

gence upon
uld be said
ent God is
is vast do-
r manifest-
places; and
human na-
t the state-
who both
roof of the
son.

l from the
ity in His
ed to the
the right
rows now
earth, and
universe.
thrones of
es at the
tyrs; and
d sin and
the Uni-
conquest
and reti-
pleasure,
The stars
nner, and
dictates of
Throne of
is said to
ld not be
He might
preroga-
re, while
longed to
d to have
nasion—it
m it: so
in fact,
cerns us,
that His
for the
st Jesus.
is inti-
commen-
so that
sent His
on to it,
he same
the cel-
s death
most em-
Christ
ed in all
of these

es been
of the
e itself
It is
a great
his, it
arrow a
s much
ld has
ago, it
a man
certain
riously

enough with marks of genius about it; but who after that, did nothing but what was mischievous, and wrote nothing but what was dull." On the 25th of April a great assembly, however, met together at Oxford, and a grand celebration took place on the occasion of the completion of a magnificent undertaking conceived some twelve years ago, (as says the *Guardian*) "to build a college which should vie in magnificence with any but one of the famous foundations of Oxford, in memory of a man who, in his lifetime had won no honor, who had lived in the shade, and who, though he had written words which strangely touched the hearts of all that speak the English language; and though he was the object of boundless love to the few who knew him, had also been the object of boundless contempt or pity to the great world of his day, and of vile insult and abuse from foul-mouthed partisans. He was but a poor dreamer and poetaster, a narrow-minded enthusiast in the eyes of the one; he was a traitor, a palterer with his faith and his vows, according to the others." But mark the contrast—"In twelve years after his death, the world may look upon a monument to him, such as has been raised to the memory of no other man . . . for many generations."

To celebrate the completion of this magnificent enterprise, great men and noble met together on the day we have mentioned, and expressed their deep sympathy with the objects and intentions of Keble College, as well as their cordial agreement with each other on this subject, in a way and to an extent that could not have existed in reference to any other subject in the whole circle of science and literature. Canon Liddon has given to the public important information as to the motives which led to the formation of Keble College about a dozen years ago. He says the idea dates from the day of Keble's funeral at Hursley. When all was over at the grave, one of his dearest friends, overwhelmed with grief, retired to a bedroom at the Park, when the suggestion of founding a college was made to him. He immediately adopted it with the greatest eagerness. In the afternoon of the same day, the first practical steps were taken in the enterprise. The governing motive was to do honor to Mr. Keble's name—to his genius as a religious poet, to his learning as a divine, to the saintliness of his life, as well as to the beauty and generosity of his character. The proposal is believed to owe its astonishing success to a number of favorable circumstances. Already several schemes of University extension had been mooted, and were under discussion at Oxford, and the enthusiasm of Mr. Keble's friends offered to one of these schemes, or to an adaptation of it, a chance of passing from the region of theory into the world of fact. The kindness of the Archbishop of Canterbury added much to further the scheme; and so it came to pass that events showed in an unmistakable manner that "if John Keeble had not lived and died, no such college would have been built in Oxford; and the first reason of its existence is that it may force on the attention of Educated Englishmen, in the days to

come, the revered name of the author of the *Christian year*."

The first stone of the College was laid on St. Mark's day, in the year 1868, by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the most loved prelates who ever filled the Archiepiscopal Throne; and on the 26th ult., a large body of the most honored names of England assembled to perform a solemn act of adoration to Almighty God for His goodness in suggesting, superintending and permitting the completion of so noble a range of buildings, 245 feet long, with College, library, and dining hall—erected in loving memory of one of the brightest spirits of the age, than whom "there was no man of his generation more distinguished as a scholar in the highest sense—in the sense which is peculiarly English;" for "no man would have borne more emphatic witness, had he been alive, than Mr. Keble to this—that religion is the ground-work and centre on and around which ought to be grouped and based every accomplishment, every construction that can tell upon the development of human nature, and its full equipments in every one of its gifts and faculties."

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

BY E. S.

(Continued.)

LASTLY, I have to notice a very grave fact in connection with Mr. White's translation of Psalm 104. And here I am obliged to regard it as a wilful corruption of the original text in order to support a hypothesis. He says that the Mosaic narrative of God's "breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life," no more favours his immortality than that of the animals. In proof of this he quotes Psalm 104: "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created; Thou takest away Thy Spirit, they die, and are turned again to their dust."

Now, such a rendering is utterly unjustifiable. The text is *ruchan*, "their breath," not *ruchaka*, "Thy breath," or Spirit. But here is both a false *exegesis* and a false translation. The scope of the Psalm tells us that David is speaking of God's all pervading Providence in the care of His Creation, and not of the *inceptive* act of its first production. Here David asserts that the preservation and propagation of the various animals is due to the direct interposition and agency of the Almighty: Biblical Theism, as opposed to Rationalistic Pantheistic Evolution in Nature. This is an important fact, and points to a great error, as the Psalm is quoted by Mr. White. His alteration of the inspired text is a much more serious matter, as it is utterly unjustifiable. I now refer to some passages of Holy Scripture which we may fitly connect with the Mosaic narrative of the Fall, inasmuch as they are logically related thereto. It is from Gen. ii. 17-19 that the definition of the terms in the agreement is to be declared, and on that definition our *premiss* must be grounded. Mr. Meriton says truly, "all admit that the words 'death' and 'life' are the crucial words of the whole controversy." The passages to be considered are Acts i. 25

and Rev. xxii. 11, 12. Other passages might be mentioned, but these are sufficient. Taken in connection with an intuition of man's moral nature, to the same effect, they tell us this at least, viz., that he is more than mortal. He is *not* one in character or in destiny with the brutes that perish. Here is positive evidence from Scripture, as there is from Nature, against the theory of Development, and negative argument, at least, in favour of natural immortality. This leads me to a brief consideration of the Psychological theories of the advocates of Conditional Immortality. Mr. White admits that "the Geological record is in favour of the creation of groups by successive acts of the Divine power, or at least by successive acts of the plastic power of nature, whatever that may be," (Pantheism). To the like effect is the physiological evidence, which tells us of a clear distinction between genus and genus in the animals. In fact, an impassable barrier between them; this Mr. White acknowledges. Page 30 and 31. Mr. Heard says "the distinction between reason and instinct was the starting point of the Cartlesion philosophy. On the assumed validity of this distinction, modern psychology has built its house, on what, we fear, must turn out to be a foundation of sand." Tri-Partite Nature of man, p. 148. He abandons the ground of distinction between the intelligence of animals and the mind of man as a ground of difference, and supports his theory of the Tri-partite nature of man by the assertion that the faculty of conscience, or God-consciousness, is the distinctive faculty, and that man has body, soul and spirit. The difference of *intelligence* between man and the animals, he leaves us to infer is but a difference in *degree*, not in *kind*. I am of opinion, however, that there is a difference, not *only* of degree, but *also* of *kind*. If the physiological evidence of a barrier between genus and genus in the animals is unimpaired, and this militates against the theory of development; it is decidedly against the *inference* arising from that theory, of either a physical or psychical identity of nature or being, or even a similarity. Mr. Heard says that "man is the true animal," and yet this *God-consciousness* of which he speaks *distinguishes* him from the animal race; but if an absolute separation can be traced between genus and genus in two animals, and there is indisputable argument for an essential difference between them and man, because of this God-consciousness, or conscience, be it *pneuma* or *spirit*; what is there to forbid the belief, upon such evidence, that the difference between *man's intelligence* and the *instinct* of the brutes, is just as absolute as the superiority of the moral faculty of conscience is to animal intelligence, and by which it is distinguished from it? The doctrine of a Tri-Partite Nature in man is but a theory, and the affinities which it discloses render it a very questionable one for a Scriptural Theist to receive or endorse.

There is a real contradiction in Mr. White's 9th chap. book 2, of what he had previously admitted. It is essential to their purpose to make out that there is an absolute fusion be-