

tion say on this awful problem. As Reason says very little, our only guide in regard to what happens after death is the Bible. One thing is clear, that the estimate formed about sin, transgression, moral depravity, in the Bible, is very decided and intense. The remedy for sin, (the sufferings and death of the Eternal Son,) is in keeping with the Bible estimate of sin. And the doctrine of eternal punishment is in keeping with the awful grandeur of the sacrifice on Calvary. In regard to sin—its demerit, its atonement, its desert—the Bible is throughout consistent. The tendency of the modern conscience is to light views of sin, and light views of its punishment. It is therefore to be expected that writers should arise in our day to deny the doctrine of eternal punishment. To this denial the two pamphlets named above are an answer, although in a fashion very dissimilar.

What does Mr. Curry mean when he says "that final separation between the righteous and the wicked, is not made till Christ's second coming?" Is it then that there must be an intermediate state where good men and evil are now. Cain and Abel, the antediluvians, and Noah, Judas and Peter, waiting for the judgment, and in the meantime preparing themselves for it, with a chance for Judas and Cain to repent and find entrance to heaven? Is this the doctrine. That there is not only a *Limbus Puerorum* where the souls of infants unbaptized remain, a *Limbus Patrum*, where the fathers of the old Testament await the general resurrection, but also a *Limbus Fatuorum*, or fools paradise, the receptacle of the foolish and the vile, to whom the gospel is again preached after their rejection of it on earth? Though such a doctrine was found in the Articles of the church of England published in King Edward the VI's reign, it was wisely expunged from the xxxix Articles as

having no foundation in Scripture save one passage in I Peter iii. 18-21, which is saved from such an interpretation by the awful denunciation of sin, and impenitent sinners found in the context. Though Mr. Curry writes as an opponent of the Restoration Theory, he thus virtually surrenders the ground to the enemy. Of a different character is the Tractate of Professor Watt. While Mr. Curry concerns himself to much with the question, What say the Fathers, Mr. Watt asks, What say the Scriptures, and takes that for a settlement of the question as it is truly.

A CRITICAL GREEK AND ENGLISH CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Prepared by Charles F. Hudson, under the direction of H. L. Hastings. James Bain & Son, Toronto. \$2.50.

The review of this book which should have appeared in our January number we gladly make room for now. It is an English Concordance of the New Testament; but it is more than that. By means of this little book a Bible Student who does not know a word of Greek can ascertain for example such a fact as this;—that the Greek word for CHASTISEMENT, Heb. xii. 8. is the same word that is translated NURTURE, Eph. vi. 4. INSTRUCTION, 2 Tim. iii. 16. Chastening, Heb. xii. 5, 7; or again this other interesting fact that the words "conclude" "counted" "reckoned" "imputed" "accounted, and esteemed (Rom. iii. 28., iv. 3, 4., viii 36., xiv 14.) were in the original the same Greek word. It is moreover a book that accomplished Greek scholars can study with profit, as is evidenced by the fact that it is in constant use in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, by the translators of the New Testament. Mr. Hastings has done an important service to the work of Bible study in publishing this book, and our wish is that a copy might be in the hand of every minister in Canada.