any have, in their belief and doctrine, limited the time of the dealings of God with the soul for its purification to about seventy years, and its situation to its association with the body. No one has been authorised to believe that to be the fact—No one can produce the least scripture authority to support the belief. No one is guiltless who preaches such a doctrine to others, for divine truth. We challenge

any man on earth to show divine authority for so believing and teaching.

Every one believes, that the soul can exist after it leaves the body, if it did not before, and can, not only retain all its present faculties entire, but be enlarged in its capacities, and susceptibilities; if this be correct, why then, can it not in this state, be led to know and love God perfectly, whom to know is eternal life. We know that the soul of an infant neither knows nor loves God, until it is instructed, relative to his character and designs of love, when it loves God, because it learns that he loves it.



### SECTION III.

The good and wise believe that God has not left the final destiny of man to his own actions and opinions—Remarks of Addison—Query relative to the situation of the soul after death—How God will sanctify the soul after it leaves the body.

Almost all of the good and wise who have spoken or written on the subject under consideration, have expressed a belief, that God has not left the eternal condition of his intelligent offspring, on so precarious a foundation, as their own mutable feelings and actions; but that he has not only decreed the destiny of the soul, but the means to secure it. This belief is necessary, to justify the ways of God to man. From among the opinions of many eminent writers, we will select a few remarks from the celebrated Addison, who thus writes.

“How can it enter into the thoughts of man, that the soul, which is capable of increasing perfection, and of receiving new improvements to all eternity, shall fall away into nothing, [or as some will have it, into a hell] of fire and brimstone to be tormented eternally,

where its existence is worse than none] almost as soon as it\* is created. Are such abilities made for no purpose? A brute arrives at a point of perfection that he can never pass; in a few years he has all the acquirements, he is capable of, and were he to live ten thousand more, would be the same thing he is at present. Were a human soul, thus at a stand in its accomplishment—were its faculties to be full blown, and incapable of further enlargement—I could imagine it would fall away insensibly, and drop at once into a state of annihilation.” “But can we believe, that a thinking being, that is in a perpetual progress of improvement, and travelling on from perfection to perfection; after having just looked abroad into the works of its Creator, and made a few discoveries of his infinite goodness, wisdom and power, must perish at its first setting out, and in the beginning of its inquiries?”

“Man, considered only in his present state, seems sent into the world merely to propagate his kind. He provides himself with a successor, and immediately quits his post to make room for him. He does not seem to enjoy life; but to deliver it down to others. This condition is not surprising to consider in animals which are made for man’s use, and which can furnish their business in a short time. The silk-worm, after having spun her task, lays her eggs and dies—but a man cannot take in his full measure of knowledge—has not time to subdue his passions, establish his soul in virtue, and come up to the perfection of his nature, before he is hurried off the stage. Would an infinitely wise being make such glorious creatures for so mean a purpose? Can he delight in the production of such abortive intelligences—such short lived reasonable beings,” [but some may believe he can delight to tor-

\* We have used the neuter gender of the pronoun, where the soul is alluded to or named. Mr. Addison used the feminine gender.

ment them in hell eternally.] “Would he give us talent that are not to be exerted? Capacities that are never to be gratified?”

“How can we find that wisdom that shines through all his works, in the formation of man, without looking on this world as only a nursery for the next: and without believing that the several generations of rational creatures which rise up, and disappear in such quick succession, are only to receive their first rudiments of existence here, and afterwards to be transplanted into a more friendly clime, where they may spread and flourish to all eternity.

“There is not, in my opinion, a more pleasing consideration, (that can interest the heart of man, arising from the information of the scriptures) than this, of the perpetual progress which the soul makes towards the perfection of its nature, without a possibility of ever arriving at a period in it.

“To look upon the soul as going on from strength to strength—to consider, that it is to shine forever with new accessions of glory, and brighten to all eternity—that it will still be adding knowledge to knowledge, and virtue to virtue, carries something in it very agreeable to that ambition which is natural to the mind of man. It must be a prospect pleasing to God himself, to see his creation forever beautifying and drawing nearer to him, by greater degrees of resemblance.”

We know, according to the scriptures, that Christ and the holy angels, will rejoice in the happification of souls; yet believers in the doctrine of an angry God, and a hell of everlasting fire and brimstone, will have it, that the Almighty maker will take *pleasure*, in the endless misery of those beautiful and glorious souls, which he brought into existence, and endued with such noble faculties, capable of sustaining an eternal weight of glory, and of shining as the stars forever and ever.

Oh! my dear reader, you must not entertain so unworthy, so unjust an opinion of your heavenly father, who is infinitely good. The opinion is unworthy, because it argues, that God is more void of tender and parental feelings than mankind, or even the brute creation. What parents would not be distressed at the knowledge and sight of the great suffering of their offspring, and hold out their hand to help, even to the most disobedient—or what parents would make their children eternally miserable? none, for any cause; and dare we to say that God will make any of his offspring eternally miserable?—we dare not; the scriptures, the only guide on this subject, give no such information. Again, such an opinion represents the divine Parent of all intelligent beings, much worse than any of the brute creation. These love their offspring—take great pains to provide for their wants—will themselves suffer for them—will labour—will fight, risk, and even lose their lives in the defence, and for the welfare of their young. No, in God, the scripture inform us, “we live, move, and have our being,” and yet dare we say that he hates us? If he does, or ever will, he is not so good as man or beast.—But some may say that he loves us all *now*, but will hate all those hereafter, who shall die impenitent. This, however, cannot be the case, as God “is of one mind, and changeth not.” It will, therefore, follow, that if he ever shall hate any soul, he must have hated it before he created it, and that if he ever did love any soul he ever will love it, for in him there is no variableness nor shadow of turning.

The opinion is unjust, because it is false, and because it exhibits the divine “father of mercies” in an unfavourable character, to the student of divinity, as one who is not worthy to be loved, for nothing but a knowledge, or a belief that God loves man without partiality, can cause man to love him.

“That Cherub,” says Mr. Addison, “which now appears as a God to a human soul, knows very well, that the period will come about, in eternity, when the human soul will be as perfect, as he himself now is. Nay, when it shall look down upon that degree of perfection, as much as it now falls short of it. It is true, the higher nature still advances, and by that means, still preserves his distance and superiority in the scale of being, but he knows, that, how bright soever the station is, on which he stands possessed at present, the inferior nature, will at length mount up to it, and shine forth in the same degree of glory.”

“With what astonishment and veneration may we look upon our souls, where there are such hidden stores of knowledge and virtue—such inexhaustible sources of perfection! We know not yet what we shall be, nor will it ever enter into the heart of man, to conceive the glory that will be always in reserve for him. The soul, compared with its Maker, is like one of those mathematical lines, which may draw nearer to another through eternity without a possibility of touching; and can there be a thought so transporting, as to consider ourselves in these perpetual approaches to HIM, who is the standard, not only of perfection, but of happiness?”

All the good and wise among men, at least, hope, that the infinitely good Creator, will in due time, restore universal holiness and happiness among his offspring, throughout his empire; none but the ignorant, selfish, wicked, and hard hearted, object to the reasonableness of the hope, or wish the eternal misery of souls in their next state of existence.

After the death of the body, the spirit, being clear of its clay, like a bird clear of its cage of confinement, soars abroad in the unlimited creation of the Almighty, where it will find new objects to admire, of wonder, of love, and of everlasting contemplation—Where and

when, all its immortal faculties may unfold and improve eternally.

Under all these circumstances, of the case of the disembodied spirit, does it not seem very reasonable to believe, that it will have ten thousand times better opportunity of purification than in this world, and associated with this body of "sin and death?"

After reading this much, some may wish to inquire or know our opinion, on the interesting subject, where those souls go, or reside, who are not fit for heaven, when they leave the body, as the book endeavours to prove that there is *no hell*, to hold them. In answer to this query, we will just remark, that no one ought to entertain a thought, that heaven is a local place, it is only happiness; or that *hell* is any thing else than *misery*—the *grave*; and the unavoidable state of spirits as we have already proved, from the proper signification of the term *Sheol*, in the Hebrew language, and which occurs in the Old Testament as the word rendered *hell*—and *Hades*. *Gehenna* is in the original Greek New Testament, translated *hell* also. All sensible readers understand, that the soul of man is *thought*. Thought requires no specific space to occupy—Time and space of any degree is perfectly equal to spiritual beings. If this then be the case, can the divine Creator be at a loss for room to hold those souls, who are not, while in the body, made fit to stand in the full vision of the divine presence? We think not; his dominions are unlimited.

But it may be, that some will say, that Mr. Addison had in view, when he reasoned of the glorious destiny of the soul, those only who are prepared in this life, for that eternal weight of glory; but he says, "here man has not time to subdue his passions, establish his soul in virtue, and come up to the perfection of his nature, before he is hurried off the stage." He



makes no distinction between, what some call, good souls and bad souls. The goodness or badness of souls, are compared by man only. In the sight of the divine being, who "sees the thoughts," all are alike bad—all need purification, none can be introduced to ultimate glory, until they are converted. It is true, that those souls who are virtuous in this life, in whom the good change has begun, are equally capable of being "changed from glory to glory," beyond the grave, but this admittance does not invalidate the force of the reason of the supposition, that those who are not virtuous in life can be made so in their future state of existence, or disembodied state, and also, arise to the same degree of holiness and glory. The admission of the fact, as the scriptures state, that souls are capable of sustaining an "eternal weight of glory," argues in favour of the supposition we wish to support—for all souls are of the same nature—have been created of the same essence, and are capable of the same improvement.

The divine creator knows this, he knows how precious the soul is. Although it now lies buried in rubbish, and in ruin, he will not cast it off forever. The owner of a valuable diamond that might be covered with filth would not throw it away because of its defilement, but would wash and cleanse it, for his use and ornament. So will the divine father, wash, cleanse, and beautify his own "jewels," from all their filth and pollution, for his own use and ornament.

It may be asked by some, how God will sanctify the soul after it has left the body? To this query we answer, that we have never been able to learn, by the scripture, or any how else, how the body of the soul, or the circumstance of the association, anywise assisted God, or afforded him any facilities, in sanctifying the soul; but we have learned by scripture, and

experience, that this bodily connexion is the main obstacle in the way of sanctification, and the primary cause of crimes and misery, in this life. If then, this be true, and who can deny it to be?—it would seem to follow as a natural consequence, that, if the soul was out of the body, it could neither sin nor suffer.

But to come to the merit of the question, how can God sanctify the soul when it has left the body? we remark, that whatever he does towards the purification of souls in this life, we know he does it by operating on the mind or soul itself, and not on the body. He communicates light, information or knowledge to the soul of a proper sort. Mental information is light; the Apostle says, "whatsoever makes manifest is light," and our Saviour who is "the light of the world," said, "this is life eternal to know thee, the only true God." The Apostle Paul was sent to the gentiles, to "open their eyes" by preaching to them the gospel of the grace [love] of God," by which they were to "receive forgiveness of sins," [a knowledge of the fact,] and an inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me," [Christ.]

From the above testimony, and remarks, it seems, that a correct knowledge of the real character of the adorable God, is life, or produces life in the soul, dead "in sin and trespasses," and which is the death that God told Adam he should die, in the day he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and which did come to pass. Since the fact of eating the forbidden fruit, and of our first parents being excluded the garden of Eden, the divine presence, the whole human family have been without God in the world, without the knowledge of his real character, and intentions towards man—They have considered him a being of power, but of revengeful feeling towards them, for the original offence of their first parents, in Eden, and their offence also, against the moral law, which is of

universal obligation, and therefore they have feared, and hated God also, and are dead.

All souls then, in any state of their existence, who are brought, by any means, to the important knowledge of the real character of the God of infinite love, whose tender mercies are everlasting, are raised from the dead, are converted, are created anew in Christ Jesus, are born again, are sanctified by faith, and know that their sins are forgiven, even all manner of sins and blasphemies. Now, we have the Saviour's words for it, that the women loved *much* because their sins which were *many*, were forgiven by him ; but to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little. From these remarks of the Saviour, it would seem to follow, as a natural consequence, that the greater sinner the soul had been previous to its knowledge of forgiveness, the greater love it would have to God the divine pardoner. And as love is the very essence of holiness, and holiness of happiness, or heaven—the qualification for eternal glory, is to be obtained simply by the knowledge of pardon. And now, we ask, why cannot this knowledge be obtained, by the spirit, beyond the grave ? It can. And the soul can, and will be forgiven, beyond the grave—or rather, the soul will be put in possession of the knowledge of the fact—which did exist, even before the soul sinned, for God is of one mind and changeth not.

Man may be offended with his fellow man, and the next day forgive him, and the next, again be offended—but God says, “fear not me, for I am the Lord, I change not.” From the circumstance of the immutability of the Almighty, it is evident, that if he ever forgives and loves any of his frail offending creatures, he did so before they were brought into existence ; and of course, will continue to do so, through the countless periods of eternity. But on the other hand, if he shall ever *hate* and punish any of his creatures, in any pe-

riod of their existence, from any cause, he did hate them from eternity, and nothing they can do or suffer, will alter his feelings, and intention towards them; their miserable fate is more surely and permanently fixed than the sun in his orbit. But, although we know that God is of one mind and changeth not, we need not be alarmed, for "God is love," and all his purposes, like himself, are purposes of love, and too, like him, they cannot fail or change, but will be accomplished in the restitution of all things.

With regard to the necessary obedience of the soul after death, to the divine will, we remark, that what produces it in the soul, in this life, is most likely to produce it in the future state; namely, a knowledge "of the kindness and love of God our Saviour," which produced it in the soul of the apostle Paul, and the ancient christians—See Titus, 3: 4; and we again ask, why cannot the "kindness and love of God our Saviour towards men appear" in the future, as well as in this state? It can and will, and even better. Here we see through a glass darkly; but in the future and disembodied state, the soul will see without dimness, and know without ignorance and uncertainty.

We are informed in scripture, that when the body shall return to the earth, that the spirit or soul, shall return to "God who gave it"—of course shall see him as he is, and be "transformed into his likeness." What plainer information do we need to assure us of the time, method, and means of the purification, and glorification of the soul?

**SECTION IV.**

**If souls cannot be altered for the better beyond the grave, Infants cannot be saved—What it is to be born of God—Idiots not fit for heaven—Those who never heard of Christ and God, not fit for heaven.**

If the foregoing remarks and arguments on the subject, are not sufficiently satisfactory to the reader, to convince his judgment of their propriety, and of the truth of the position which we have taken, we will exhibit some others, which we think, will be, and from whose evidence, as matters of fact, and of reason, can be no appeal.

First—Then, taking it for granted that the soul is produced or brought into existence by ordinary generation, at the time of the formation of the body, we argue that the soul of an infant has no knowledge of God, whom to know is eternal life, nor of Jesus Christ. Now, as we are informed by scripture, that the necessary qualification for heaven, or the enjoyment of the divine presence, is to love the Lord our God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the strength, and with all the mind, it would be seen that infants cannot be saved, under the circumstances of the case, who die in an infantile state, if there is no alteration of the soul for the better in the future state; as it is impossible to love an object without having some knowledge of it, and we know that an infant soul has none of God, of course no love to him, but as we are assured from the testimony of scripture, that the souls of infants will be saved, we must believe that they will undergo alteration, for the better, after the death of the body.

We are informed, that no soul can be saved if it has not been born again, or born of God; and we are told in I John, 5: 1—That “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.” Now we

have known that infants cannot believe this, nor any others who have never even heard of his name ; and it follows from the analogy of reasoning, that those who do not, from some cause believe that Jesus is the Christ, cannot be blessed, as they are not born of God.

Second—We know that many persons are brought into existence, who remain very ignorant during life ; many *idiots* ;—of course, such persons cannot know God nor Christ, whom to know is eternal life, even should they be born and raised in a land of scripture information ; and yet it seems that unless they have an opportunity of obtaining this knowledge in the future state, their existence is a curse, as they must miss of life, and experience annihilation or misery. Should such persons exert all their mental powers to obtain a knowledge of God, they could not by any means obtain such a knowledge of their Maker, as to induce them to love him with all their heart, of course could obtain no more purification for heaven than brute beasts. Under these circumstances of hard fate, in this life, can any one believe, that the divine creator would bring idiots into existence, with an inferior capacity, capable of suffering an immortal existence of misery in the future state, for no other good reason, but because they had not understanding enough to know and love him with all their souls—and for the specific purpose of suffering the miseries of Idiocy during their natural life, and the endless miseries of hell hereafter ? The Almighty knew perfectly well, that this must be their fate, before he made them, of course made them for that very purpose ; for we must believe, that the divine being could but know what would come to pass, as a fact implies he had previously decreed the occurrence of the fact. The same argument may be urged relative to the short existence and death of infants, who are as idiots.

Again—If the millions of souls, who are now, and will be hereafter associated with mortal bodies, and leave them without an opportunity of attaining to the proper knowledge of God, and necessary qualification for heaven, on earth; nor have the means of qualification in the future state, how can we justify the ways of God to man, in bringing into an existence of human misery, so many beings for eternal wo? But we can justify the ways of God, by believing the truth; that the souls of infants, of idiots, and of all the millions of human beings, who from any cause, may be prevented during this life from attaining a due degree of qualification for the enjoyment of heaven, or the glory of the divine presence, shall attain to it beyond the grave, in their next state of existence, “when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality.” If souls were perfectly fit for heaven or immortal enjoyments, while in the body, they would have heaven on earth, and not be under the necessity of putting off the body of mortality, in order to be immortalized, and made happy.

We know that happiness does not consist in the nature of the place that the soul may be in, but in its own disposition or feeling—the qualification it may possess.

Perhaps, a query may arise in the mind of the reader, at this stage of the argument, whether those souls which may leave the body without being made holy in it, will suffer during the time they may be unholy, and unfit for heaven, until they may be made holy? Relative to this question, we would remark, that as holiness and happiness are inseparably connected, one naturally producing the other, no intelligent being can be happy unless holy, in any state or mode of existence whatever. And further, we are authorised by scripture to believe, that the adorable God never designed “willingly to afflict nor grieve the children of

men," for the sake of grieving or punishing them, but merely allows them to be afflicted, or punished, by the operation and influence of their conduct and disposition, or those of others; yet always with a view to their benefit. Jeremiah well remarks, "wherefore should a living man complain for the punishment of his sins, it is of the Lord's mercy that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not; they are new every evening and morning; great is his faithfulness;" and we may add, his goodness in the case, that allows the "impieties of man to reprove him, and his sins to punish him"—that he "scourges every son whom he receiveth," that they may be made perfect through sufferings, and made partakers of the divine nature. All this discipline is absolutely necessary for the refinement of the soul, else it would not be administered. We must believe that God never did nor ever will, cause or allow one of his creatures to suffer in any state or time of their existence, one moment longer, nor one degree more, than is absolutely necessary to fit them for that eternal weight of glory for which he designs them. If he did, their sufferings would stand as an eternal allegation against his goodness and justice.

It is plain, that as long as the soul is unholy, and has to associate with other unholy beings in any state, it must be more or less unhappy: but how long any soul will continue unholy in its disembodied state, with all the faculties of that state to attain holiness, is more than we can declare; still we may be allowed to suppose, that the time of its purification, depends upon its previous qualification, and we will venture an opinion, that no means which can be offered to the soul in this life, will further its qualification for future and eternal enjoyment, so much as those intellectual improvements of the mind. "With all thy getting," said the wisest of men, "get wisdom, for it is the prin-



cipal thing." But as all degrees of time are equal to spiritual beings, we cannot calculate to any certainty or advantage.

Although we do believe, that unholy souls must remain unhappy, until they are made holy, by some means; we do not believe in the existence of what some call a *purgatory*, or as others do in the doctrine of hell-redemption: no, for we do not believe in the existence of any local hell, calculated to inflict punishment, or in a purgatory, other than those means that the Creator has ordained in this and the future state of being, for the purgation of all impure intelligences in his universe. Happiness nor misery have no place of existence, but with the mind—and whenever, or wherever that is holy, it will be happy.

But some may inquire, what is holiness, and how are souls made holy? Holiness of soul consists in "loving the Lord our God with all the mind," and our neighbour as ourselves, and this love to God produces correspondent actions; an entire obedience, and submission to his will, and that to our neighbour, such as to do him all the good we can, and no harm, under any circumstances. Perhaps no person ever lived on earth who attained to this perfection of love; and the reason is plain, because like the Apostle Paul and all other mortals, they were closely connected with a carnal mind, and a body of sin and death. Still advances are made towards this perfection, in this life.

It may now be asked, what are the means by which these advances to holiness are made? We answer in the words of scripture, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God,"—"And we know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not." And that "this is eternal life, that they should know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." That the attainment of such knowledge, is

the means of advancement, we believe ; of course it is plain, that the rapidity or slowness of those advancements, depend much upon the correctness, or incorrectness of our views of the true character of God and Christ. Now if the reader wish to know God, he may read "God is love," and of Jesus Christ, "the father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." "He that hath the son [believeth on him] hath life," that is, whoso believeth that he is the Saviour of the world, hath life. But these declarations and scripture proofs, do not intimate, that if any souls should not attain to the perfection of the belief that giveth life, in this life, they cannot attain to the faith of truth in their next, or future state.

And now we ask, if the soul, in a disimbodied state, will not have a much better opportunity of obtaining the perfection of the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, than it has in this body of organized clay, whose foundation is in the dust! We must believe it will.

After the soul shall have left the body, it shall, as the scriptures declare, "return to God who gave it;" of course, as the scriptures also state, see him as he is, face to face. Here the soul sees in part, knows in part, but in the disimbodied state, shall know as it is known. It can know God to be a "God of love," as it will find, that instead of putting it under eternal punishment, for the imperfections of a short life, he will freely forgive, and take it to his bosom, as his own dear child, who was lost but now is found, who was dead, but is alive, and brought through the avenues of misery to its father's house, who "will wipe away all tears from *its* eyes."

In this disimbodied state, the soul can easier attain to the knowledge of Jesus Christ. In this state, it

will see him face to face, without a veil between, and shall know, and of course, believe that he "is the Christ," and the "Saviour of the world;" and the sight, or knowledge of God and Christ, will exalt, sanctify, transform, and glorify the most low, degraded and unhappy soul, that ever left the body.

Again, we know that there are many souls, who are associated with bodies for many years; and yet, from the place of their nativity, or other causes, over which they could have no control, have been prevented from obtaining any correct knowledge of God, or any that was beneficial. Now if the Almighty does not afford them an opportunity of believing the truth, so as to obtain eternal life, in this state of existence, how can we believe he is an impartial God?

Almost all persons believe, that all those souls who are saved, are put in possession of eternal life in their next state of existence, are operated on, or influenced, by the divine father; and we would here remark, that if any miss of heaven, it must be for the lack of the same kind and degree of influence which God afforded to others, upon whom salutary effect was produced.

Those who argue that all have equally the assistance which is needed to purify the soul in this state of existence, are either very ignorant of facts, or willingly lie to their own souls. Every aid, to have an equal effect, must be proportioned to the evil which is to be overcome. Were this always the case, the effect would be uniformly produced.

Again—the intellect of different persons varies as much as their distinctive bodily features; and truth, expressed in the same terms to people of different powers of perception, will not, therefore, be equally efficacious. The light of divine truth sheds meridian day on one, while to another it affords but a glimmering twilight. While a word fitly spoken affords to

one a demonstration, to another it must be repeated line upon line, and reiterated by precept upon precept, to have any visible effect. All have need of the same truth, in equal degrees, to be equally happy, and even should we allow degrees of happiness in a future life, yet certain it is, that without some degree of divine light, no one can be happy, even to the fulness of his capacity, however small that may be. True indeed, men in this world do not *appear* to be equally happy, but we believe they are really nearer in this respect, than is generally imagined; and the poet has not assumed any considerable license, when he says, "not one will change his neighbour with himself." Indeed, the celebrated Pope brings the subject home to our business and bosoms, in the following beautiful lines :—

“ The learned is happy nature to explore,  
 The fool is happy that he knows no more;  
 The rich is happy in the plenty given,  
 The poor contents him with the care of heaven.  
 See some strange comfort every state attend,  
 And pride, bestowed on all, a common friend.”

But would the infinite difference which some suppose will exist in a future state, be honourable to God as a moral governor? Will the most obstinate fanatic allow that the rule which gives to every one a share of happiness in this life, will be reversed in the next? All the orthodox contend that impartiality will be more specially exhibited in the future, than in the present life; but if, instead of different degrees of happiness, as we see in this state of being, a portion is to enjoy supernal blessedness at the expense of endless sin and suffering to the other portion, shall we call this impartiality?

Every person of moral reflection, must remark the great difference between the conditions of the human family in this life. Some have much better opportunities afforded them, not only to be happy in this life, but to obtain qualification for endless felicity. To still all our inquietudes on the subject of a partial providence, an unequal distribution of the favours of the Almighty, we must remember, and believe the remark of the Redeemer to his disciples. "Master" said they, "did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind." Neither this man sinned nor his parents that he was born blind, but he was born blind that the works of God might be made manifest. Jesus Christ then delivered him from his blindness, from his infirmity, did on him the works of God. So he will deliver all mankind, from blindness—from moral death—from temporal miseries and infirmities of every name. The blind man was born blind, not for his own sin which he might have committed if he existed before he came into the body, if he did thus exist, no; nor for the sin of his parents, but for the specific purpose that Jesus Christ might see him, and in the sight of the multitude, open his eyes.

And we must believe, that whatever the condition of any of the human family is, in this life, it is so, by divine appointment, that the "works of God may be manifest." Whether any one is rich or poor, a slave or free, ignorant or wise, male or female, black or white, blind or not, enjoying much holiness, or great misery, they are so, that the ways of God might be made manifest, and we believe his ways are ways of love, for God is love. His way through the instrumentality of the Redeemer, to the blind man was love, and he will deliver the whole creation from their "bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." If the man had not been blind,

he could not have been recovered, of course he could not have loved Christ for opening his eyes. So if the human family had not been associated with a carnal body, and thereby induced to sin, and compelled to suffer, they could not be delivered, nor could they love God for their deliverance ; of course they could not be happy, for love is happiness, and heaven—" He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and he in him," but God will deliver the human family from blindness and wo—both physical and mental.



### SECTION V.

Statement of another opinion relative to the origin of the soul—  
 God could have prevented moral evil and human misery—  
 The necessity and benefit of evil and misery.

Some theologians hold, and inculcate the opinion, that souls existed before they associated with flesh, and in which pre-existent state they sinned, by some means, and are now put into mortal bodies, and made subject to vanity at such times and places, and under such circumstances, as the Almighty may select with a view to their purification, and perfection, like the captain of their salvation, through suffering.

Assuming the truth of this hypothesis, we may, with much propriety, argue in favour of a belief of the final restoration of the degraded soul—which is now made subject to vanity, but we hope and say with the Apostle, it shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

But to reason on the subject. If souls did exist before they came into the bodies, and do come into them because they have sinned, the intention of God in sending them here, must be for their benefit, and if any are not benefited by the connexion, he must have

known the fact before he ever intended the connexion, and if he did know it as a fact, he would not have sent them here, unless he intended their misery instead of their happiness.

But if God really intended the present and endless misery of some soul which he has associated with mortal bodies here, he could as well have let them be so in their disembodied state, or if their deviation from moral rectitude, did not make them as miserable as he wished, he might have devised some way for that purpose as well as to first send them to exist in bodies, on a great and beautiful world, which he seems to have made for their accommodation, and to make them suffer some, so as to just taste misery and then to endure it for ever. But that he wishes their purification and endless happiness, is evident, if the scripture be true. If then God wishes the happiness of souls, we must believe that their connexion with mortal bodies—their subjection to vanity, and their present sufferings, are parts of the means he uses for that purpose. Upon no other system of faith, can we justify the ways of God to man, in permitting the existence of evil and suffering among them.

Arguments of reason, and expositions of Scripture have been used in all ages, by the good and wise, to reconcile the mind of man, under the circumstances of the existence of moral evil and human misery, under the reign of a wise, powerful, and good being, and have proceeded upon the ground of the short continuance, necessary and salutary effect of human suffering, to produce a relish of, and qualification for an eternal weight of glory, in the next state of existence for every sufferer—and they all ought, like the Apostle, to reckon the sufferings of this present life, or time, are not to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in them. And also on the finite nature of sin, or moral evil, and its tendency to produce good.

Under such views we may be reconciled to live and to suffer, and not to "fret at evil doers, or against the Lord," as our sufferings are to work out for us, an eternal weight of glory, and that evil doers are permitted by the Almighty to live, under his care and everlasting love. And we may believe also, that he who has wounded will heal, who has degraded will exalt, who has begun a good work of redemption will carry it on to perfection, either in this or the coming state. That as the Scriptures declare, as we have been partakers of the earthly nature, so shall we be of the heavenly.

Once more. Although we do not believe in a resurrection of the body, because it would be contrary to scripture and reason, nor in what is called a general judgment, yet to those who do we will apply this further argument in favour of the doctrine by asking them what they think may be the exercise of the soul after death, which may leave the body unholy, during the time, which will intervene between the death of the body of some, and the day of the general judgment? We would ask, will they not have ample time and means afforded during this period for sanctification? Will not their opportunity be better, than when associated with a fleshly body, and carnal mind of earthly and sensual propensities? Surrounded with bad examples—natural temptations, and, according to common belief, a powerful, malicious, personal Devil, who with all the subtlety of an angel of light is continually going about, seeking whom he may devour?

All who believe in a resurrection of the body and general judgment, agree in thinking that souls will not, either be rewarded with heaven for their services, nor punished in hell, before the judgment day—of course, they ought to believe, and reason is on the side of the argument, that all souls will be redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and that the song of universal praise will



be sung by "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them; saying, blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." But we would ask, with what propriety could every creature give this glory to the Lamb, unless they had been actually redeemed?

We anticipate an objection, that may be made by some, against the position which we wish to establish, predicated on the last noted hypothesis, the pre-existence of souls to Infants and Idiots, and all those who from natural circumstances, have been during life precluded a moral qualification for heaven. The merit of the objection is, that, if souls were, capable of sinning in their pre-existent and disembodied state, why not suppose they are capable of repenting and reformation, as souls abstract from bodily considerations, and if they do not, they are proper subjects of punishment, according to the rules of moral justice.

To this reasoning, we oppose the argument, that, if the human soul did exist, before it was connected with a body, and in that state sinned, we have no grounds from scripture, or reason, to believe that it is now capable of repenting, while associated with the body of an Infant or an Idiot, or even with that of wisdom and age, unless it is properly informed of the nature and character of God, and the requisitions of the law; "how can they call on him of whom they have not heard?" If souls have moral information before they came into mortal bodies, it is evident that they lose it, by some means, at their first appearance in flesh, for not only our common sense and reason teach us that this is the case; but the scriptures uniformly, represent all mankind, in a state of uninstructed nature, "without God in the world," or without the knowledge of God.

And now, dear reader, how can you, why will you disbelieve, or dispute such reasonable, such consolatory doctrine? No scripture denies it, no reason disproves it. It is a doctrine full of sweet and immortal hopes, a doctrine calculated, to justify the ways of God, to the most reasonable, and the best feelings of the human heart—to cause all souls to love and adore the great and good Father of the human family. It is a doctrine that above all others, which have ever been offered for the credence of man, is best calculated to promote human love, human hope, and human peace and happiness.

Of love—If all mankind fully believed that all their fellow creatures were the children of God, and equally interested in this love, and would certainly meet and associate together, in great glory, in their next state of existence, would they, could they hate and injure each other, in this life? No, they would not, they could not; but they would love each the other as Christ loved them. They would realize the fact “he that loveth God loveth his brother also.”

Of hope—If people really believed in the eternal salvation of all souls, with what feelings of resignation could they part with those whom they loved, their separation by death would be viewed, as only of short duration, when they should meet with, and see them again, adorned with all the charms of divine beauty, and filled with immortal joys, in the regions of endless pleasure, where is no more parting.

Of peace—If all mankind were believers of the consolatory doctrine of the universal holiness and happiness of the human family, would they not live in love and peace with each other, and with God? yes, they would be delivered from the fear of future wo; of the endless misery of themselves—of their children, and all others, whom they loved. Though a dear friend, a relative, a son, or a daughter, might die, void of the

knowledge and love of God, in the soul—might be a murderer, or a prostitute—defiled with crimes, and covered with scandal—was hurried off the stage of life unwarned; no time afforded for reformation, no time to make reparation for injuries done—no manifestation of a godly sorrow for sin; no signs or fruits of repentance; but “a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation” in the future state; yet those who had the faith of truth could enjoy peace, relying on the power, goodness, and promise of God—to cleanse—to purify—to sublimate, the defiled and degraded soul, in his own way and time, and receive it, as his own wandering, prodigal, suffering child, when he will dress and beautify in all the charms of celestial lustre, and present it to all the family above, to be admired among all those who come out of great tribulation, and have “their robes washed white in the blood of the Lamb.”

And now, my dear reader, how can you disbelieve or oppose so consolatory a doctrine, so worthy of a God of all power, love, and justice? Is not its truth interesting to every fine feeling of your heart? Is it not congenial with the purest love of your soul, which yet retains some relic of the divine nature, love, relative to your neighbour, to your relations, to your dear children, and all mankind? Surely it is. You would make all mankind eternally happy, if you had the power so to do; but you cannot. God is pure love; he has all power, he can make all souls eternally happy, and can you doubt his love or his power? it is his will to have all men to be saved, and is not his power sufficient to accomplish the resolves of his will? Surely it is—then all men will be saved.

There is a position taken by the opposers of the doctrine of God's universal and impartial love, of the following nature—That many great sinners live long in sin and pleasure, and if, when they leave the world,

they go straight to heaven, they are better dealt with, than many others who sin less, and suffer more, in life. The reader must here remark, that no one can correctly estimate the quantum of the happiness or pain of another, and that calculation on this subject is uncertain; but should we give the position the place of presumption, there is nothing gained against the doctrine of love for which we contend. Pure love wants nothing for its favors—When, as we read, the lord of the vineyard gave as much to those of his labourers who had worked but *one* hour, as to those who *bore the heat and burden of the day*, they murmured; but his reply to them was—is thine eye evil, because mine is good; have not I a right to do as I will with mine own? Then, dear reader, if you had the love of God in your soul, you would not object, that the vilest sinner in existence—even your murderer, with his hands stained in your blood, should after death be forgiven, sanctified, and received into the joy of your father's house, to be the associate of your soul, companion of your joy, through all eternity.—Had you the spirit of Christ, this would be your feelings—he prayed for his murderers, “father forgive them, they know not what they do.”

Thus, it is easily seen, that divine love requires neither suffering nor service, to entitle the needy sinner to its favors—if it did, man would not be saved by grace—but even say that it requires suffering, and reception to prepare it for the enjoyment of its favour. We do not believe that souls are capable of sinning beyond the grave, so as to be forgiven; but we persist in the belief, that they are proper subjects of operation, and can be prepared by operation, into a qualification, and capacity of sustaining an eternal weight of glory, and we are inclined to the belief that this is done after the soul leaves the body.

To support this position, let it be supposed, that a very wicked man should be on his death bed, and to believe that he was soon to die and enter into the presence of a holy, and sin avenging God—would he not die in much fear of God, and eternal misery? he would—But let us follow, in idea, the transit of the disembodied soul. As soon as it put off mortality, its perceptions are altered and enlarged—as the scriptures declare, it now sees as it is seen, and knows as it is known. It discovers something of the spiritual and holy nature of God, the purity of his law, and propriety of having attended to its precepts—and it fears and trembles. Like the poor, sinful, self-condemned woman, of whom we read—who bowed to the Saviour's feet, washed them with her tears, and wiped them with her hair, and kissed them. So will the soul of the poor sinner do, when it sees God and Jesus as they are—it will voluntarily bow in all the depth of self abasement, at the feet of God—it will wash them with its tears of fear, of sorrow, and of love—It will say, "father I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am not worthy to be called thy son." But should the father, as he most assuredly will, raise up and embrace his long lost son, with the warmest expressions of his love, and inform him that his "sins which were many were forgiven," would not such a soul, on hearing, or understanding this declaration of Him who never changes, be immediately delivered from fear? would it not be filled with gratitude, with admiration, and delight, with love unfeigned to the divine father—with "joy unspeakable and full of glory?" Would not such information, and such usage cause the soul to love God with all its might, and mind, and strength—to "love him because he first loved it?" This would be preparation for heaven. This would be an assimilation into the image or likeness of God, who is love. No other means can be

used, to make degraded intelligences love God, and of course fit for heaven, but by forgiving them all manner of sin. God Almighty, has no other way of purifying and exalting defiled souls, but by pardoning them freely—but by the influence of love. And the Saviour declares, that he that hath much forgiven, loveth much, but where little is forgiven there is little love. So to forgive much, is to cause much love, to fill the soul with love—love is heaven.

Whatever of affliction mortals meet with in this life, are the chastisements of their Maker for their crimes, and the result of divine love, to reclaim them—that they may be made partakers of his holiness; but an endless punishment in the future state could do the soul no good. All the magazines of eternal wrath poured on the soul, never could kindle the least spark of love in it, to the divine father of spirits; but would increase, and perpetuate its hatred, to the author of its existence, and its miseries.

We repeat again, that the divine Creator has no better method to make souls eternally happy in their next state of existencè, than to permit them to sin and to suffer, for a short period, during mortal life, by associating them with a body of flesh, whose natural propensities are opposed to the divine law, and interest of the soul itself; and when by this connexion they are made fully sensible of their weakness, their imperfection, and need of pardon, and of the impossibility of being ever holy or happy in this state of connexion and subjection to vanity; then to deliver them from mortality, and let them know that all their sins, which are many, are forgiven them; thereby it is assimilated to love, to the divine Creator. The obligation of gratitude, and the sensibility of love to God, for this pardon, without desert, is by this means made as extensive as the capacities of the soul, and as lasting as its immortal nature.

We anticipate objections enough, to the position which we have taken—but we will remark, in answer; if the divine Creator could have devised and executed any better way for the purification and glory of souls, who can justify his conduct for refusing the better, and choosing the worse? no one. Now the Almighty can never do wrong, and therefore, the present method of making souls eternally happy is the best.

The scriptures declare, that God hath concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy on all. Now we inquire, how God could have concluded all under sin, unless he had previously ordained that all should sin? he could not; or how could he have mercy on all, unless all sin—mercy could not exist, without the existence of the criminal. Again, without the exercise of mercy in pardoning the condemned sinner, the soul could not love the divine pardoner, of course could not be prepared by love for eternal glory. The soul could not, by any other means, be made to love God, because he first loved it. Thus, it appears as plain, as the first principles of calculation, that God, by associating all souls with a fleshly body, and carnal mind, which is enmity to God, not subject to his will, neither indeed can be, caused them to sin, against a spiritual law, whose requisitions are not only opposed to the propensities of the carnal mind, but reaches to the thoughts of the heart of flesh, that he might have mercy on all such offenders, and that the knowledge of this mercy might produce in the pardoned soul, pure and everlasting love, to the divine Creator, pardoner, and Redeemer, who by his blood and death, made known this love and pardon, to criminal souls.

Thus, in conclusion, we see that there is no impropriety in God's pardoning the worst of sinners, either in this, or the future state, without suffering or service, and that no good man will murmur at the dis-

play of so much grace—and that no soul in any state of its existence, can be made truly sorry for its offences against any being, until it discovers that this being loves it, and that this love can be shown only by a perfect willingness to forgive. As soon as the father kissed his returning son, his heart was melted, and he said, father; I have sinned.

Secondly, we have seen, that the display of unmerited, and free pardon of the soul by the divine Being, is the way to purify and exalt it, to a state of future and eternal glory; and thirdly, this could not have been done unless the soul had been left to sin and to suffer, as it now does; that had God been able to devise a better method, he could not, he would not have pursued the present one for the restoration of all things.

After reading the above, the reader may say, that we charge God as being the author of sin—of this he will read in the next book.

And now, dear reader, if you can have the faith of truth, can believe the consolatory doctrine of the certain alteration of the soul for the better beyond the grave, you must, you will be happy, through every period of your life, for you will know, that whatever might have been the age, condition, or conduct of your dear children, when they left the body, they are saved, are happy, and that you shall surely see them again in your father's home, in all the charms of angelic beauty. Is it not comfort to you, when your beautiful babe is about to die—when you contemplate the fading of the roseate cheeks and ruby lips—the departing of the sublime lustre of the eyes—the heaving of the breast with agony and pain, and quickened palpitation of the heart of innocence, and love—the pulsations of which are soon to cease—and to see it weep on your breast of compassion, the burning tears of death, and implore with all the eloquence of



suffering beauty, and love, the help you cannot give—  
O, then to believe, that the object of your fondest  
love is soon, by this sad struggle, to put off mortality,  
to bloom in immortal beauty, and that you shall cer-  
tainly, and that soon, see it again, and press it full of  
joys, to your immortal soul never to part again ;  
surely it is a consolation.

Is it no comfort, when your son or daughter, your  
husband or wife, your brother or sister, or your father  
or mother is about to die, while viewing the last  
struggle of nature's pains, to believe that all the suf-  
fering scene will soon be over, and tears of grief will  
all be wiped away by God's own hand ; when all the  
hidden faculties of the immortal soul shall bloom and  
flourish in a better clime, where neither pain, nor  
death shall ever come to mar immortal joys, or part  
the blessed in heaven ? Thus to believe that all man-  
kind will ultimately be purified, and sublimated to the  
highest degree of intellectual perfection, is cheering to  
the benevolent soul.—To be sure to meet the friends  
of your life—the parents of your body—the sisters  
and brothers of your love—the wife of your bosom,  
and long the partner of your sorrow and joy,—the  
husband of your affection and heart's love—the chil-  
dren of your fondness and earthly comfort—all—all  
arrayed in immortal beauty, and filled with divine  
joys, never to part or suffer more—is to have the joys  
of immortal life—even so Lord Jesus, amen.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY

# LIGHT OF TRUTH.

## Book Fourth.

*A critical exposition of the present systems of Christian Theology, with scripture proof of their falsity and injurious tendency to mankind.*

### SECTION I.

Of the origin of sin—Fabulous account—True account—Sin not infinite, but finite.

The origin of sin, has, by the generality of christian professors, been very easily accounted for, but in a way which we must disbelieve and dispute, and that with a view to the benefit of man. The substance of the account alluded to is the following.

Some time before the creation of man, the Almighty thought proper to create a great multitude of spiritual beings, called angels; and that some of those creatures of God, were much higher in dignity and glory than others, but were all perfectly free from the least moral disorder; but, that one of those holy and glorious angels of light and immortal life, who was dignified above all the rest, and stood *prime minister* of the Almighty, discharged the functions of his high office to the admiration of millions of celestial beings and the approbation of God himself, for a length of time—but at last fell from his glory, and perfection. The cause of his fall, or dereliction from his primeval state of being and dignity, is stated nearly in the following manner:

When it pleased the Almighty to reveal the brightness of his glory and the image of God in humanity, he gave forth the command, as now appears in the

ninety-seventh Psalm, and seventh verse—"Worship him all ye gods;" and in Heb. 1 : 6, "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him."—But that when this dignified, holy angel, this prime minister of God, whom christians generally have called Lucifer, son of the morning, heard the command, he was surprised at the idea of worshipping any other being but God himself, and looked on this Son of God with disdain and contempt, and in a moment grew indignant—brushed his strong pinions, and waved them for the throne of God—challenged supremacy with the Almighty himself, and cast his eyes to the sides of the north, as a suitable place to establish his empire. Legions of spirits immediately became disaffected towards God, and followed this chief in rebellion, and formed a dangerous party in the kingdom of the Almighty. The Son of God was invested with power, as generalissimo of heaven, to command the remaining faithful force against the common enemy. In short, after many great and bloody battles between armies of contending angels, Lucifer and his party were driven out of heaven, leaving it in peace, though in a great measure depopulated—one third of the stars of heaven being drawn away by the dragon's tail.

God having created the earth and placed the first man and woman on it, in a most happy situation of innocence and moral purity, without the smallest appetite to sin, or propensity to evil; the arch apostate, enviously looked from his fiery prison, to which place he had been consigned by the Almighty, and beholding man in so happy a situation, and with a help meet, and in a capacity of increasing to a mighty multitude, whereby the kingdom of glory might not only be filled again to its original number, but be enlarged, was determined to defeat the design of God in this case. Accordingly, he came out of his fiery prison, entered into

a serpent, or snake—went to the woman, and beguiled her, caused her to eat of a certain fruit which God had forbidden them to eat, or touch, by which means he introduced sin into the world.†

We have not been very particular in this sketch, but it contains the common notion of the introduction of sin into our world.

We shall now put this doctrinal notion under examination, and look diligently for the authority or propriety of accounting for it in this way.

And first, of this memorable rebellion in heaven.—It seems that this rebel angel had always been obedient to the commands of his Maker until the very hour of his fall—that there was not the least spot of pollution in him until he felt the motions of pride, which lifted him above submission to the Son of God. This being the case, we ask, was this angel ignorant of the real character of the Son of God, whom he was commanded to worship? If he was not, but knew him to be no other than the Eternal, his Creator, manifested in a nature which Jehovah created—if he loved his Maker with an undivided affection, as he must have done, if he was holy, and which none will dispute who believes the story, he would have worshipped him with due reverence the moment he made the discovery, and heard the command given. But if this son of the morning did not honour the real character of him whom he was commanded to worship, had he complied, he would have worshipped he knew not what, and nothing can be more absurd, than to suppose that the Almighty would command any of his creatures to worship ignorantly. We ask further, could purity produce impurity, or moral holiness give rise to unholiness? All will answer, no. Was not the angel ho-

† Every believer in the sheer absurd account of the origin of sin, ought to remember that he learned it of John Milton, and not from the Bible.

ly in every faculty of his nature? Was not the command to worship the son holy and just? All will answer, yes. Then from such causes, how was sin produced? The reader will easily see that the question cannot be answered. And now, dear reader, if you will turn and look at the passages of scripture to which we have referred in the subject, you will see that they afford no authority, for believing that either gods or angels ever refused to worship when commanded. The passage in Psalms 97 : 7—"Worship him all ye gods," and that in Hebrews, 1 : 6, "Again when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels worship him," no doubt alluded to Jesus Christ—but we ask, was he brought into the world, before or since the first transgression of man? Since, most assuredly. Then, supposing that millions of angels had refused to worship him, when he was brought into the world, and sinned thereby, we inquire, what effect their refusal could have on man's transgression? Surely none, for a cause cannot be posterior to its effect. Therefore, to suppose that those angels, who never sinned till long after man became a transgressor, were the instigators of what is called the fall of man, discovers a want of correct calculation.

And further, what authority have we from scripture for believing that the command to worship was disobeyed? We find nothing connected with either passage, that intimates there was any refusal among the gods or among the angels. Nor is there any need of supposing, that, by the term god, in one of the passages, and of angels in the other, any other beings are intended, than those of men.

With regard to the command for all the gods to worship him, we remark, that scripture states, "They were called gods to whom the word of God came—and the scriptures cannot be broken." And the com-

mand, for all the angels to worship him, stands on the same ground. By angels, are meant messengers, who are employed by God for the instruction of their fellow creatures, in the will of the Almighty : but as all those messengers, or ministers, were inferior to the "messenger of the covenant," whom the Almighty promised to send to Jerusalem, it was suitable to show his superiority by such a token in the scriptures, as commanding all the angels, or in other words, ministers of the sanctuary, to worship him.

There is another passage or two, in the 41th ch. of Isaiah, which reads, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O! Lucifer, son of the morning?" which is brought in requisition to prove the fall of Satan. But if the reader will read all the chapter to the 24th verse, he cannot but be convinced, if he has the understanding of a school boy, that no other being is alluded to in the above text, than the king of Babylon.

Again, this angel of light and glory, must have been very ignorant of the power and goodness of God, to have had a thought, that to rebel against him could be of the least possible advantage to him, or that he could have maintained a contest with the Almighty ; even man, with all his imperfections, possesses more correct understanding on the subject, than the great archangel must have had, to justify the hypothesis, that he did rebel, under these circumstances. If this angel did rebel with an expectation of success against his Maker, it intimates, that the inhabitants of heaven must have been extremely uncultivated in that age of eternity.

If heaven, which is said to be God's throne, be, or ever was inhabited by defectible beings, the place itself must be a defectible place ; and why the Almighty should take up his special abode in such a place, surrounded by defectible beings, we cannot imagine.— If, however, it should be argued, that he took up his

abode among them with a view to make them holy, we reply, that it appears he did not do it ; and it would show as much ignorance, as Satan is suffered to have laboured under while a holy angel, by supposing that God ever was, or ever will be, disappointed in his expectations or wishes. But we will proceed. After Satan was turned out of heaven, (it is said by man) he saw no possible way to injure the Almighty, his adversary, but by contaminating the new creation, which he had just made, and placed in a happy situation in the garden of Eden.

Now reader, observe here, how strange and improbable this account is. Did not God know the evil disposition of Satan ? Had he forgot the awful difficulty just settled ? or could he leave man to the subtilty and wrath of the devil, as an innocent and helpless lamb to the ferocity of a bear robbed of her whelps ? God, it seems, had driven Satan out of heaven, from his own presence, but left him at loose ends to prey on his tender offspring, whom he had just left in a situation on the earth. What would appear more unnatural and shocking, than for a father to chase his enemy out of his door, but to leave him to slay his defenceless children in the street ?

After what has been here written, is it possible that any one can find, or even pretend to find from scripture, the mere shadow of evidence, or reason, for believing such a story, of the cause or origin of sin ?

But, we are told, that man standing or being in a state of sinless purity, in the image of a holy God, could not have fallen from that state of rectitude, unless there had been some sinful being to tempt him. This argument is unjustifiable ; for if it is true, that a perfect being cannot sin unless it be tempted, but if tempted can sin ; then, according to this mode of reasoning, and these calculations, the Almighty himself may sin, if he should be tempted, who is no more per-



fect than man originally was (according to orthodoxy,) being created in the "image of him who created him," and as man did fall from rectitude, and become sinful, so may the Almighty, admitting that the above hypothesis is correct.

From this we see that the argument of the doctrine of the fall of man, by the temptation of the devil, or the snake, is false, because its results would be impious to believe—man therefore, was never holy since he had a body and a carnal mind.

But, admitting that there is any force in the argument, that man being holy could not have sinned without a tempter, it stands as directly against the fall of satan without a temptation, as it does against man's transgression without a temptation. Was man more pure before he sinned than was the holy angel in heaven? If not, how could that angel sin without a temptation, easier than man, who was made in a lower grade of being?

But supposing we should admit that God commanded an angel to worship his son Jesus, and that the angel refused, and we call that refusal the first sin ever committed, it would not determine its origin, or cause. A cause must exist before an effect, or production—So after all our travelling in argument to heaven after a sinning angel, and after pursuing him to *hell*, and from *hell* to earth, we have not yet found an answer to the question. We have only shown, that the way in which this question has been generally stated and believed, is without foundation.

Having exposed, and we think refuted the notion of the generality of christian professors, respecting the origin of sin in the moral system, we shall make only a few remarks on the subject, but do most earnestly solicit the reader who is in the search of truth, to read Ballou's Treatise on the Atonement, and on the Parables in the New Testament, from which work on the Atonement we have collected for this subject.

We are informed by the Bible, that God created man in his own image, and we are informed by the scripture also, that, Christ "is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person;" and that he is the "beginning of the creation of God." But we are further informed by the sacred text, that after this creation of man, in the image of God, he "formed (not created) man of the dust of the ground." The immortal part is thus made a partaker of flesh and blood, and is, as the scriptures declare, made subject to vanity, not willingly, (not by its own consent) but by reason (or the will) of him who subjected the same in hope.

Man has now, not an immortal, but a mortal constitution, possessing natural carnal appetites and passions; therefore the immediate cause of sin is found in the natural constitution of man, which Paul calls the "body of sin and death."

From these remarks, the reader may be led to think, that we would intimate that God himself, is, or was the cause of sin in man, because he put him into a mortal body, and under the influence of natural appetites and passions, that lead him to crime and misery, as naturally as the current flows from the fountain.

Well, if it should be admitted, that sin will finally terminate for good in the moral system, it will be then necessary to admit, that God was its first cause, or else we cannot admit that he is the author of all good. But if it should be argued, that sin will not terminate in good, but is and always will be real damage to the kingdom of the Almighty, we must admit, on this hypothesis, that he is not Almighty, nor good—for if good and Almighty he would not have allowed sin to enter his kingdom to injure it. We therefore, must admit that God, by putting mankind into mortal bodies, subjects them to vanity, and that all their

crimes and sufferings, will by him be made to terminate in good—the good of man, and the pleasure and glory of God himself.

In no other view of the subject, can we justify the ways of God to man. Those who object to the existence of a God, say—If he is all-wise, he must have foreseen the evil and misery which were coming into the world—If he is all powerful, he could have prevented them from taking place ; and if he is all good, he would have hindered them from existing at all, or from continuing, especially if true, as stated by some, the existence of moral evil is the cause of the eternal misery of the greatest part of God's intelligences.—To answer these objections against the existence of a God of all wisdom, of all goodness, and of all power, we must acknowledge, and say, that he did foresee the evil and misery which would exist in the world, with all their effects and consequences, and that he could have prevented them from taking place : and that although the existence of evil is not the cause of eternal misery ; but that the existence of moral evil and human misery, will terminate for the good of the universe, and therefore the existence and continuance, is in accordance with the will, wisdom, power and goodness of the Almighty, and the eternal happiness of all immortal intelligences.

By whatever means sin may have been introduced among the human family, nearly all Theologians have agreed in believing it to be infinite in its nature and consequences, we therefore will now, put this part of an erroneous doctrine under examination.

The supposition that sin is infinite, is endeavoured to be supported, in consequence of being committed against an infinite law, which is produced by an infinite Legislator. But here we must remark, that the intention of a legislature must be thwarted in order that the law should take cognizance of sin. Now if God

be the legislator, his intentions in legislation, are thwarted also. Here the reader cannot help seeing, that if sin be infinite because it is committed against an infinite law, whose author is God, the design of Deity must be abortive, to suppose which, brings a cloud of darkness over the mind as intense as the supposition is erroneous.

It cannot, with any propriety be supposed, that any rational being can have an intention contrary to the knowledge which he possesses. Was a resolve brought into a legislature to be passed into a law, it would be very unlikely to succeed, if the legislature knew perfectly well, that the intention of the law would utterly fail.

It is possible, and very frequently the case, that imperfect beings desire contrary to their knowledge; but this, in every instance is proof, and often the cause of their misery.

Now to reason justly, we must conclude, that if God possesses infinite wisdom, he could never have intended any thing to take place, or be, that will not take place, or be, nor that which is, or will be at the time when it is, and it must be considered erroneous to suppose, that the Allwise ever desired any thing to take place, which by his wisdom, he knew would not take place, as such a supposition must in effect presuppose a degree of misery to exist in the eternal mind, equal to the strength of his fruitless desire. Again, if we admit a disappointment to the Supreme being, in the smallest matter of consideration, it follows, that we have no satisfactory evidence, whereby to prove, that any thing at present, in the whole universe, is as he intended it should be. All the harmonies of nature, which to the eye of wondering man, are so convincing of that power, wisdom, and goodness, which he adores, may have continued their laws in active force much longer than God intended—may have brought into

existence, millions of beings, more than was contemplated, in creation, and by this time become a perfect nuisance to the general plan of the Almighty ; nor are we certain, if we admit that God ever was, or ever will be disappointed in any thing, or matter, but that he will be disappointed in all his calculations ; of course, of the eternal destiny of all his intelligent creatures, and even of his own. If this inference should be granted, we have not the least foundation, for any faith, in any of the promises which God has made in the Scriptures respecting the fate of the righteous, or the wicked. Such a system of belief would destroy in the mind all the influence of the Scriptures. The admission of such an error, would sink the human mind to the lowest degree of moral depravity, where darkness reigns with all its horrors, without one ray of the cheering lights of divine truth and love, that in the Father of light there is no variableness nor shadow of turning. No intelligent being would or could worship, and depend on a being, who was liable to change, and disappointment.

Let us now make the inquiry, if the intentions of the Supreme are violated by the sin of finite beings ? If not, then sin is not an infinite evil, and the consequences are therefore limited. But if we admit that the plans of God are thwarted, his will cannot be infinite, for infinity admits nothing beyond it. If the transgression be not infinite, neither can its consequences be unlimited and illimitable.

But enough has probably been said, to show that sin cannot be infinite, and cannot therefore require infinite and unlimited punishment. But we will suppose sin and its consequences infinite in their nature.— Then they are thus of necessity, and whatever necessarily exists, must be right. No proposition is better supported than this. Well, what then is the result ? Why, if the extension of its consequences be right, the

plan of God must be thwarted in putting an end to sin, and sin and suffering must be continued endlessly, or the plan of God must be frustrated, and injustice triumph over God—*ergo*—injustice is infinite. If therefore, we agree to call sin an infinite evil, and maintain the infinity of its consequences, either none are saved from it, or those which are saved from it, are unjustly saved. To speak of men who never were sinners as being saved, is utterly absurd, and it can be no less so to say that any are saved from sin, or its consequences, on the principles of injustice. This would involve the principle of injustice as an infinite principle, and confound all distinction in the use of terms.

A very child can see, that if justice and injustice be equally attributes of the Almighty, then both are merged in one essence, and that the terms are interchangeable; in which case we use these various terms synonymously, and endeavour to make a distinction without a difference. We call God a good being, and fancy that his justice entitles him to that appellation; but why not, on the supposition we have just mentioned, call him an evil being, if we understand evil by the term injustice? Yet if the terms justice and injustice, good and evil, convey the same meaning, why do we speak of sin as an evil, or of righteousness as its opposite? Let those who hold to such absurdities answer the question.

But that which can be limited in its consequences, has no claim to infinity. But sin is limited by justice, or Jehovah is not a JUST God and a SAVIOUR. If he is just in putting an end to sin, then sin must come to an end, or it will transcend the attribute of justice, which is either infinite, or is not an attribute of Jehovah. But if it be still contended that sin is an infinite evil, then all sins are infinite, or none; and if one sin be infinite, all are of one grade, or rather, but one sin exists, and that is all the infinity which exists in crea-

tion. On this principle, I see not why sin is not our chief good, and the proper object of worship.

Let us now suppose that the good which may be effected by any rational created being, is infinite. The same person may then be infinitely good, and infinitely evil. A paradox truly, but not more absurd, than to call sin an infinite evil. If man's faculties are infinite, his acts are also infinite, and *vice versa*. If therefore one side of the question is good the other is perfect, and man is but a bundle of absurdities—a being who is the source of never ceasing contest, between two contradictory infinities. Or, let one balance the other, and neutralize both.

To say that whatever evil God permits is ultimately to be overruled for good, is both rational, and scriptural. Let us grant then, that sin will finally terminate in good. In this sense sin is not an ultimate evil. But we term it evil in a limited sense, and very correctly. The act of Joseph's brethren was in itself an evil, but as overruled by God, it produced good. Here is distinction between good and evil, marked by the *intention* of the actors. To Jacob, this was a present evil, and he considered all these things as against him; but had his faculties been infinite, he must have seen the result, and these things would have appeared for him, and not against him. But the intention of the brethren was evil, and they justly suffered all the horrors of remorse, and all the fears of death. But had their faculties been infinite, and had they seen their crime in all its deformity, it could not have been committed. The falsehood which they told old Jacob was occasioned by their fears, but their ignorance was greater than their knowledge of either the present or future consequences of their conduct. Yet their ignorance did not prevent the good which God purposed to bring out of the event. For the *evil* they *suffered*, but when the evil was overruled for their own good—they *rejoiced*.

## SECTION II.

Second plan of Atonement, examined and refuted. Remarks on its injurious effects.

Another system of atonement shall now be examined. The object of this plan is to manifest the glory of God, in giving honour to his holy law. It supposes that God is to effect this by certain displays of his sovereign and irresistible grace, and that self is his ruling motive. The reason given is, that his glory is paramount to every other object, and is not therefore necessarily connected with the best good of all, or any of his creatures.

This system argues, either that God has lost glory, or that his glory may be enhanced. If his glory suffers diminution, it may finally be annihilated, and in proportion as it decreases, he must suffer loss, and become in so far, less than infinite. If his glory be perishable, and subject to decay, it cannot be indestructible, and in so far as his glory is connected with his being, he is in a state of mental decay. And this is the very pith of the argument, as is seen by his caution in watching it; for none but a weak being can be afraid of losing by a stronger, and hence his constant vigilance for its preservation.

Heathen mythology represents Jupiter seated on the top of Olympus, absorbed in the contemplation of his own perfections, unmoved by the joys or sorrows—the happiness or misery of puny mortals. And where is the difference in *fact*, between these representations? Self, dear isolated self, is the object of both. Unconnected with all sublunary affairs, Deity is represented as caring for nothing relating to the affairs of his creatures, and as utterly unconnected with his offspring by even the slightest moral relation. Thus in effect, he is represented as creating without aim or object, un-



connected with an indescribable something, called glory ; which glory he is every moment liable to lose, and of which he is so jealous, that he must make the most savage exhibitions of his power to maintain it. What motives he offers for love and veneration, in this character, is left to the wisdom of others to discover. The character thus given him, implies want and anxiety, always allied to imperfection.

That this representation of his character never can induce a filial affection, is evident from the fact that it presents no feature of loveliness, by which rational beings can be attracted. We can love nothing which does not present some features of goodness. But goodness is recognized only by acts which demonstrate its existence. Goodness is that attribute which promotes the happiness of those who are within the scope of its power. It can never be confined to self ; and we may with as much propriety say a rock or a tree is good, as to represent the creator of the universe as good or beneficent, unless the disposition to diffuse happiness be manifested in appropriate acts of kindness.

The scriptures, however, give him a very different character. He is there represented as our common Parent—the Father of the spirits of all flesh. This brings us into a moral relationship, and evidences a paternal providence, and constant watchfulness over us. He is said to open his bounties for the sustenance and satisfaction of all his creatures, and our senses testify to the fact that he sends rain and sunshine on the just and the unjust, producing fruitful seasons, and filling our hearts with joy and gladness. How near these descriptions agree with that torpid apathy imputed to him by the system under examination, every one can judge, whose moral sense has not been benumbed by the stoical theory of which we are now speaking.

Judging then by what we learn in the book of nature, and its confirmation in the volume of inspiration, the lineaments in the features of his character, as thus unfolded, claim our warmest affections. We are thus taught to "love him because he first loved us." A motive is thus afforded for the exercise of gratitude, and gratitude is rational devotion. But in which of the icy features with which the doctrines of men have invested him, shall we look for one ray of light to warm the hearts of his creatures? Where shall we look for one expression proving that he careth for us? It does not appear—it exists not. All is cold as the icebergs of the arctic pole, and dark as the vaults of death. No motives are exhibited for the exercise of the affections, and without motive men never act.

But we have not yet done with the premises, nor exposed its most prominent absurdities. The system supposes that the highest exhibition of honour to the law of God, was manifested in the sufferings of Christ. Men are supposed to have incurred the penalty of endless misery, a penalty which can never be inflicted, and therefore a palpable contradiction in terms. To say that God can inflict, or man suffer, endless punishment, is to limit the suffering, by bringing it to a close. A proposition which is a most palpable absurdity, growing out of others which made it requisite as one falsehood makes many more necessary, to hide the original among a number of its fellows. True, indeed, the system does not aver that Jesus suffered exactly the penalty; for a few hours' suffering will hardly be termed endless, especially as no one believes he is now suffering. But the theory in question, supposes the being who suffered infinite, in some sense, and therefore term it an infinite atonement. Being met, however, by common sense, the sticklers for this system aver, that though Deity could not properly be

said to suffer, yet the complex nature, the divine and the human, added such dignity to the sufferings, that the humanity which suffered, being raised to a state of immortality, by the infinite portion of Jesus, the suffering, though *finite*, has an infinite effect, and exhibits the glory of God, in the punishment of the human, and therefore finite nature of the sufferer. But after all these sufferings and exhibitions, and all the representations of cruelty inflicted on one of these two natures belonging to one person, by the other nature which took it into company, nothing seems to be accomplished for man's benefit. The sinning children of God, are still left to welter in torments while God exists, saving only, that this very singular act has given God power to save as many as shall be called by his irresistible grace, from the just demerits of their crimes. How much is thus gained by or for men, admitting all this display was solely for the selfish glory of God, let those judge, who have examined the system with a common share of observation.

We have now looked at this plan of atonement, and seen that it has no foundation in the scriptures—that it is altogether inadequate to its pretended effect—and that it tends to harden the heart, by an exhibition of folly and cruelty, worthy of no authority save heathen fable, and the mystery of fanatics.



### SECTION III.

Third plan of atonement examined, and found wanting. Dishonourable to God, and injurious to man.

This plan, as regards the law, the penalty, and person making the atonement, agrees with the former, but differs in its object. Original sin, so called, is supposed to be washed away, so that not one of Adam's race,

will on that account, be finally and interminably miserable. It also supposes, that man, by this means, possesses a moral power to oppose the natural desires of his nature, and conform to the requirement of holiness. That Christ died also for our *actual* sins, of which we may receive a benefit by repentance and faith, and that now a possibility exists of the salvation of all men, on the performance of certain conditions, not very specifically defined, among which is the reception of Christ as he is *offered* to us.

This plan also includes the idea, that men can, and that many do, reject the use of the spirit afforded them by these means, in consequence of which they are totally lost. And it further maintains, that no certainty of salvation is given to any one, nor does it lay God under any obligation to save a single soul, in any way. So very consistent a foundation, we shall probably find well fitted for supporting the superstructure which has been built upon it.

That we may commence the work of examination understandingly, it may be well to state distinctly certain ideas which seem essential to all these several systems. We have noticed them in part, and shall now speak of them more fully. *The* God, or Godhead, is supposed to consist of three persons, all and each really God, or very God, *of* very God, or three distinct persons, in one essence; but nevertheless, so triangularly divided and subdivided, that either one, or all three, is or are, one only God, in three persons, forever. But yet, that a distinction subsists sufficient to make a legal contract. In this contract, the Son being second in the trinity, agreed, under certain stipulations, to honour the law of his Father, by enduring enough of his wrath to wash out the original taint of the first transgression, on certain conditions to be performed by man, not yet fully made public. But setting aside all this confusion, let us inquire—If the Father be God,

the Son be God, the Holy Ghost be God, and each infinite, and truly Almighty, we have three infinite Gods, two in the relationship of Father and Son, and the third "proceeding from the Father and the Son," yet the Son *begotten* by the power of the Holy Ghost, the third person in this incomprehensible, triad of infinities. But leaving all *this* sublimated nonsense, let us inquire into the remainder of this wonderful contrivance. The Son, to fulfil his part of the contract, has to take human nature into company, thus composing a complex person, being "God and man in two distinct natures, and one person for ever." Very well. Now if each of the trinity be God, and God and man compose but one person, then man, or human nature, is a component portion of a triune, or three-one Jehovah. If then the finite part of Christ only suffered, the Son did not fulfil the contract, for he agreed to suffer. If *he* suffered, then infinity can suffer, and become imperfect. Some endeavour to maintain this, and hence we read in Watts, "the great Jehovah dies;" and another requests us to behold a "dying God," while a third speaks of Christ as receiving "a new and immortal life!"

If the reader carefully examines all the stupid absurdities in the commencement of this stupendous plan of atonement, he will not be disappointed in believing that the result of the system will be equally ridiculous. He must see, that even admitting men were destined to suffer endlessly for the sin of Adam, and the death of Christ has merely washed away this stain, little, if any thing is gained, even in appearance. Man is still liable to suffer all the terrible consequences of transgression—his nature is not changed—he is still subject to vanity, and his boasted state of a second probation is no better than the first, which resulted so woefully. The death of Christ has not made salvation certain to any one. A possibility is all which is promised in the

whole affair, notwithstanding all this great display, in which God is represented as suffering to appease his own wrath.

But, after all, where is the wisdom in all this contrivance, which Deity must know would fail, if it does fail? Where is the safeguard against the abuse of the power to sin, which has once been abused? Where is the wisdom of that economy which puts into the hands of man a weapon which has been used, and may again be used for his own destruction? Has God no will about this affair? or does he care so little about his offspring, that any possible event is equal to his feelings, equally subservient to his declarative glory? Would a wise earthly parent act thus carelessly in regard to the children of his body? Certainly not.

No principle is more certain, than that the love of the creature is drawn to the Creator by the manifestation of his paternal regard to us. But in what part of this system is he represented to us as either wise or benevolent? Is wisdom implied, in bestowing on man a continuation of power which has already been abused? Did he, or did he not, foresee the consequences of this act? If the plan exhibits neither wisdom nor goodness, where is our reason for reverence or regard? No possible evidence is given, on this system, that he is worthy our veneration, or our gratitude, and hence its immoral tendency is seen in bold relief.

But granting for a moment, that God hoped, or expected, a very different result, then he is disappointed, and who knows he will not be always disappointed? If he improves by experience, then is he imperfect, and not allwise. If his understanding is but finite, where shall we trust better than in our own wisdom?

The Scriptures, however, represent him as infinite in power, knowledge, and goodness; as loving his creatures, and devising their happiness; as WILLING the salvation of all, with the ability to accomplish it;

as having a determinate counsel which shall stand ; as having made known the good pleasure of his will, which shall be fulfilled. This represents him as the Father, guardian, and benefactor of the human race, and our never ceasing friend. Whether these characteristics deserve our obedience, our veneration, our gratitude—judge ye.

Having now, as we believe, fairly exhibited and refuted the more common notions entertained of the atonement, we purpose to present the reader a Scriptural and rational view of the subject, extracted from a Treatise on Atonement, by Rev. Hosea Ballou, now of Boston.



#### SECTION IV.

The personage of the Mediator who makes the Atonement, and his ability for performing the work.

We have already stated some of the absurdities contained in the opinions of most christians, respecting the Mediator : We shall now be a little more particular on the subject.

We shall contend, that the Mediator is a *created, dependant* being. That he is a created being, is proved from Rev. 3 : 14, where he is said to be “the beginning of the creation of God.” His dependency is proved, by his frequent prayers to the Father. That he acknowledged a superior, when on earth, is evident, from many passages which might be quoted.—See St. John 5 : 19. Christ here says, “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.” He acknowledged a superior in knowledge, see Matthew 24 : 36. “But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.” This passage implies, that he did not

know of that day himself. St. Mark is still more explicit, see 13 : 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." And further, that he acknowledged a superior, even in his risen glory, may be proved from his own words to his servant John, on the Isle of Patmos, see Rev. 3 : 12. "Him that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name." Four times, in the above passage, he acknowledges a being whom he worships. Again, see Psalm 45 : 7. "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, because God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The reader will observe, we have ventured to put the word because, in room of the word therefore, in this quotation; but we have not done it, without the authority of a former translation. The difference is so essential, we cannot dispense with it. Observe, the writer of the Psalm addresses one God, and speaks, in his address, of another, see 6 : "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This God is dependent on another, expressed in the 7th : Because, God, thy God hath anointed thee, &c. That the names, God, Lord, and everlasting Father, are applied to Christ, we shall not dispute; neither shall we dispute the propriety of it; but we do not admit, that they mean the self-existent Jehovah, when applied to the Mediator. In the quotation from the Psalm, Christ is said to be anointed above his fellows. Fellows are equals. Who are Christ's equals? Perhaps the reader may say, they are the Father and the Holy Spirit; but we can hardly believe, that Christ was anointed with the oil of gladness above his Father,



neither do we believe any one will contend for it.— We are sensible, that God speaks, by the prophet, of smiting the man who is his fellow ; but this fellowship must be different from the one just spoken of, and stands only in an official sense. The reader will then ask, if we would consider the Mediator no more than equal with men ? We answer, yes, were it not, that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows. See Philippians 2 : 9. “ Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.” For this exaltation and name, he was dependent on his Father, and received them from him. This name, which is above every name, is the name of God, named on Jesus. It will be said, Christ taught the people, that he and his Father were one. I grant he did, and if that prove him to be essentially God, the argument must run farther than the objector would wish to have it. See St. John 17 : 11. Christ prays that his disciples may be one, even as he and the Father are one. The oneness of the Father and Son, is their union and agreement in the great work which he has undertaken ; and he prayed that his disciples might be as well agreed in the gospel of salvation, as he and his Father were, see 18. “ As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world.” The Father of all mercies sent his Son Jesus into the world, for a certain purpose ; and there was a perfect agreement between them, in all things. He says, he came not to do his own will, but the will of *him* who sent him. And again, My meat and drink, is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish *his* work.

The President of the United States sends a minister to negotiate a peace at a foreign court ; this minister must conduct according to the authority which he derives from him, by whom he is sent ; and as far

as he does, he is, in his official character, the power that sent him. It is evident, Christ received the power which he exercises in the work which he hath undertaken, and that his kingdom was given to him, which goes to prove, he did not eternally possess them ; see Dan. 7 : 14, "And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom." According to the prophecy here quoted, the dominion, glory and kingdom of Christ, were given him. The people whom he is to rule are given him, see Psalm 2 : 8. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen *for* thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession." St. Matthew 28 : 18. Jesus saith, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth." 11 : 27. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." These and many more passages are found in sacred writ, in support of the dependence of the Mediator on the Supreme Eternal, and that he derives his power and glory from him. But if Christ be essentially God, all those scriptures seem without just signification.

Christ is said to be the "image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature." His being the first born of every creature, agrees with his being the beginning of the creation of God. It is plain to us, from scripture, that the Mediator is the first human soul which was created, as Adam was the first man that was formed ; and that he is, *in spirit*, the Father of every human creature, as much as Adam is *in the flesh*. Therefore, Christ saith, as it is written, "Behold I and the children that thou hast given me."

It is written, that man was created in the image of God ; and, by the light of the gospel, St. Paul ventured to assert, that Christ was this image. The reader will do well to observe, that the image of a person, and the person, are not essentially one, but

some knowledge of a person may be obtained by his true image. Christ being the image of God, it is by him we learn the nature of the Father. Christ saith, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him." Again, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." St. Paul is particular, on this subject, in his 1st Epistle to Timothy, see 2 : 5. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus." It seems, by this testimony, that St. Paul was a stranger to the notion of Christ's being essentially God, as it would be improper to call him a man, were that the case. If it be argued, that Christ is God and man both, we ask, was it the whole divine nature which constituted the divinity of Christ? If this question be answered in the affirmative, we desire to know where that divinity is which constitutes the other two persons in the Godhead. If the question be answered in the negative, and it be argued, that the divinity which Christ possessed was an emanation from Jehovah, it is coming directly to what we contend for, viz. that he is a created being.

As we have seen, from the prophecy of Daniel, that Christ received his kingdom ; so we are taught, by St. Paul, that he will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, when he has accomplished the grand object of his reign, see 1 Cor. 15 : 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father : when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be *subject*

unto him that put all things under him, that *God* may be all in all."

We next inquire, has the Mediator power, or ability, to perform the great work of atonement, which is the reconciliation of the world to God? Those scriptures, with their connexions, which we have quoted to prove the Mediator's dependency, abundantly prove the sufficiency of his power to accomplish the work in which he is engaged. If all power in heaven and earth be committed to Christ, no doubt can be entertained of its sufficiency. If the whole system of law in moral nature be subservient to the designs of the Redeemer, and if he hold in his hands the power of moral government, it certainly must be at his option, whether men shall be reconciled to God, or not."

Will all men then be reconciled to God? Let the scriptures answer.

"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh."











BT821.C35

The light of truth :

Andover-Harvard

000761551



3 2044 077 883 023

