

tween the two (or three) parts of *man's* nature so that, as the *animal* organism is broken up, or destroyed in death, it is likewise true of *man*. There appears to be an equal inconsistency in the doctrine of Mr. Heard, as there is in that of Mr. White, with what I regard as Biblical teaching upon this subject.

Both are agreed as to the theory of a Tri-Partite nature in man, although they differ as to whether it is psyche or pneuma that is quickened in regeneration, and is the God consciousness or distinguishing faculty. That there is such a distinguishing faculty, seems to me a sufficient evidence, taken in conjunction with the teaching of Scripture, not only in favour of a *survival* of man, and so against the argument for his natural mortality, but also a *positive* evidence in favour of his *natural immortality*. I can but say that I do not agree with Mr. White when he says, p. 42. "We have no doubt after all one pains, between two conclusions, and know not certainly whether our ancestry is from the perishable life of the globe, or directly from the hand of Heaven; whether one destiny is to return *wholly* to the dust or to spend eternity with God.

Our nature bears traces of a *double* alliance, with earth and with heaven, and "we know not what we shall be," till we enquire at the oracle of Him that made us."

Still less do I assent to the alternative which he proposes, "Either man is non-mortal because he is immortal; or he is non-mortal because the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and they that hear shall live."—p. 90.

I do not agree with it because it is an alternative which is based upon a false quotation. The passage is not they shall "live," but they shall "come forth." The question is not of a resurrection, but of a *survival* of the soul, and that whether by natural immortality, or by the impartation of the same by the act of Christ.

This *garbled* quotation would tell also against such impartation of immortality by Christ, (as they propound it) since it is affirmed of "all that are in the graves." I know he does not intend this, but the alternative which he so imposes, requires this interpretation.

The passage with which the *latter* part of Mr. White's quotation stands corrected is as follows:—"Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death into life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live"—John v, 24-25. I here quote from Von Oosterzee, on Luke (p. 163): "It is of course understood that the Saviour hereby the first mentioned *nekroi* means the spiritually dead, and it at once appears how much, by the *double* sense in which the word "*nekroi*" is here used, the expression gains in beauty and in power. Here also in the use of language by the Synoptic and the Johannine Christ, there is

an admirable agreement." Comp. John v, 24-25.

I also quote from Steir on the above passage (vol. v, p. 107): "Yea verily, I am He whom ye wait for, the Son of God, the raiser of the dead. Thus begins the Lord anew with His third Amen, Amen. But I have told you before, and now tell you again, that this quickening of the dead by the voice of my Word, begins now already in the souls of believers; and that is the true Resurrection of life, without which there can be none in any future time."

Also on Matt. viii, 22-23 (vol. i, page 358): Who then are the dead? *Not those who are being mortals soon to die, reckoned as being dead, for then the contrast would here be lost.* The disciple to whom it is forbidden is himself one of such. No; the Lord speaks here, as in St. John v. 24-25, of spiritual death, according to the Spirit's usage throughout the whole New Testament. (I have italicized the second sentence.)

This quotation singularly enough directs us to the words, which Mr. Minton says ("The Way Everlasting," page 25) are "the crucial words of the whole controversy." Who are "*the dead*" here spoken of? What the character of such death? The answer of a sound exegesis will not favor the theory of a conditional immortality.

We may here make a few additional remarks respecting those passages before referred to, that is—Rev. xxii, 11-12, and Acts i 25, as giving evidence to the fact, that man is placed here *on trial for a future life*. These passages also place the future life, both of the righteous and of the wicked, upon the same basis, *with respect to duration*. Of Judas it is said "that he might go to his own place." In Rev. xxii, 11-12, it is said that the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked consists (in measure at least) in their *continuing* in the possession of a righteous and of a wicked character.

The obvious inference is, that such duration, as is there spoken of, is at least indefinite, as it is continuous. This agrees with a deep moral persuasion that judgment or punishment follows the mortal death of the wicked, and both go to fortify the conclusion derived from the works and Word of God; in reference to the sin of our first parents, that the "death" spoken of had reference primarily to their moral nature and not to their physical frame. The animating principle, or moral nature, is in Scripture regarded as the man,—the bias of the governing faculty,—the will, whether it be for good or evil is the man himself; but, taken in connection with the affections, which, again, govern the will, as the will does the habit of the life. That course of life, in relation to God and to Eternity, which, upon knowledge and trial, is chosen and followed here, has all the probability of being continuous and perpetuated,—and such conviction is ratified in the strongest way by the testimony of Inspiration. Moreover, take away this truth, and you take away one of the very strongest practical arguments to deter from wickedness and to encourage in a righteous cause.

I will add, that we may here compare Rev. xxii, 11-12, and St. Matt. xxv. 26. The former teaches that the *natural* punishment of sin is *continuance of an evil character*.

The latter speaks of a *positive penal infliction* awarded by the Most High. This is described by Rolasin, aionion. That both speak of conscious suffering or punishment, and not privation of physical life, there can be no doubt. The former passage assures us of a continuance both of life and character, in the case of the wicked. The extent of such continuance, as a fact of Biblical testimony, rests upon the meaning in this place of the word aionios. If, in such connection, that word may mean aught less than eternal, then may the punishment of the wicked not be Eternal.

BOOK NOTICE.

THE VALLEY OF THE SHADOW. Eight Sermons on the Doctrine of Future Punishment. By Charles H. Hall, D.D. New York, T. Whittaker, 1878. Cr. 8vo., pp. 180.

These sermons, preached in the Church of The Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, in the months of February and March, were edited by the statement of opinions delivered by Mr. Beecher, of "Plymouth Church," and by the sermon of Dr. Farrar, in Westminster Abbey. The parallelisms in the views here presented, and those of Dr. Farrar, will readily be seen by any who compare the two works.

If the present treatment, in this and other works, of the doctrine of the eternity of punishment had merely the effect of suggesting to the reader proper lines of study and reflection leading to a clearer conception of the views held and taught by the Church Catholic, we should not object to the multiplication of books or the repetition of arguments which, though differing in phraseology, yet are similar in kind.

"These sermons," as the author states, "make a broad issue with the common doctrines of hell and its endless torments." "And," probably in a sense the author did not intend, "the reader will judge for himself whether they give him anything useful and satisfactory in place of them." We fully believe that "some will resent them as false to the venerable teaching, which claims the grand title of orthodox." We do not so readily accept the assertion that "others, who have long lost all faith in the old, may discover that their doubts have grounds in reason and Scripture."

Whatever may have been Calvin's views of the Augustinian doctrines and the "new forces" received in America by Jonathan Edwards, Hopkins, Emmons and others, it is rather a strong assertion to say that the opinions expressed by them, and not always in temperate or guarded language, form "to-day the real sub-structure of the common dogma."

Necessarily the author dwells somewhat at length on the meaning and reception of the terms *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, *Tophet*, *hell*, *damnation* or *condemnation*, but neither here nor in the case of *aionios*, *eternal*, *everlasting*, *forever*, is there anything new presented.

Dr. Hall summarises his belief as set forth in the sermons, that the doctrine of Hell is not found in the Old Testament, though it may be true, none the less, only it is not found there. He, in common with almost all systems of true Catholic theology, does not believe that the soul of the righteous man goes to heaven at death, or the soul of the wicked to hell at death, and that the saints are in joy and felicity. He believes the necessity and certainty of the judgment, and the scenery of it, as revealed in the Bible, to be for good reasons, poetic, representative or symbolical. He finds no faculty in him that makes it possible for him to reason about the idea of absolute eternity. He knows nothing about it.

As to the restoration or annihilation of the wicked or anything else, as an affirmative thought about them, he confesses he does not know enough to have an opinion, nor any faculty

to form
you dis
my ig
half-sh
declare
commi
to teac
justice
yond o
depth,
knowle
be thou
with H
warnin
have tl
the di
around
to entr
finite I
see ligl

Conc
By Dai
& Co.,

If ti
veloped
scientif
startlec
pressed
hithert
as Sir
settled
yet we
assailed
to the

Thot
books t
wearin
birth o
pensati
work is
—origi
which
Faculty
of Bos
publica

The
and pre
the utt
conditi
hearts
of the
specula
revoliti
sions, i
roborat
ing tha
denoun
from tl
periodic
to spee
cases tl
ecclesia
oppones
has bee
specula
designa

This
useful l
centre.
Christ,
discusse
ment.

The
called U
by the
membes
ance of
Take fo
"For o
body of
Christ v
mankind
ransom
God, en
thoroug
filled w
anew in
God—o

The p
Restora