
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

CHRIST'S WORDS ON THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

BY REV. CEPHAS KENT, RIPTON, VT.

[PREFATORY NOTE. — The design of this Essay is to furnish aid in determining the proper signification of those words in the New Testament which are chiefly employed in teaching the doctrine of future retribution. The Great Teacher uttered these words. What do they mean? In order satisfactorily to answer this question, their *use* must be examined. To facilitate this, a table of references has been prepared, pointing out *all the places in the New Testament where the words are found.* The completeness of this list brings to the careful student of the English Bible, as well as to those acquainted with the original language, the great means of forming an independent opinion as to the teachings of Scripture in the use of these words.

But further, these words are understood to derive much of their significance from a Hebrew word of like import in the Old Testament. It is therefore claimed that the Greek words in question cannot be fully explained without a faithful comparison with the corresponding word in Hebrew. To answer this claim, and as preliminary to the discussion, the use of this Hebrew word has been examined, and a list of references made out marking *all the places* in the Old Testament in which the word occurs.

These lists together are a complete concordance of these words. In them the reader has before him, or within easy reach, the entire basis of the argument on the subject in question, so far as it depends on the use of these words.

The result brought out in this Essay derives its force from the fulness of the references and from the facility thus furnished to any patient investigator to detect and point out any fallacy that may be thought to be discovered, and to satisfy his own mind in respect to the just weight of the argument.]

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. — עוֹלָם, *Αἰών*, *Αἰώνιος*.

THE question whether our Saviour taught the doctrine of eternal punishment is to be determined by appeal to his verbal utterances on the subject, and to the general outlook of his instructions. If these do not help us to give a clear,

definite, and unhesitating answer, it must remain in doubt till a new revelation is given us.

Were the seventeen hundred and eighty-two years which have passed since the last of the Gospels was written to be dropped out of existence, or buried in utter oblivion, leaving us the Bible as we now have it, the proper means of ascertaining the truth on the subject before us would be precisely what they are now. For, since the completion of the inspired volume there has been no voice from heaven to teach us with authority how its instructions are to be interpreted. We are, therefore, to take the Bible as we find it, and learn what it means from itself.

The Old Testament Scriptures, as I understand, are the only writings in the Hebrew language in existence of as early a date as the last of the prophets; the traditions of the Talmud not having been reduced to writing till about the year A.D. 150. It follows from this that the meaning of Hebrew words is to be learned from their use in the Hebrew Scriptures, unaffected in the least by the new meanings, or modifications of meaning, which were introduced into the language hundreds of years afterwards.

Almost the same may be affirmed of the Greek translation of the Old Testament called the Septuagint. This translation is said to have been made from the Hebrew about two hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ. Although doubt is entertained by learned men whether the work was completed at so early a period, the quotations from it in the New Testament by the writers of the Gospels and by the apostles are proof that it was in existence in the time of Christ, and was in common use among the Jews. It is written in what is called Hellenistic Greek, or the Greek as spoken by the Jews in Egypt. This differs somewhat from what is known as classic Greek, or the Greek language in use among educated men to whom Greek was their mother-tongue. The meaning of Greek words in the Septuagint is therefore to be finally determined by their use in this book, comparing them also with the original Hebrew, and not by their use in classic

Greek, or even the Hellenistic Greek in use two or three hundred years afterwards, and modified by prevailing or popular systems of philosophy or religion.[1]

It is exceedingly important to bear in mind, while endeavoring to understand the words of the Great Teacher on our subject, that at the close of the Old Testament canon of Scripture, the meaning of its language was fixed. No changes which the lapse of time or other causes might subsequently bring about in its use could alter the meaning of that book. The same is true of the Hellenistic Greek of the Septuagint in the time of Christ, and of the words of the New Testament after its various documents passed from the hands of those who wrote them. Keeping this in mind, it will be seen how cautious we must be in the use of arguments as to the meaning of the writers drawn from a different use of words in Talmudic Hebrew or classic Greek, or Hellenistic Greek as used after the times of the apostles and under the influence of the gnostic philosophy or other prevailing errors.[2]

Christ used the word *αἰών* in some of its forms, and its derivative adjective *αἰώνιος*. How came he to use them? He found them in use among the people, and in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. There can be no doubt that he employed them in the sense which they generally bear in that book. What is that sense? And how can we determine it? We need not inquire how they were employed by the historians, poets, and philosophers[3] of ancient Greece, or even by the Christian Fathers,[4] so-called, of the early centuries. It is enough to ask, simply, what is the sense of the Hebrew words to which they correspond. In this way, and by examining their use in the New Testament, we can judge with reasonable certainty as to their meaning in the instructions of the Saviour on the subject of future retribution.

If the words in question were of infrequent occurrence, it would be natural to seek help in determining their meaning from their etymology or history. But here there is no need of this. They are found in so common use and in so various

connections that there is little danger of misinterpreting their true significance in any place where they occur.

Let us examine them. First: עוֹלָם.

Our interest in the examination of this word for the purpose now before us grows out of the fact that the Greek *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are so often employed by the Septuagint translators to express its meaning in their version as to assure us that when we understand the meaning of עוֹלָם we also know the meaning of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*. The table of references appended to this Article points out its occurrence in the Old Testament four hundred and forty-five times. Careful attention has been given to each one of these in the original, and no single instance has been discovered in which it does not relate to *duration*. There are two in which, in our version, it is rendered *the world*. In one of these (Ps. lxxiii. 12) the translators, as it seems to me, miss the point of the writer. They have it: "These are the ungodly, who prosper (עוֹלָם) in the world: they increase in riches." But the writer designed to give expression to the intensity of what he soon acknowledges to be his unreasonable and wicked dissatisfaction and impatience at the way things were managed: "These are the ungodly, and they are *always* prosperous: they heap up riches; while *I* find that there is no use in trying to be good, for I am plagued all the day long."[5]

The other place where עוֹלָם is translated *the world* is Eccl. iii. 11. This is the meaning given to this text in Buxtorf, and Gibbs's Gesenius. But as no parallel passage is referred to by either to favor such a construction, and as *eternity*, in the connection, to say the least, gives as good a sense, it is proper to regard such translation as merely conjectural and without warrant. With these two passages thus disposed of, it is proper to say that עוֹלָם *invariably* has respect to *duration*.

The plural form occurs twelve times, but without any meaning different from that conveyed by the singular, as may be seen by consulting the following references: 1 Kings viii. 13; 2 Chron. vi. 2; Ps. lxi. 5; lxxvii. 5, 7; cxlv. 13; Eccl. i. 10; Isa. xxvi. 4; xlv. 17 (twice); li. 9; lvii. 11.

As a late writer, in the endeavor to prove that this word does not mean eternity, but simply *an age*, has asserted that, in accordance with that theory, there are found such "reduplications of the word as an עוֹלָם of עוֹלָמִים, or an age of ages," I remark that I have discovered no instance of such reduplication.[6] It seems pertinent to the subject before us to say this, preparatory to presenting the word itself.

Meaning of עוֹלָם. — This word is used in Scripture in senses directly opposite to each other. For what can be more opposite to the future than the past, or to the past than the future? In the more common use of the word, it has respect to duration in the future. But the instances in which it refers to the past are too numerous to be properly called "catachrestic," or exceptions to general usage, as they are called by Professor Stuart. *Ancient times*, *of old*, *of old time*, *long ago*, or something equivalent, is legitimately a common meaning of עוֹלָם. I have found fifty-two instances where it is employed in this sense, though not always so rendered in the common version. This number comprises about one eighth of all the cases in which the word is found.

But further, not only has this word two opposite significations as past and future, but each of these — עוֹלָם *past* and עוֹלָם *future* — has two different meanings, one describing *the indefinite*, the other *the infinite*. A careful examination of the word, in its various connections, can scarcely fail to convince one that these four meanings attach to it, and that they cannot but be recognized in any faithful translation of the Scriptures. But notwithstanding this diversity, there is seldom any confusion or ambiguity of meaning, more than there would be, in common discourse, in the use of the word *hemlock*, meaning both an evergreen tree and a poisonous herb; or more than if the four senses in which עוֹלָם is used were expressed each by its own appropriate word of a single signification. In almost all cases, the connection shuts up the sense to the one meaning which there belongs to it, and shuts out the other three.[7]

This shows how needless and how futile all endeavors must be to fix upon the word a meaning independent of its connection, or to argue that because in one place it evidently points to an indefinite and finite future, it cannot in another place be *known* to mean an infinite future.

It is a most noteworthy fact that עוֹלָם is not used, in a single instance, to designate a limited or definite period, either past or future. For our present purpose no further remark is called for in relation to those fifty-two cases which have reference to the past.

But in seven eighths of the instances in which עוֹלָם is used in the Bible it speaks of an indefinite or infinite *future*. The sacred writers employ it very often to point out an indefinite, though less than infinite, duration, just as forever and everlasting are used in our common speech, where an infinite future is not intended. At the same time, it is unquestionable that it is generally employed to express the *infinite* future. This idea is sometimes conveyed by other words and forms of expression. But עוֹלָם where it means *forever* or *everlasting*, is found many times throughout the Bible where any other word of like meaning is found once. This is the word that describes Jehovah as the everlasting God in Gen. xxi. 33; Ps. xc. 2; Isa. xl. 28. It is this in which is declared his eternal dominion in Ex. xv. 18; Ps. ix. 7; x. 16; xxxiii. 11; lxvi. 7; and it is this word, עוֹלָם, that is employed so many times in the Psalms, and elsewhere in the writings of the historians and prophets of the Bible, to set forth God's eternal existence and dominion, his title to everlasting praise, and the glorious truth that the mercy of the Lord endureth forever. To describe the infinite, eternal God, or what belongs to him, it is used seventy-six times.

It is this fact — that this word is so applied to the self-existent God and to his unchangeable government and attributes — that, beyond all reasonable controversy, *fixes* upon it the meaning of *eternity*. That when applied to other subjects of a temporary and perishing nature it has a more restricted meaning, we have already seen. But that in its

application to God, his government, and attributes it means eternal, it is as impossible for us to doubt as it is to doubt the divine self-existence. If this does not mean eternal, there is no word or combination of words, from Genesis to Revelation, to tell us anything of the infinite past and the boundless future; and all that we can know of eternity, without a new revelation, must be gathered from sources independent of any light that comes to us from between the covers of the Bible.

But here the question comes up: If the word has so different meanings, when is it to be regarded as referring to the *infinite future?* In view of the fact that it is so often applied to the infinite God, the answer must be that *it means eternal or everlasting, in all cases when the connection, properly understood, does not positively show that it is more restricted.* Thus, when in Jer. x. 10 we read that "God is an עוֹלָם King," the sense does not restrict it, and we know that it means *eternal.* But when Solomon, in 1 Kings viii. 13, speaks of the temple which he had built as "a settled place for God to dwell in עוֹלָמִים," the sense shows that it does *not* mean eternal.

Second. Let us now examine *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* synonymous in the Septuagint with the Hebrew עוֹלָם.

The interpretation of עוֹלָם has been thus dwelt upon for the reason that its whole meaning is transferred to the Greek of the Old Testament by means of *αἰών* and its derivative *αἰώνιος*. In four hundred and fifteen places where some form of עוֹלָם is found, only seven have been found where it is translated by any other word than *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*. This shows a remarkable correspondence between them.

This all but universal use of *αἰών* and its derivative by the translators of the Septuagint to give the sense of the Hebrew עוֹלָם, shows that the words must carry with them into the Greek the two opposite meanings of past and future, and the two subordinate variations of each as indefinite and infinite.

In the New Testament, however, *αἰών* has the sense of *world*, which, so far as I have been able to learn, it never

bears in the Septuagint.[8] It is several times a loose synonyme of *κόσμος*, *world*,[9] but whether this world or the world to come depends wholly on the connection. Considering how often the word is employed in both senses, it is remarkably free from ambiguity. It occurs thirty-two times in the sense of world, or where it is not designed to express the idea of past or future time. These thirty-two, or (including Eph. ii. 2, where it is rendered *course*) these thirty-three instances of its use in the New Testament, may therefore be set aside as having no bearing on the present discussion. Besides these, *αἰών* is found in the New Testament (if no mistake has been made in the examination) seventy-one times where it has reference to time or duration, past or future. The adjective *αἰώνιος* follows this sense of *αἰών* throughout all cases of its use, and, so far as I can ascertain, is in no case employed in the sense of worldly, or of pertaining to the world. As these two words, the noun and the adjective, are so nearly related to each other, it does not seem necessary to consider them separately, further than to state that *αἰών* is used in reference to the indefinite past seven times, and *αἰώνιος* three times. Leaving out these, and for the present those passages also which relate to future retribution, we find *αἰών* used of the indefinite or infinite future fifty-five times, and *αἰώνιος* in the same sense fifty-nine times. In all these instances *αἰών* may properly be translated *forever*, or, with a negative particle, *never; αἰώνιος* is rendered *everlasting* or *eternal*. These words are applied to God, his glory, and kingdom thirty-eight times, and sixty-two to the blessedness of the righteous. The thirty-eight which relate to the existence, attributes, and government of God leave no question that in such connection they are to be interpreted in their most extensive signification, as forever and eternal. And there can be no doubt that, if the element of duration is introduced at all,[10] this same meaning belongs to them in the sixty-two cases where they are used to set forth the glory of future blessedness, so that they point to a duration which will have no end.

We find, then, in the New Testament, one hundred and seventy-three instances in which occurs, in one form or another, one or the other of these words, *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*. Throwing out the thirty-three of *αἰών*, where it has no reference to time or duration, and the ten instances of their use where they have reference to the past, and the remaining one hundred and thirty point to the future. Leave out also from our consideration, just at this stage of our discussion, the fifteen which relate to the future condition of those who die without repentance. The thirty-eight cases where the words refer to God incontestably carry with them the idea of everlastingness or eternity. The sixty-two pointing to the happy condition of the righteous are generally regarded as equally clear in asserting that this condition is to be absolutely without end. There remains fifteen instances of a miscellaneous character, not reckoned in the above, in most of which the words as clearly mean forever or eternal. In no case is either word used to describe a period of known and definite limits.

In a few instances *αἰών*, meaning ever or forever, or, with the negative never, is employed as in common speech we use the words forever and never, when we have in mind no direct reference to a never-ending future. Thus Paul said, "If meat make my brother to offend I will never eat meat; or I will by no means eat meat forever; that is, I will forever abstain from it." So the Saviour said to the fruitless fig-tree: "Let no man eat fruit of thee forever." Such a use of these words misleads no one, and brings no doubt as to their true meaning when applied to things which are in themselves capable of an absolutely boundless future. The steps of the argument here attempted may be thus recapitulated.

1. עוֹלָם in Hebrew is the word above any other, and used many times more than all others, to express eternal duration.

2. This word is rendered in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which was in use in the time of our Saviour, by *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* nearly fifty times to one where it is ren-

dered by any other word; thus proving that these were the words in general use in the days of Christ, to express the meaning forever and everlasting of the Hebrew עוֹלָם.

3. This meaning of these words is confirmed throughout by the usage of them in the New Testament. For if we leave out thirty-three instances where *αἰών* does not relate to duration, and the ten in which it and its derivatives relate to the past, in the sense of ancient times, or from everlasting; and, further, leave out, for the present, the fifteen which apply to future retribution, we find these words, one or the other, one hundred and fifteen times; one hundred, or more than three fourths of these, relate either to God or the blessedness of his people; and the remaining fifteen in general correctly translated forever or everlasting, but sometimes in the sense of always or perpetually, or with a negative by never, as when Peter said, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." It is to be carefully noted that, while the noun *αἰών*, with a preposition used adverbially in the sense of forever, is applied, as in this case, simply to all future *time*, the adjective *αἰώνιος* is never used in the New Testament except in the sense of *eternal*, having reference either to the past or the future, unless we except from this those instances in which it is applied to the future condition of the wicked.

Shall these be excepted? Is there any ground in philology to make them exceptions to the general usage of *αἰών*, and to the otherwise uniform usage of *αἰώνιος*? If we believed that Jesus and his disciples who employed these words in setting forth the subject before us spoke with no more than human authority, we should discover no ground to hesitate as to the meaning of their language and the doctrine which they intended to teach. We should interpret their words as teaching the doctrine of eternal punishment, as they are generally interpreted by those who disbelieve in their divine inspiration and authority. Of words that are met with as frequently as עוֹלָם in Hebrew, and *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* in Greek, and forever and everlasting in English, I think it would be difficult to find one in either of the languages of a more con-

sistent, and, in their proper connections, uniform and unfluctuating signification than any one of these three.

Christ uses the word *αἰών* once, and *αἰώνιος* four times in reference to the condition of the wicked. In Matt. xviii. 8, "It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire." Matt. xxv. 41, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. xxv. 46, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

In this last example it is important to notice the clear contrast between the condition of the righteous and of the wicked, as here set forth. The difference is not in the duration of one or the other, for the same word is used in both cases to describe this idea; but one is punishment, while the other is life. As to the quality of duration they are asserted to be exactly parallel. Everlasting punishment, *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*; everlasting life, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*.

In view of the language here employed by the Saviour, uncontradicted and unmodified by any other word of his, but strengthened by all his instructions bearing upon this subject, it is as certain as language can make it that, if he intended to teach the eternal blessedness of the righteous, he also intended to teach the eternal punishment of the wicked. In Matt. xii. 32, "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come." This world and the world to come take in the whole existence of the human race. To fail of forgiveness both in this world and the world to come is to fail utterly, as long as the soul exists.

Consider, also, the Saviour's discourse as recorded in Mark ix. 43–48 inclusive, where, in setting forth the doom of the wicked, he thrice repeats his appeal to "the unquenchable fire, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched"; the eternal duration of punishment being asserted not by the words forever or everlasting, but by denying its end: "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." [11]

Of like import is the instruction given in Luke xvi., in the story of the rich man and Lazarus,[12] "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." These words were put in the mouth of Abraham by the Saviour, to teach something in regard to the condition of departed souls. Besides other instruction imparted by the story, there was this: that the gulf between the righteous and the wicked, after the death of the body, is impassable. To suppose that out of regard to Jewish prejudices, or for any other reason, he would give the countenance which he here does to such an opinion when it was contrary to truth, a mere fiction or Jewish fable, is opposed to all that he tells us of his errand into this world: to bear witness to the truth, to be the way, the truth, and the life. Now make the supposition that instead of the declaration above, the Saviour had put into the mouth of Abraham the utterance, substantially, of Henry Ward Beecher, in Plymouth Pulpit (New Series, p. 97): "Son, be comforted; for if there be summer in heaven you will find it. Though you be plunged into the depths of hell, if you long for such a God as is manifest by Jesus Christ, you will find him. You will see him for yourself, and not another for you. You will be like him yet, though it be myriads of ages hence." Had the Saviour done this, he would have left no doubt that he intended to teach that all men would eventually be restored to the favor of God. This would have given full warrant to the preacher's closing and emphatic announcement in the above discourse, thus: "This is my gospel, the tidings of a God, who is, out of his own patience and suffering, working the salvation of the universe. *Yea and amen.*" But instead of this, Christ said, "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." Clear and decided is the declaration here made that that gulf *cannot be passed.* Who then really believing in Jesus as a divine and infallible

teacher will venture to say that it *can* be passed, even "though it be myriads of ages hence."

But let us look at the subject as independent of all the explicit testimony which has been here brought forward. On the supposition that *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* had never been used in relation to future retribution, and that those discourses of the Saviour in Matt. xxv., Mark ix., and Luke xvi. were not found in the Scriptures, how would the matter stand? What is the general outlook of the Saviour's teaching on the subject? Reference can be made only to a few of many citations which would be in point. "The broad way, the wide gate, which leads to destruction; many go in thereat" (Matt. vii. 13). "And the ruin of that house was great" (Luke vi. 49), "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xiii. 41, 42). "So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xiii. 49, 50). "But he shall say, I tell you I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity; 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" (Luke xiii. 27, 28). "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation" (John v. 29). Most noteworthy is the manner in which these instructions were given. That loving Saviour, who came down from heaven to save men, spoke of these terrible things without apology, misgiving, or reserve, and left no single word to allay the terror they must awaken.

Only one more quotation will be given from the words of

Christ. They are from his last prayer, recorded in John xvii.: "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me." Is it possible to regard otherwise than utterly and forever hopeless the condition of those whom the Saviour distinctly and specifically excepts from the benefits of his prayer?

The argument as presented rests entirely on the words of Christ, and need not be prosecuted further. For if it is not proved that he taught that the punishment of the wicked would be without end, it cannot be proved that the apostles believed or taught it, or that anybody else ever believed or taught it. As doctrines of revelation, that of eternal life and that of eternal death rest upon the same basis of scriptural proof. They must, therefore, stand together or fall together. Every argument drawn from the Saviour's teachings in favor of the eternal blessedness of the righteous, is equally valid to prove that the wicked will go away into eternal punishment; and no argument can legitimately be drawn from the language of the Saviour's instructions against the doctrine of eternal punishment which does not strike with equal force against the scriptural proof of the doctrine of eternal life. For since the duration of punishment to the wicked and of life to the righteous is expressed by the same word, to deny the eternity of punishment is to deny the authority and validity of the Saviour's promise of eternal life to his followers, except so far as we may fancy reasons for trusting in his promise, independent of our confidence in him as our infallible and authoritative Teacher. Considering that he who came to bear witness of the truth uttered those words in Matt. xxv.: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," and "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," — to deny the doctrine of eternal punishment because we cannot see its consistency with the divine benevolence, must logically involve the denial of the divine origin of Christianity.

We know so little of the latent influence of prejudice or misconception and false training on religious belief, that it may

be proper for us charitably to believe that many who deny the plain instructions of Christ on this subject, are yet so far loyal to him in heart that they will be personally accepted by the heart-searching Judge as his true friends and disciples. But if called on to give our sanction to any one as a religious *teacher* or *preacher* of the gospel who denies this, or holds it so feebly and hesitatingly that he does not preach it, such charity is entirely misplaced. In his commission to his ministers, the Saviour says, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." We cannot doubt that true loyalty to him will prompt careful obedience to his instructions; and that such obedience will demand, and will be seen to demand, from the professed teacher of religion the earnest declaration of the truth, as taught by the Saviour's own lips, that when the righteous are received to life eternal the wicked will go away into everlasting punishment. To call this in question is to the same extent to call in question the reality of a supernatural revelation. For nothing can be more preposterous than to admit the divine origin of the Christian religion and the infallibility of the Founder, and yet deny a doctrine which he taught so clearly and with such emphatic reiteration. And not less preposterous is it to suppose that an infallible Teacher, with a heart full of kindness to the race which he came to redeem, would employ the same word to describe the duration of punishment to the wicked as of life to the righteous, if it were not as truly his purpose to inflict the one as to bestow the other. Nothing could be more at variance with veracity and with the spirit of true benevolence than to seek to frighten men with the threatening of evil that was sure never to come.

The earnest study of this subject can scarcely fail to convince every sincere inquirer after truth that no man is worthy to be approved or employed or listened to as a Christian teacher who has any misgiving as to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ taught that the punishment of the wicked will be eternal, and that this doctrine is true.

This Table of References is intended to point out every verse which in the Hebrew Scriptures contains the word עוֹלָם, in any of its forms; and every verse in the New Testament containing the words *αἰών*, or *αἰώνιος*. The words sometimes occur more than once, in the same verse.

עוֹלָם.

Gen. iii. 22; vi. 3, 4; ix. 12, 16; xiii. 15; xvii. 7, 8, 13, 19; xxi. 33; xlviii. 4; xlix. 26. 13
Ex. iii. 15; xii. 14; xvii. 24; xiv. 13; xv. 18; xix. 9; xxi. 6; xxvii. 21; xxviii. 43; xxix. 9, 28; xxx. 21; xxxi. 16, 17; xxxii. 13; xl. 15. 17
Lev. iii. 17; vi. 18, 22; vii. 34, 36; x. 9, 15; xvi. 29, 31, 34; xvii. 7; xxiii. 14, 21, 31, 41; xxiv. 3, 8, 9; xxv. 32, 34, 46. 21
Num. x. 8; xv. 15; xviii. 8, 11, 19, 23; xix. 10, 21; xxv. 13. 10
Deut. v. 29; xii. 28; xiii. 16; xv. 17; xxiii. 4, 7; xxviii. 46; xxix. 28; xxxii. 7, 40; xxxiii. 15, 27. 12
Josh. iv. 7; viii. 28; xiv. 9; xxiv. 2. 4
Judges ii. 2. 1
1 Sam. i. 22; ii. 30; iii. 13, 14; xiii. 13; xx. 15, 23, 42; xxvii. 8, 12. 10
2 Sam. iii. 28; vii. 13, 16, 24, 25, 26, 29; xii. 10; xxii. 51; xxiii. 5. 12
1 Kings i. 31; ii. 33, 45; viii. 13 pl.; ix. 3, 5; x. 9. 8
2 Kings v. 27; xxi. 7. 2
1 Chron. xv. 2; xvi. 15, 17, 34, 36, 41; xvii. 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 27; xxii. 10; xxiii. 13, 25; xxviii. 4, 7, 8; xxix. 10, 18. 24
2 Chron. ii. 3; v. 13; vi. 2 pl.; vii. 3, 6, 16; ix. 8; xiii. 5; xx. 7, 21; xxx. 8; xxxiii. 4. 12
Neh. ii. 3; ix. 5; xiii. 1. 4
Ezra iii. 11; ix. 12. 3
Job vii. 16; xxii. 15. 2
Ps. v. 12; ix. 5, 7; x. 16; xii. 7; xv. 5; xviii. 50; xxi. 6; xxiv. 7, 9; xxv. 6; xxviii. 9; xxix. 10; xxx. 6, 12; xxxi. 1; xxxiii. 11; xxxvii. 18, 27, 28; xli. 13, 14; xliv. 8; xlv. 2, 6, 17; xlviii. 9, 14; xlix. 8, 12; lii. 8, 11; lv. 23; lxi. 4 pl., 7; lxvi. 7; lxxi. 1; lxxii. 17, 19; lxxiii. 12, 26; lxxv. 9; lxxvii. 7 pl., 8 pl.; lxxviii. 66, 69; lxxix. 13; lxxxi. 15; lxxxv. 5; lxxxvi. 12; lxxxix. 1, 2, 4, 29, 36, 37, 52; xc. 2; xcii. 9; xciii. 2; c. 5; cii. 13; ciii. 9, 17; civ. 5, 31; cv. 8, 10; cvi. 1, 31, 48; cvii. 1; cx. 4; cxi. 5, 8, 9; cxii. 6; cxiii. 2; cxv. 18; cxvii. 2; cxviii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 29; cxix. 44, 52, 89, 93, 98, 111, 112, 142, 144, 152, 160; cxxi. 8; cxxv. 1, 2; cxxxi. 3; cxxxiii. 3; cxxxv. 13; cxxxvi. 1–26; cxxxviii. 8; cxxxix. 24; cxliii. 3; cxlv. 2, 13 pl., 21; cxlvi. 10; cxlviii. 6. 141
Prov. viii. 23; x. 25, 30; xxii. 28; xxiii. 10; xxvii. 24. 6
Eccl. i. 4, 10 pl.; ii. 16; iii. 11, 14; ix. 6; xii. 5. 7
Isa. ix. 6; xiv. 20; xxiv. 5; xxv. 2, 26 pl.; xxx. 8; xxxii. 14, 17; xxxiii. 14; xxxiv. 10, 17; xxxv. 10; xl. 8, 28; xlii. 14; xliv. 7; xlv. 17 pl.; xlvi. 9; xlvii. 7; li. 6, 8, 9 pl., 11; liv. 8; lv. 3, 13; lvi. 5; lvii. 11 pl., 16; lviii. 12; lix. 21; lx. 15, 19, 20, 21; lxi. 4, 7, 8; lxii. 9, 11, 12, 16, 19; lxiv. 8, 4. 45
Jer. ii. 20; iii. 5, 12; v. 15, 22; vii. 7; x. 10; xvii. 4, 25; xviii. 15, 16; xx. 11, 17; xxiii. 40; xxv. 5, 9, 12; xxviii. 8; xxxi. 3, 40; xxxii. 40; xxxiii. 11; xxxv. 6; xlix. 13, 33; l. 5; li. 26, 39, 57, 62. 32
Lam. iii. 6, 31; v. 19. 3
Ezek. xvi. 60; xxv. 15; xxvi. 20, 21; xxvii. 36; xxviii. 19; xxxv. 5, 9; xxxvi. 2; xxxvii. 25, 26, 28; xliii. 7, 9; xlvi. 14. 18
Dan. ii. 4, 20, 44; iii. 9, 33; iv. 34; v. 10; vi. 6, 21, 26; vii. 14, 18, 27; xii. 2, 3, 7. 21
Amos ix. 11. 1
Joel ii. 26, 27; iii. 20. 3
Obad. 10. 1
Jonah ii. 7. 1
Micah ii. 9; iv. 5, 7; v. 2; vii. 14. 5
Zeph. ii. 9. 1
Hab. iii. 6. 2
Zech. i. 5. 1
Mal. i. 4; iii. 4. 2
Total, 445

Αἰών.

Matt. vi. 13; xii. 32; xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49; xxi. 19; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20. 9
Mark iii. 29; iv. 19; x. 30; xi. 14. 4
Luke i. 33, 55, 70; xvi. 8; xviii. 30; xx. 34, 35. 7

John iv. 14; vi. 51, 58; viii. 35, 51, 52; ix. 32; x. 28; xi. 26; xii. 34; xiii. 8; xiv. 16.	13
Acts iii. 21; xv. 18.	2
Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xii. 2; xvi. 27.	5
1 Cor. i. 20; ii. 6, 7, 8; iii. 18; viii. 13; x. 11.	7
2 Cor. iv. 4; ix. 9; xi. 31.	3
Gal. i. 4, 5.	2
Eph. i. 21; ii. 2,7; iii. 9,11, 21; iv. 12.	7
Phil. iv. 20.	1
Col. i. 26.	1
1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 17.	3
2 Tim. iv. 10, 18.	2
Titus ii. 12.	1
Heb. i. 2, 8; v. 6; vi. 5, 20; vii. 17, 21, 24, 28; ix. 26; xi. 3; xiii. 8, 21.	13
1 Pet. i. 23, 25; iv. 11; v. 11.	4
2 Pet. ii. 17; iii. 18.	2
1 John ii. 17.	1
2 John ii.	1
Jude xiii. 25.	2
Rev. i. 6, 18; iv. 9, 10; v. 13, 14; vii. 12; x. 6; xi. 15; xiv. 15; xv. 7; xix. 3; xx. 10; xxii. 5.	14
Total,	104

Αἰώνιος.

Matt. xviii. 8; xix. 16, 29; xxv. 41, 46.	6
Mark iii. 29; x. 17, 30.	3
Luke x. 25; xvi. 9; xviii. 18, 30.	4
John iii. 15, 16, 36; iv. 14, 36; v. 24, 39; vi. 27, 40, 47, 54, 68; x. 28; xii. 25, 50; xvii. 2, 3.	17
Acts xiii. 46, 48.	2
Rom. ii. 7; v. 21; vi. 22, 23; xvi. 25, 26.	6
2 Cor. iv. 17, 18; v. 1.	3
Gal. vi. 8.	1
2 Thess. i. 9; ii. 16.	2
1 Tim. i. 16; vi. 12, 16.	3
2 Tim. i. 9; ii. 10.	2
Titus i. 2; iii. 7.	3
Philemon 15.	1
Heb. v. 9; vi. 2; ix. 12, 14, 15; xiii. 20.	6
1 Pet. v. 10.	1
2 Pet. i. 11.	1
1 John i. 2; ii. 25; iii. 15; v. 11, 13, 20.	6
Jude vii. 21.	2
Rev. xiv. 6.	1
Total,	70

NOTES TO PRECEDING ARTICLE.

[The preceding Article was completed and sent to the printer before the occurrence of recent events which may seem to make it personal. The following notes have been prepared not by the author of the Article, but by another contributor to this magazine.]

[1] While the classic Greek may be used as a source of much information in respect to the language of the Septuagint, still, in case of doubt, the decisive appeal is to be made to the Septuagint alone. The peculiarity of the subject among subjects treated in Greek, the fact that the work is a translation, which class of work never exhibits the pliability of an original essay, and the evident ignorance of Hebrew displayed by some of the translators, make the Greek of the Septuagint almost an idiom by itself. Nor can the original Hebrew be always used as determining the meaning of its translation, so frequent are the mistakes of the translators.

[2] Writers should be careful, in searching out parallel uses of Greek words in classic works, to get the *popular* uses of such words. The New Testament is eminently a book of the people. Christ spoke the language of the people, and so did his disciples. John's λόγος is not Philo's λόγος. True, there are technical terms in the Bible, — λόγος is one, "life" is another, and there are many more. New Testament Greek is a "converted language." But biblical technics have their roots in the speech of the common people, and are to be explained in accordance with it. The schools had another set of technical terms, modelled upon their own ideas. Of these, as above said, we are to beware.

[8] There was a good deal of philosophy in the air in those days, which may have affected the common speech greatly, although insensibly. It is so to-day. Our missionaries in the Orient find among Armenian lads, who have never seen a book on that subject, or heard a lecturer, deep questions about development. These thoughts come from the mental environment of the age. If so now, why not so then? Yet the ideas are in these days popular in form, and are expressed in words which interpret themselves.

[9] The *philological* interpretations of the Greek Fathers should always be respectfully listened to. Being Greeks, they could *feel* their mother tongue as we cannot. But their fancies are too likely to lead us astray, if we depend upon them further than this.

[10] Vide Lange's Com. Note by Rev. J. F. McCurdy, and Prof. Conant's translation.

[11] The most the Hebrew can offer as analogous to the Greek οἱ *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων* is the phrase קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים.

[12] The word "always" is used in our common speech with a similar modification of meaning. Take, for example, the cases quoted in Webster's Dictionary as illustrative of the *same* meaning of this word: "God is *always* the same," and:

> "Even in heaven his [Mammon's] looks and thoughts
> Were *always* downward bent."

What a difference of meaning! And yet who can mistake it? The latter, however, is a case of modification, and not the strict use of the term.

[13] The application of researches made upon the digamma to this word has cleared many difficulties as to its variation in signification, and has settled the temporal reference of its derivative *αἰώνιος*. Αἰών is derived from the root *αϝ*. This root appears in Greek as *ἀεί*, *always;* in Latin as *aevum;* in German as *ewig;* in English as *ever*. Ἀΐδιος, the other word for *eternal* (Rom. i. 20; Jude 6) is from the same root (Vide Liddell and Scott, last ed.). The idea of time is, therefore, inextricably involved in the very origin of the word. With the idea of *totality of duration* as the primitive meaning, the word, if applied to a man, would easily come to mean *lifetime*, since it is then restricted like all similar words according to the nature of its subject. The meaning *generation*, arises in a similar way. Transition from *lifetime* to *time of life* is the same on any theory of the origin of the word. The meaning *dispensation*, *world*, that is, *a long space of time peculiarly marked off*, is obtained by the same process of restriction according to the nature of the subject. Such changes, as from *lifetime*, through *life*, *principle of life*, to *spinal marrow* become explicable when the root idea is properly conceived. But even if these changes are inexplicable, no such meaning as *spinal marrow*, e.g. can be used as an irrefutable agument against *eternity* as the proper meaning. Absolute contradictions are found in two meanings of the same word, and yet neither can be denied. Who will explain to the perfect satisfaction of one who

demands to know all the steps of the change of meanings, the case of the Hebrew יָדַע which means *to know*, and *not to know*? In fact, there are not always *steps* in these changes for language *leaps*.

[9] E.g. Titus ii. 12; Heb. i. 2; ix. 26; xi. 3. Nearly always, some trace of the original distinction between κόσμος and αἰών can be seen.

[10] The "element of duration" must be introduced; for it is in the very ground-work of the word. The absurdity of giving αἰώνιος a qualitative force, instead of a temporal force, as is done by the advocates of restoration, is illustrated very forcibly by substituting this rendering in 2 Cor. xiv. 17–v. 1. The whole point of the passage is to be found in its contrasts between temporariness and eternity. "For our light affliction which is *but for a moment*, worketh for us a far more exceeding weight of glory *in another world*." This will pass, but is far inferior in force to our translation.—"While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen *belong to this world*, but the things which are not seen *to another*." Indeed! quite a piece of information! Now, can we believe that a sensible writer would say this?—"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle *were dissolved*, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, in the heavens, *in another world*." That this is the sense is incredible.

[11] Some, as, for instance, the late Canon Kingsley (see his Life, recently published), assert that, as the only office of fire or of the worm is to purify by consuming corrupted matter, setting the elements free to enter into new combinations, so the punishment of the future world is merely to purge the soul of sin. The fatal objection to this interpretation is, that such is not the popular conception of fire and the worm. The man of science looks at them so; but the people think only of the *destroying* fire and the *gnawing* worm. Christ, in talking to the people, must have used popular language. This interpretation forces upon the words a meaning belonging only to the nineteenth century and science. It cannot stand.

[12] Restorationists call attention to the fact that the rich man is said to be not in Hell (Γέεννα), but in Hades (Ἅιδης). They therefore declare that this concerns only the intermediate state, and cannot be used as an argument in this discussion. But it is not so certain that it is not properly translated Hell (vide Smith's Bib. Dict., Art. "Hell, Supplement, by President Bartlett.) At any rate, it is a Hades which will issue in Hell; for it is the region of torments, the lowest deep, whence Dives looks *up*. Waiving this point, we may further ask what light is here thrown upon the probability of repentance under future discipline? Not the slightest evidence of repentance can be presented. Dives wishes his *agony* may be relieved, but does not speak of sorrow for *sin*. He would send Lazarus to save his brethren from *pain*, but never a lisp is there of desire to save them from *sin*. Can better evidence be presented of the adamantine hardness of his heart than this,—that, even under the wrath of a loving God, his only thought is of selfish relief? F. H. F.