

spected, to satisfy those who thought they could make capital out of it for a party purpose. And now there is some reason to suppose that the letter itself is a forgery. It had been attributed to the Rev. Dr. F. G. Lec, Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth; but that gentleman in writing to the *Manchester Guardian*, denies the statement that he is the author of the letter said to be addressed by "Presbyter Anglicanus" to Cardinal Manning, or "that he has promoted or signed a petition, either to the Pope or the Papal authorities in conjunction with other Church of England clergymen." The story has caused so great a sensation, and has rendered such signal service to party platform-speakers that we shall expect to find the pious fraud repeated in due course of time.

The note of Count Andrassy to the Sultan when submitted to the British government, after its acceptance by Russia and Prussia, received an addition by the Queen's ministry, which, at the time, was the subject of considerable discussion by the public. It has now transpired that the English article required the Sultan to send a special commissioner to the insurgents; and that if the insurgents should reject the proposals for peace the Austrian government should make a military occupation of the whole territory of the insurrectionary provinces for six months, while the British government will send a division of its fleet to cruise in Turkish waters, and in the Adriatic also. Any steps which England may take to compel the submission of the provinces in insurrection will, just so far and in such proportion, increase the responsibility of our home government in requiring full and complete justice to be granted to the Christian population. The whole nation, in fact, should be on the look out to prevent any repetition of the barbarous treatment which Christians have received at the hands of the Turks. It is rumoured that Russian intrigue is busy in Roumania, and that General Souvaroff has had an interview with Prince Charles, at which it was agreed that the latter should take an early opportunity for refusing to pay the Turkish tribute, and that upon the Porte taking steps to enforce its rights, a Russian force of 150,000 men would occupy the Province. We hope this rumour will turn out to be incorrect, inasmuch as Roumania has not so urgent an excuse for rebellion as the other provinces, where Turkish oppression and misrule are more rife.

THE EXTRAVAGANT LIVING and large incomes of the English clergy are themes on which the Radical press of former days, chiefly dwelling on some isolated instances, were fond of dilating on. A fuller statistical knowledge has done much to disabuse the public mind on this subject as well as on others. An old clergyman has recently died in England of whom it has been discovered that for several years he lived on the miserable pittance of eight

pence per day. It is sometimes attempted to contrast the rich luxury in which an English clergyman lives, with the pure, disinterested labors, without worldly remuneration, of other religious bodies: and it has been said of Moody and Sankey that they prosecuted their work in England without fee or reward. The *Christian World* however has thrown some light upon the subject, and asks how these gentlemen could live, support their families, travel, and get back to America without pay. It states that the average gifts to them—apart from special contributions expressive of personal good will—amounted to at least £100 stg. per week all the time they remained in Scotland and England. In this is not included the royalty on the hymn and tune books, inasmuch as that was relinquished for six months, and the amount £7,600 was at length sent to the Treasurer of Mr. Moody's Church Building Fund. The reason why it is thought these facts should be generally known is because the supposed refusal of these revivalists to receive pecuniary recompense is in some parts extensively used to throw discredit on the endowed ministry of the Church, and also on any remuneration received for the ministration of the word and sacraments.

REVIEW OF THE PAMPHLET OF THE REV. F. T. OXENHAM ON FINAL RESTORATION,

BY THE REV. E. SOFTLY.

Question Three.—"Is there any statement in Holy Scripture which must of necessity mean the popular doctrine?" The question here put is too exacting in its character, in view of the subject. The object of the author would appear to be to require each passage referring to the subject, to fully express the whole doctrine, and (having as he supposes destroyed the evidence from the meaning of the words used to express eternity,) so destroy the force of the evidence as a whole by rejecting it in its several parts, in detail, whereas it is an important canon of interpretation that the subject matter, and the scope of a writer be duly considered. The more just enquiry is this:—Seeing that there is a word used in Holy Scripture in connection with the punishment of the wicked, which does certainly and indubitably mean *endless*, or *eternal*, does the general scope and tenor of Holy Scripture, go to corroborate the conclusion afforded thereby that the punishment of persistently wicked men, will like that of devils be literally *endless*, or *eternal*? If God has so ordained that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless, it is reasonable to suppose that in some one place we may find decisive language to that effect; it is but required, having found such testimony, that the general scope of the Sacred Writers shall be such as to confirm that conclusion. The passages, St. Matt. xii. 31-32; St. Mark iii. 28; and St. Luke xii. 10, when compared with each other

lead us to this conclusion, viz., that there is a sin which cannot be forgiven. Neither the Law nor the Gospel makes any such provision; for this no doubt is the reference in St. Matt. xii. 32, where *toutoi toi aioni* is connected with *toi mel-lonti*. St. Mark says "it shall never be forgiven." St. Luke "it shall not be forgiven." Here also great weight is to be given to the fact that all hope of forgiveness to the sinner, is, in the mind of the writer, confined to earth and time. These passages are to be compared with 1 St. John v. 16: "There is a sin unto death." Here, as in the passages before referred to, we learn that there is a sin resulting in death; the one idea is expressed in all. It would be sufficient for our argument if this were confined to the particular sin referred to, but I take it also to mean that the natural and necessary result, of chosen, malignant, and unrepented sin, as developed in this life, is declared, after death, to be irremissible. St. John expresses this by death, *thanatos*. There is no doubt that this refers to future punishment, the "second death," or the "loss" of the soul. Mr. Oxenham admits all we can require, or the passages actually teach, save when he says, that this, while "endless," is "entirely different from what we usually understand by everlasting punishment," and "it is compatible with existence in heaven." \*

I think it is "generally understood" that the pains of hell and the joys of heaven, (while each will be "endless") will consist of both what is derived from character, and fitting circumstances appointed by God in accordance with character.

Severally considered, happiness and misery, in the future world will be chiefly from character and society, and how "loss of capacity to know and love

The argument of Mr. O. from the Etymology of the word *apheme* is not justifiable from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, for we find it used as a convertible term with *ilaskomai*, which also means to forgive. Both in their Etymological reference are essentially connected with the Atonement of Christ, by whose sacrifice sin is taken away.

*Aphesis* is the word generally used to express forgiveness, and we find the verb used not only in the verse preceding, where our Lord says all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, (Matt. xii. 31,) but also in the Lord's Prayer, St. Matt. vi. 12, and in St. 1 John i. 9. The *antithesis* between *aphethesetai auto*, and *ouk aphethesetai* is found in the removal of the punishment in the one case, by the imputation of Christ's merits: in the other that there is no such removal, because to them Christ's merits are not imputed.

This of course includes all the teaching of Scripture with reference to forgiveness. Where sin is pardoned of God, we are taught to believe that all its effects and consequences, material and moral are finally and fully removed.

The forgiveness of the believer is a necessary consequence of his justification and trust in Christ, is full and complete, and in all its results will be perfectly disclosed at the day of judgment. The very opposite will be the case with the wicked who will receive all the results of his unbelief.