

and death, and gone to be with Jesus, "which is far better," where there is no sin or sorrow, where pain or death can never enter, and where the inhabitants shall not say we are sick. On the sad occasion the obsequies were conducted in an impressive and solemn manner by the Rev. Thomas Neales, Rector of Woodstock, who preached a beautiful and appropriate sermon, the parish church being crowded to overflowing, many not being able to get in. Her remains were followed to the grave by a large concourse of sympathising friends, who came from different parts of the parish to pay this tribute of regard to the memory of the departed.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

LITERAL TERMS.

(Continued.)

HAVING considered the figurative and allegorical descriptions of future punishment, I now come to the consideration of those terms used in Holy Scripture, as *literally* describing the same.

These are comparatively few, but I think they are quite unmistakable, both with respect to the fact and character of *punishment*, and also with respect to its *continuance*. A few words first, with reference to the former. As the New Testament plainly speaks of *punishment*, Mr. White and his friends are necessitated to describe this term. They do so, by declaring that as it is synonymous with "death," so, it covers no more than is contained in cessation of life, or, in other words, animal death-destruction, as they define it.

This they say is punishment, because continued life is *necessarily* a good. It requires little consideration to dispel this fallacy. Let us remember that *persistently wicked characters* are the subjects of this punishment, and then ask the question whether continued or eternal existence, in such a character, would, under any circumstances, be to them a *good*, and whether annihilation of *such* beings would be to them a punishment?

Evidently, the *summum bonum* of "life," as it is regarded subjectively and inherently, must be character. True is the adage, "Virtue is its own reward;" true also, that vice is its own punishment. Objectively considered, God Himself, in His favour and love, is the *summum bonum* of "life," but this the wicked cannot enjoy, because of their *character*. His *creatures* also, they will be deprived of hereafter. How then can the annihilation of such beings be *literally* and properly a *punishment*? Literally, however, rationally and properly, it must be so, if Mr. White's theory is to stand. We understand "punishment" *literally* to mean punishment, because we have no authority whatever, either from the etymology of the word itself or from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, to give it any other meaning. Neither can we from rational or philosophical considerations do so. Moreover, we understand it to comprehend a positive and punitive infliction awarded of God, outside of, and super-added to, the natural result of an evil character. "Death,"

we hold, properly and naturally, to describe the latter, altho' sometimes associated with the former in Holy Scripture; but while the Old Testament commonly defines future punishment by words connected with "death" and natural evil, the terms used by our Saviour, are more specific and with reference to a positive, punitive, and awful infliction.

Their own rule, the literal sense, here condemns and confounds the theory of Mr. White and his friends. Thus far with respect to "punishment." The literal sense of this term is intensified by our Saviour's associating with it the word "fire," not (as Mr. White says) to utterly destroy or obliterate the wretched subjects of punishment, for the context *forbids* it, but literally to *punish* them. It is immaterial whether we understand the "fire" to be literal fire or not; our Lord uses "everlasting fire" and "everlasting punishment" as convertible terms, and terms synonymous with each other in this connection.

The idea of "punishment," however, forbids entirely the idea of consumption or destruction. Did we need anything further to explain this matter, the language of St. John in the Apocalypse is conclusive. He speaks of "torment" *basanismos*, and this torment is not alone the portion of the devils but of wicked men, (Ch. 21 : 8. ; St. Matt. 25 : 41.) Moreover, it is said that the adherents of Antichrist "have no rest day nor night," "they shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Ch. 14 : 10. No plea of the obscurity and figurative character of this Book can possibly do away with the obvious meaning of such language. The one word, *basanismos*, is quite sufficient to banish such folly. However awful it may be, as believers in Divine Revelation, it becomes us to bow to the evidence of the Divine will.

It remains now to consider the duration of such "punishment," as described by certain terms in the New Testament.

Dr. Littledale, in his recent comment upon Dr. Farrar's volume, speaks of *aionios* as the "crucial word," and while he admits that it often unquestionably has the meaning of *endless*, yet says that other Greek words *undoubtedly* meaning "eternal" or "endless" might have been used by the Apostles and no doubt *would* have been used, had such a meaning been intended. He does not, however, notice the fact the Hebrew word *olam*, having a precisely similar meaning, viz., that of obscurity, or indefiniteness, is generally used in the Old Testament, not only to describe "eternity" in the proper and metaphysical sense of that word, but it is also used in reference to Jehovah Himself. Thus we arrive at a satisfactory solution of this question. The word *aionios* was used by the Hebrew writers of the Greek New Testament, because it followed the analogy of the Hebrew Scriptures, and if *olam* was sufficient to describe the character of God, it was also sufficient and fitting to describe "eternity" in

the proper sense of that word. But the idea conveyed in *aionios* is intensified by the words *aionios ton aionon*; this is used in Rev. 20 : 11, when speaking of the punishment of the Devil. With such punishment the language of our Saviour, as also that of St. John in the Apocalypse, connects that of the wicked men of this world, as well as the angels connected with Satan in his rebellion; and if the language used in such places requires any further explanation, as the punishment of the one is identified with that of the other, both as to the *time* of sentence and the *place* of such punishment, any place of Holy Scripture describing the punishment of the devils, will likewise describe the punishment of wicked men.

This argument, which I have applied in my review of Mr. Oxenham's pamphlet, I will again adduce here. The Apostle Peter, in his Second Epistle, speaks of the punishment of devils, so also Jude in his General Epistle. St. Jude speaks of "everlasting chains," where the word *aidios* is used, which, without any doubt whatever, means "everlasting" in the strictest sense of that word. Here then we have what Dr. Littledale conceives to be *wanting*. The only possibility of escape from this conclusion lies in the idea that the *future* judgment of the Great Day may be *retrogressive* in its character with relation to the devils, that whereas their chains of darkness, or bonds of misery, are *now* eternal; as *that* period, because *aionios* is sometimes used to express a limited though indefinite period, *therefore* it may be so in the case before us. Dr. Littledale, however, rejects this possibility, as he says, that such supposed retrograde action of the Deity, as *reversing* the process of creation, is the *chief* objection to annihilation.

Comment is unnecessary. I shall only add a few words as to the grammatical construction in St. Jude 6. Mr. Oxenham would have *eis krisin megales hemeras* to mean *until* the judgment of the Great Day; but the construction will not stand. Winer, in his Grammar of the New Testament dialect, (§ 53, c.), says, "*eis*, transferred to *internal* relations, (or in a tropical sense) is used of every object, *aim* (a) of the measure (Bernhardy, p. 218) to which something rises, 2 Cor. 10 : 13, *eis ta ametra* 4 : 17. (b) of the *state* into which something passes, Acts 2 : 20; Heb. 6 : 6, ("renew them again *unto* repentance.) (g) of the *result*, Rom. 10 : 10, (with the heart man believeth *unto* righteousness." The two last clauses in brackets are my own, and given to suggest a parallel.

Thus, if we regard the natural consequences of *sin*, we may interpret this as referring to the *result* of their sin, and if we regard the punitive *purpose* of the Most High, we shall connect it with the *aim* of their being so bound. "The Lord hath made all things for Himself, even the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. 16 : 4.

Viewing this subject from the only legitimate standpoint, the teaching of the Holy Scripture, that teaching is, I conceive, quite clear and explicit. It is simply a matter of Scripture evidence, which fairly and candidly