

unmanageable, untameable, a person who cannot be pigeon-holed. He will learn from no master, he will have his own methods and his own way. He belongs to no section, to no sect. The earth is his cradle, and the deep, illimitable sky the very inmost garment of his soul. To his lovers he will have many a secret to tell, but he can never tell where his secrets come from. In his ear alone forever sounds

The melody born of melody,  
That melts the world into a sea.

A. E. WETHERALD.

## FAIRIES' SONG.

[All Rights Reserved.]

Up, says! draw nigh,  
Come let us fly

Pitter patter with our wings, as the gnats in spiral rings;  
Come! from sward and flowers and leaves,  
In balmyest this of all the eves.  
A hall! a hall! a Fairies' dance  
Upon the floor of elf romance,  
All in this soft sweet summer clime,  
All in this dulcet loving time,  
When nights are light as diamond rime,—  
Though indeed the time for loving is the all and only time.

Moonlighters we  
Who gladsome be,  
And our lightly-tripping heels, skilled in rapid rounds and reels,  
Pit-a-pat will whirl and bound  
In many a graceful merry-go-round;  
While stars shall wink their lanterns' light  
Aloft, and all the livelong night  
The fairy bells shall ring the chime  
That pulsates all life's loving time,  
The throbbing life of nature's prime,—  
For indeed the time for loving is the all and only time.

Call in those fays  
Who cause delays  
Splishing splashing 'mong the lilies—joy betide the thoughtless sillies!  
They to-night must foot the sands  
In gay toe-twinkling sarabands,  
Till a flush from out the sea  
Shall enrosy gradually  
The fresh sweet face of morning-prime,  
In sunbreak time, in loving time,  
For mete of time is but love's rhyme,  
And indeed the time for loving is the all and only time.

HUNTER DUVAR.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All communications intended for the Editor must be addressed: EDITOR OF THE WEEK,  
5 Jordan Street, Toronto.  
Contributors who desire their MS. returned, if not accepted, must enclose stamp for that purpose.

## ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I am very glad that you have brought this subject forward in your columns, and I hope to see it fairly ventilated therein. With the sentiment underlying the article I can heartily agree, but I think there is a misconception regarding the term itself which may mislead some readers; and I ask a small space in which to express shortly what appears to me to be the Scriptural view of the subject.

I. The term itself, "eternal punishment," without entering into the question of the primary meaning of the original word in Matt. xxv. 46, is decidedly a Scriptural one; the meaning usually attached thereto, "everlasting torment," is most decidedly an unscriptural one; and cannot be held or defended the moment the true nature of man is understood, according to the Word of God, viz.: That he is not possessed of an immortal or deathless life by nature, having forfeited his right to the Tree of Life by his fall (Gen. iii. 22-24). To this agree the variously repeated statements of the Saviour in John's Gospel, that He "came to give life," even "eternal life." No truth is more clearly set forth by Christ than that; consequently, as man possessed life of one kind, it was a life of another kind, even "the life of God," from which Paul avers that we are naturally estranged by sin (Eph. iv. 18); and without which no mortal, it is evident, can live on everlastingly. Let this fundamental truth taught in the history of man's fall, and in the Gospels of man's redemption, be seen, and in due time all other truths which are connected therewith will fall into their proper place and be understood.

II. I said the term "eternal punishment" does not mean "everlasting torment"; that is self-evident, if my former position be held: let me, however, define what it does mean according to the tenor of Scripture, which is so contrary often to theological systems.

In the first place "eternal" does not mean "everlasting." The two words are from different sources; the former being derived from the Latin, the latter from the Anglo-Saxon language. The one denotes an age-abiding period, the other perpetuity. The revisers of the New Testament have evidently disentangled the words from their long accustomed usage as synonyms, as any one may see by comparing the changes made by them in their use of the words. The reader that cares to prove this can easily do so with a concordance.

In the second place, it is very evident, therefore, that the punishment, of whatever character it may be, is an age-abiding one. I may here say, in passing, that men are not being punished whilst they are dead, seeing the Scripture so continually maintains that "the dead know not anything," that there is no knowledge in Hades whither all go at death, after the manner of our Saviour. Upon this subject I need not further dwell; but I mention it as somewhat needful in order to understand my closing Biblical illustration of "eternal punishment." Jude gives it in his Epistle, verse 7 (R.V.), "Sodom and Gomorrah . . . are set forth as an example suffering the punishment of eternal fire," or, as the margin reads, "as an example of eternal fire, etc." And yet Sodom and Gomorrah have to be restored, have yet to be judged, put on trial; and will see then the true nature of their sin, and hear the glad tidings of a ransom paid by the blood of Christ of which they knew nothing in their life. Compare Ezek. xvi. 48-55, with 1 Tim. ii. 4-6. The consequences of such a restoration to life and knowledge can only result, I most heartily hope, in good to them and glory to God in Christ Jesus. Yours faithfully,  
Toronto, November 23, 1885.

W. BROOKMAN.

## DISUNIONISTS IN THE QUEEN'S GOVERNMENT.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—The *Globe*, which is now angling for support in every quarter, including that of Irish Disunionism, has the following paragraph:—

Mr. Parnell will occupy a more powerful position in the new House of Commons than any other individual member. Yet no one seems to suppose that he will be offered a seat in the Cabinet. No one can give any reason but one why he should not be called to the honour and responsibility of administering Irish affairs—he represents Ireland. Yet there are people who pretend to believe that the English treat the Irish as they do the Scotch—like brothers and equals.

It is no doubt very flagrant injustice, and a great proof of British determination to treat the Irish with iniquity, that a man who avows the deadliest hatred to Great Britain, whose aim is the Dismemberment of the Empire, and whose followers lose no opportunity of insulting the Queen's name, should not be included in the Queen's Government.

A Nationalist meeting at St. Catharines is reported by the same journal to have been formally closed with three cheers for Mr. Parnell, Mr. Anglin, and the Queen. The combination is curious, because, as I have said already, any mark of honour to the Queen's name is strictly forbidden by Mr. Parnell's Association.

It is well to remember when we read the *Globe* and the *Mail* on this question that both are in the hands of Roman Catholics, and one of them, at least, in that of a Roman Catholic Irishman.

Yours,

UNIONIST.

## NEW RELIGIONS.

NOT quite a century ago, an attempt was made to set up a new religion. When Chaumette's "Goddess of Reason" and Robespierre's "Supreme Being," had disappeared from the altars of France, La Reveillere-Lépaux essayed to introduce a Natural Religion under the name of Theophilanthropy, to satisfy the spiritual needs of the country over which he ruled as a member of the Directory, Chemin Dryantès, Dryont de Nemours, and Bernardin de St. Pierre constituting with himself the four evangelists of the new cult. The first mentioned of these must, indeed, be regarded as its inventor, and his "Manuel des Theophilanthrophes" supplies the fullest exposition of it. But it was La Reveillere-Lépaux whose influence gave form and actuality to the speculations of Chemin, and whose credit obtained for the new sect the use of some dozen of the principal churches of Paris, and of the choir and organ of Notre Dame. The formal debut of the new religion may, perhaps, be dated from the 1st of May, 1797, when La Reveillere read to the Institute a memoir in which he justified its introduction upon grounds very similar to those urged in our own day against "the theological view of the universe." Moreover, he insisted that Catholicism was opposed to sound morality, that its worship was anti-social, and that its clergy—whom he contemptuously denominated *la pretraille*, and whom he did his best to exterminate—were the enemies of the human race. In its leading features the new Church resembled very closely the system which we have just been considering, offered to the world by the author of "Ecce Homo." It identified the Deity with Nature; religion, considered subjectively, with sentiment and, objectively, with civilization; and it regarded atheists and the adherents of all forms of faith—with the sole exception of Catholics—as eligible for its communion. Its dogmas, if one may so speak, were a hotchpotch of fine phrases about beauty, truth, right, and the like, culled from writers of all creeds and of no creed. Its chief public function consisted in the singing of a hymn to "the Father of the Universe," to a tune composed by one Gossec, a musician much in vogue at that time, and in lectures chosen from Confucius, Vyasa, Zoroaster, Theognis, Cleanthes, Aristotle, Plato, La Bruyère, Fenelon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Young, and Franklin, the sacred Scriptures of Christianity being carefully excluded on account, as may be supposed