have only imposed on themselves.　They do not perceive that two things may be inseparable, and quite consistent with each other, which are nevertheless not convertible.　Light and heat are insep-arable in a sun-beam, but it would be an abuse of language to make light mean heat.　Sin and misery are inseparable in this world and in the next, yet it would be an abuse of language to make sin mean misery.　And so, while the words "destroy and "perish," may not be terms convertible with endless conscious misery, they may be perfectly consistent with it, if the destruction referred to is of that which renders existence godlike, noble, useful, and desirable.

But those who teach that the wicked shall be annihilated through sufferings, which may be protracted for "ages of ages," should not forget that it is equally an abuse of language to make the words "perish" and "destroy" mean conscious misery for "ages of ages."

I cannot conclude, without expressing the conviction that the doctrine of Conditional Immortality degrades the entire conception of Christianity, to an extent that few who have embraced it, under-stand fully.　If the penalty threatened on account of sin is the extinction of being, the life which Christ bestows is the opposite. It is the imparting to men endless conscious existence.　Only this, and nothing more.　Holiness of heart and life, cannot enter into the end.　It may be a means to the end, or a condition, without which the end cannot be secured, but the end is mere conscious existence.　When we open our New Testaments, we read that believers were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world that they should be holy. (Eph. i. 4.)　We are told that our Redeem-er is called Jesus, not because he saves his people from extinction of being, but because he saves them from their sins. (Matt. i. 21.)　We are informed that he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. (Tit. ii. 14.)　We are assured that Christ loved the