

observable in all his sermons, which were delivered not with extraordinary vehemence of manner, but with a mild firmness which arrested the attention of the youngest and commanded the respect of the most advanced. Naturally a fluent speaker, he took care not to speak until he had weighed, measured and considered what he was going to say. Hence he was always heard with pleasure and satisfaction, and much reliance was placed upon his opinions, which were valuable because they were not hastily formed. But his good points did not stop here; he possessed the happy faculty of being most agreeable in the social circle, and was particularly successful in his treatment of children. Many will miss the frank, honest Canadian gentleman who contributed so largely to the enjoyment of those with whom he came in contact. By his sad and premature removal the Church in this Province has lost an able and efficient officer; his fellow clergy a warm and attached friend; his parish a faithful and laborious pastor; the community at large, one whose deeds will long be remembered and whose memory will long be fragrant. Though so young a man, his keen intellect, his ready, forcible, and persuasive speech, and the earnestness with which he threw himself into every work which he deemed conducive to the welfare of the Church, gave him much weight in the Church's councils, and brought him into positions of influence and responsibility. The Board of Foreign Missions, the Church of England Temperance Society, and the project for the establishment of a Divinity School in connection with the Cathedral of the Diocese, will especially miss his powerful advocacy, his prudent counsel, and his untiring exertions on their behalf.

In another column our readers will learn that since his departure, one of the children he left behind him has been taken away by the same disease.

We may also add that our columns testify to the value of the deceased clergyman as a regular correspondent from the Diocese of Fredericton. Scarcely a week passed which did not bring us contributions from his pen, all of which were valuable and such as we were glad to insert. We deeply sympathize with the bereaved family which has sustained the greatest loss they can possibly meet with on earth.

#### FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

BY E. S.

THE subject of future punishment may be said to be the great question before the world, not as to the fact, but as to its character or continuance. Few can be found bold enough to say there will be no future punishment; this is scarcely true of Philosophic Sceptics; it certainly is not true of those who have any reverence for the Word of God. The wide spread and various divergences from the doctrine of the Christian Church will not allow this most important and practical doctrine, underlying all religion as one of its foundation stones to remain as it is fast becoming, a matter of question, whether, as for

so long a period taught and received by Christian believers, it is still to be taught and received, or not. The public statements of such men as Canon Farrar, to add no other names, recently brought before the religious world require attention. The subject is taken up by a number of prominent men, and Orthodox Theologians are plainly challenged to maintain if they can the eternity of future punishment. The two great divergences therefrom are Restoration and Annihilation or extinction of the soul as well as the body. It is concerning the latter that these remarks are intended to apply. The writers in favour of Annihilation most prominently before the public, are Messrs. H. Constable, E. White and S. Minton, while the latter gentleman is, I believe, regarded by those with whom he is thus associated as having done most in support of their position. I shall refer to the chief lines of argument adduced by Mr. White in his book "Life in Christ," because it is certainly the most elaborate and exhaustive work of the authors enumerated as supporting this doctrine.

There is of course a difficulty in understanding the infliction of an eternity of pain by a God of mercy and goodness: and so there is in reconciling the admission of evil into the world with the existence of the same superintending power. And therefore I cannot admit as valid argument any view of the intrinsic merits of the case as we are able regard it; It is a question of scripture exegesis simply and alone.

I might entirely pass over those chapters of Mr. White's book in which he regards the subject from the standpoint of science. Altho' he discloses a strong bias towards the idea of evolution, he ultimately relinquishes it as untenable. There can be no doubt, that were it possible to demonstrate that the life of man physical and moral was but an evolution from a similar life existing in the brute creation, their point would be made, and death as the annihilation of both parts of man's substance as a compound being, if asserted by the God of nature, would not only probably, but certainly be demonstrable from that Revelation of which he also is the Author. The former position however is not demonstrable. No department of Natural Science can be made to serve this end. There is an essential difference between the intelligence of animals, and man's mental and moral constitution.

The argument for analogy between the intelligence or instinct of animals and the mind of man breaks down in a similar way to that for a diversity of origin in different branches of the human family. That is, as there is an insurmountable barrier between genus and genus in the animals, so is there an essential difference between the instinct of the animals and the intelligence and moral faculties of mankind. Quite the opposite is the case with reference to genus and species in man. In the language of Prof. Richard Owen: "Man is the sole species of his genus, the sole representative of his Order." The facts of science (notwithstanding appearances of analogy between them) run counter to the hypothesis of evolution, or development from

the animals to man, either as respects the material or the *psychical* portion of their being. There is a well defined distinction between the lowest type of human intelligence, and the highest type of that of the animals, from which we are said to be evolved.

There are several flaws in Mr. White's argument from the subject of the first few chapters of his book that must be noticed. He says Geology tells us that our world bears in its crust a record of death, the age of which record, he admits, cannot be accurately determined, that is, whether before or after the period when the Mosaic narrative may fairly be supposed to have commenced; still, however, he concludes that Adam had such an entire familiarity with the idea of death from this evidence that he could only understand the death threatened by God to himself upon disobedience, after a similar manner, namely, "the loss of his life as a man." But there are two difficulties in the way of this theory. "The fossil evidences of death," which have come down to us, may have been subsequent to the Adamic period in their actual being, and if anterior, as we have no data to determine how long Adam was sinless after his creation, it cannot certainly be said that he was acquainted with such fossil evidences of death. As the world left the Creator's hand he pronounced it "very good," and there is every reason to believe that death in any form to the animal creation only supervened when sin had entered; for we are told that under such a curse "the whole creation groans and travails in pain even until now."

There is another great flaw in the argument of Mr. White, underlying the whole of his argument from Holy Scripture; that is, he assumes from the very slender information conveyed on the subject by Biology and Psychology, that the human soul is not immortal in its nature, but like that of animals is perishable at death, although he is led to allow afterwards, when dealing with the argument from Holy Scripture, that it does not so perish actually. This further involves his theory in difficulty. If it does not so perish at death together with the body, as does that of the animals, or at least is lost, so that it is never more possessed by the individual organism, whatever becomes of it, then the literal meaning of the curse, "Thou shalt surely die," i.e., lose thy being as a man, so as never to regain it, as in the case of the animals—this cannot stand. Furthermore (although I here anticipate the Scripture argument), Holy Scripture certainly teaches the conscious survival of the soul in Hades; this being so, how is it that it so survives? Is it by a special decree of the Almighty, and that, only temporarily, in order that it may not only be subjected to suffering, but also after such infliction, adjudged of God, be then killed, destroyed, and made to perish? If so, then the simple, literal meaning of "death," "destruction," "perish," "cut off," &c., becomes not a simple, but a compound one. More fatal to it as a system and interpretation of Scripture, it becomes a mere hypothesis, unsupported by proof either of Natural Science or of Revelation.

M  
Is  
agre  
ture  
ation  
tion,  
pose  
whic  
vive  
whet  
of th  
Al  
Scrip  
scan  
and  
probe  
your  
man,  
posit  
olog  
was  
the c  
able  
son.  
man'  
ology  
the I  
any c  
a fa  
evolu  
latin  
going  
subje  
we r  
advan  
of o  
the  
by t  
Almi  
tined  
of the  
in the  
argu  
perish  
his a  
itions  
By  
hendi  
sciou  
he ha  
that  
himse  
would  
philos  
yet th  
mora  
or da  
The r  
able,  
immo  
is cou  
not o  
alism  
immo  
BAPT  
§ 8.  
exclusi  
point  
followi  
to take