

word rendered "hell" in the text cited above—"ought never to be translated, any more than Babylon," &c. This way of objecting to the translating of words is a measure often employed to conceal the truth. Thus a Mr. Millard, opposing the doctrine of Christ's deity, maintained that where we read, (Isa. ix. 6.) "He shall be called . . . The Mighty God," the Hebrew ought not to be translated; but it should be read, "He shall be called . . . *Elgibbor*. So likewise Abner Kneeland, when professedly making a translation of the New Testament, while he was a Universalist, to evade Christ's plain declaration of the *everlasting punishment* of the finally impenitent, would have the word *aiōnios* untranslated, and so gives us Matt. xxv. 46. "These shall go away into *aiōnion* punishment: but the righteous into *aiōnion* life." The word *gehenna* occurs in the following texts, Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 33. Mark ix. 43, 45, 47. Luke xii. 5, and James iii. 6. Let the reader try substituting the name of a place, as Babylon, irrespective of punishment, or suffering, in these texts, and see if it will make any consistent sense. As the word *paradise* used in the New Testament to denote *heaven*, is taken from the delightful garden of Eden, (see Gen. ii. 8, 10 in Greek, and Luke xxiii. 43. 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4. Rev. ii. 7.) So the word *gehenna*, denoting *hell*, the abode of the miserable, may be naturally derived from words signifying 'the valley of Hinnom', which was a place of filth and wretchedness. The eminently learned and judicious Professor Stuart, of Andover, says, "That the word *gehenna* was *common* among the Jews is evinced by its frequency in the oldest Rabbinical writings. It was employed by them, as all confess, in order to designate *hell*, the *infernal region*, the *world of woe*. In no other sense can it be made out that it was employed in

the New Testament." I may add, unquestionably it was used by the Lord Jesus in the sense in which it was understood and used by the Jews.

Mr. B. says, ("Bible Meaning," &c. p. 14, 15,) "The 'everlasting punishment' told in Matt. xxv. 46, we believe will be endless; but," he adds, "Paul in 2 Thes. i. 9, calls it 'everlasting destruction.'" The language of Paul, however, who speaks of being "punished," is evidently to be understood in accordance with that of Christ. The annihilation of the ungodly would not be punishment, but exemption from it. Moreover, the Apostle never used such an incongruous phrase as 'everlasting annihilation'—*everlasting nothingness!* Mr. B. labors also to evade the obvious import of the plain language of Christ, by referring to two Greek Lexicons in which it is suggested, that the primary meaning of the verb *kolazo*, whence *kolasis*, in Matthew rendered "punishment," is derived, is to *cut off*; and asks, "Who can prove that Christ did not use this word in its primary sense of cutting off?" Our author ought to know, that it is not incumbent on any one to *prove a negative*; but he is bound to prove, that Christ did use the word in this sense, and so state that impenitent sinners will "go away into *everlasting cutting off!*" He should know, also, that, not the etymology, but the common use of a word (*usus loquendi*) is the proper rule by which its meaning is to be ascertained. The verb *kolazo* is used in the New Testament in the sense of *punishing* only, (Acts iv. 21; 1 Peter ii. 9,) and the noun *kolasis* in that of *punishment* or *torment*, (Matt. xxv. 46; 1 Jno. iv. 18.)

How does Mr. B. attempt to evade the evident meaning of the statement of our Lord respecting the rich man and Lazarus? (Luke xvi. 19–31.) He alleges, (p. 49, 61,) that it is a parable. But it unquestionably has a meaning;