

to be recommended for invalids; but it must not be served with all the fat at the end, nor must it be too thickly cut. Let it be cooked over a fire free from smoke, and sent up with the gravy in it, between two very hot plates. Nothing is more disagreeable to an invalid than smoked food.

8. In making toast-water, never blacken the bread, but toast it only a nice brown. Never leave toast-water to make until the moment it is required, as it cannot then be properly prepared—at least, the patient will be obliged to drink it warm, which is anything but agreeable.

9. In boiling eggs for invalids, let the white be just set; if boiled hard, they will be likely to disagree with the patient.

HOW TO KEEP A PIANO.—Otto Brunning, writing to the *Journal de Musique* of Paris, says:—The piano is constructed almost exclusively of various kinds of woods and metals; cloth, skin and felt being also used in the mechanical portion. For this reason atmospheric changes have a great effect on the quality and durability of the instrument, and it is necessary to protect it from all external influences which might affect the materials of which it is composed. It must be shaded from the sun, kept out of a draught, and, above all, guarded against sudden changes of temperature. This latter is a most frequent cause of the piano getting out of tune, and the instrument should be kept in a temperature not lower than 54 deg. and not higher than 86 deg. F. When too cold the wood, cloth and skin swell, and the mechanism works badly; when too warm these materials shrink and produce clicking, squeaking and other disagreeable sounds. Moisture is the greatest enemy of the piano, and it cannot be too carefully guarded against. In a very short time damp will destroy every good point about the instrument. The tone becomes dull and flat, the wires rusty and easily broken, the joints of the mechanism stiff and the hammers do not strike with precision, and if these symptoms are not attended to at once the piano is irretrievably spoilt. Therefore do not put your piano in a damp ground-floor room, or between two windows, or between the door and the window where there is a thorough draught. Never leave the piano open when not in use, and above all when the room is being cleaned. Do not put it near a stove, chimney, or hot-air pipes. Always wipe the keys after playing. Never pile books, music, or other heavy things on the top. Be careful when using the soft pedal not to thump the notes. Do not allow five-note or other exercises of a small compass on a piano you have any regard for. A leather cover should be kept on the instrument when not in use, and removed every day for the purpose of dusting. A cushion of wadding or a strip of flannel laid on the keys will help to keep them white and preserve the polish. Never leave the piano open after a musical evening or dance. If you are obliged to have it in a damp room, do not place it against the wall, and raise it from the floor by means of insulators, and always cover it after playing. Employ the best tuner you can get, and if a new instrument let it be tuned every two months during the first year, and at least three times a year afterwards. Always have it tuned after a *soirée* if the room has been very hot.

DR. FARRAR ON ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

The Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., Canon of Westminster, has recently delivered in the time-honoured Abbey, a series of five sermons which has excited no slight degree of attention both at home and over this continent. These sermons are remarkable alike for their divergence from the usual orthodox routine, for their passionate, almost fierce, denunciations of the old-fangled method of interpreting Scripture, and for the eloquence and beauty of their style. Canon Farrar has endeavoured in these efforts to show, that, although there is a terrible retribution upon impenitent sin hereafter, and that no man can hope to see the Lord without forsaking and repenting of sin, the Bible does not teach the nightmares which some unhealthy imaginations have based upon the sacred text. He repudiates and denounces the fell idea, "that, the moment a human being dies—at whatever age, under whatever disadvantages—his fate is sealed hopelessly and for ever; and that if he dies in unrepented sin, that fate is a never ending agony, amid physical tortures the most frightful that can be imagined; so that when we think of the human race we must conceive of 'a vast and burning prison in which the lost souls of millions and millions writhe and shriek forever, tormented in a flame that never will be quenched.'" He believes that an immediate and irrevocable sentence to everlasting agony is not taught in the Bible but that there is some intermediate state "wherein souls which, at the time of death, are still imperfect and unworthy, and not yet in a state of grace—and of such are the large majority of us all—may still be reached by God's mercy beyond the grave." Farther:—"That God has given us no clear and decisive revelation on the final condition of those who have died in sin. It is revealed to us that 'God is love'; and that, 'Him to know is life eternal'; and that it is not His will that any should perish; and that, as in 'Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'; but how long, even after death, man may continue to resist His will; how long he may continue in that spiritual death which is alienation from God; that is one of the secret things which God hath not revealed."

It will be observed by the above excerpts that the Canon has departed very widely from the ordinary orthodox doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Does the Canon deem the wrathful sentence, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," not "vindictive" but only "corrective?" and delivered by a merciful, loving Creator, whose patience over His weak, sinful creature, man, was still far from exhausted, yet would He torment him in a sort of refined purgatory, for an indefinite term, until his sins are "burnt and purged away?" Looking at the question in all calmness and with due deliberation, I, for one, cannot accept Dr. Farrar's conclusions, any more than I can accept the words of that divine who told his hearers of the babes in hell, a "span long." Either may be true, but in the clear light of reason both views seem abnormal and to lack confirmation. I may here state for the benefit of those whose opinions differ from mine, that I do not arrogantly claim infallibility for Reason, or anything approaching it, yet I believe if it were oftener made use of when questions like these are before the mind, much superstition and nonsense would be instantly and forever rejected.

If the reader will get his English Bible and turn to Matthew xxv. chap. and 46th verse, he will find these words: "And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." In the inspired (?) original, the same word is used for both "everlasting" and "eternal"—the Greek word *aionios*. As a great deal depends upon this word from the use which the writers of the New Testament made of it in dealing with the future, it will not be out of place to give the opinion of one or two scholars regarding it, who are thoroughly qualified to speak. Wordsworth says: "*aionios* corresponds to the Hebrew *olam*, which appears to be derived from unused root *alam*, to conceal; so that the radical idea in *aionios*, as used in Holy Scripture, is indefinite time, and thus the word seems to be fitly applied to this world, of which we do not know the duration; and also to the world to come, of which no end is visible, because the world is eternal." Lange thinks *aionios* has nothing to do with hiding or concealing, "but comes probably from *aio*, to breathe, to blow; hence life, generation, age: then indefinitely for endless duration, eternity." De Quincey, one of the best Greek scholars of his day, declares that *aionios* does not necessarily mean everlasting in either case, but represents the duration or cycle of existence belonging to any object, not individually for itself, but universally in right of its genus.

Farrar deems the word in both clauses to mean "eternal—by which (in this connection) we mean something *above and beyond time*, time being simply a mode of thought necessary only to our finite condition—yet it is by no means necessarily the case that the word should have identically the same meaning in both clauses, since the meaning of the same adjective might quite conceivably be modified, and even altered, by that of the substantive to which it is attached. Nothing could be more in accordance with the ordinary genius of human speech than that the same adjective might have its fullest meaning in one clause, in which that meaning is entirely consonant with reason and conscience, yet not have it in the other where it would be shocking and terrible."

In the above cited authorities, the two first represent the opinions of the large majority of the commentators; De Quincey, as far as I know, stands alone; and Dr. Farrar represents a small but ever increasing party of the present day who profess to perceive in Holy Scripture—only that "which is consonant with reason and conscience"—in other words, just what suit their individual degree of culture.

My limited space will not permit of a lengthened examination of any of these various views. I am prepared to accept (as far as the derivation of the word is concerned) any one of them as true; yet I hold, however limited the word *aionios* may be in meaning, it was the most expressive epithet for the perpetuity of time which the Greek contains, and as such was used by the New Testament writers to express their ideas on future punishment and future reward, and must be understood to assert, as far as the writers had words to assert, the endless duration of punishment and reward. Farrar says that the term is frequently used to designate things which have come and shall come to an end. Very true. But is Dr. Farrar so forgetful of his own mother tongue as not to remark that such phrases as "everlasting strife," "eternal disgrace," "endless conflict," are frequently used to-day, and were doubtless used eighteen hundred years ago? Dr. Bartlett, alluding to this, well observes: "The fact is not affected by occasional instances in either language where impassioned utterances or popular phraseology may apply them without rigid exactness; where a speaker may call that eternal of which he can see no end, confounding the indefinite with the infinite; or where no termination is contemplated, even though as a matter of fact it may speedily come. The meaning of the terms remains the same, notwithstanding the overstrained and careless use; and, in calm and well considered utterances, not the slightest doubt attaches to the meaning."

The language employed in the Scriptures is everywhere the language of the people, and it is in constantly overlooking this patent fact that scholars overreach themselves. It is too often forgotten that the humble, and generally ignorant, writers of Holy Writ never used metaphysical terms, probably were incapable of using them; and yet we can scarcely take up in these times an expository work on the Bible without meeting with the grossest absurdities, which, on examination, are generally found to be based on the plainest and simplest words conceivable. The later exegetes, particularly, are open to criticism on this score. They, apparently, find it impossible, with their modern culture and fastidiousness, to teach the bold and often coarse doctrines which their ancestors swallowed without choking; and they forthwith commence to adapt these doctrines to suit themselves. Dr. Farrar dislikes the bold words "hell," "damnation," "for ever." He investigates their meaning, and finally comes to the conclusion that they can be evaporated into "gehenna," "condemned," and "something above and beyond time," and is satisfied that he has done something noteworthy as an exegete as well as fulfilled the requirements of a refined and polished age. In reality, what has the Canon gained? In regard to *Gehenna*, it was originally the valley of Hinnom, which King Josiah, as Lange says, converted into a place of abomination, by throwing there dead bodies and burning them, and hence it served as a symbol of condemnation and of the abode of lost spirits. So *Gehenna* or Hell, which you will? The difference between "damned" and "condemned" is not worth while considering. That between "forever" and "above and beyond time" is *prima facie* of the same quibbling nature as the first. In connection with this word *aionios*, where it occurs twice in the same sentence, though in different clauses, as in Matt. xxv. 46, Canon Farrar makes a statement which, if sustained, would go very far towards establishing his position. He says: "It is by no means necessarily the case that the word should have identically the same meaning in both clauses, since the meaning of the same adjective might quite conceivably be modified, and even altered, by that of the substantive to which it is attached." Now, as a matter of fact, Canon Farrar has here been led into another error in his efforts to adapt the text to his preconceived ideas of what it should be. Archbishop Trench (Synonyms New Test. p. 47) asserts very strongly that the *kolasis aionios* of Matthew xxv. 46, is no corrective, and therefore temporary discipline; and cites authorities to show that the derivative name to which the qualifying term is attached had acquired in Hellenistic Greek a severer sense (Dr. Farrar ignores this), and was used simply as punishment or torment, with no necessary under-thought of the bettering through it of him who endured it.