

offering us will-o'-the-wisps for loadstars,—intimating that there are no stars, nor ever were, except certain old-Jew ones, which have now gone out.”¹

Religion in the hands of the priests had become a mechanism, law in the hands of the scribes a scrupulousness, morality in the hands of the Pharisees a pride, philosophy in the hands of the Sadducees a dull scepticism and a political shift. The priests were magicians, the scribes pedants, the Pharisees moralists without a morality, the Sadducees self-seeking politicians. The Jews of Jerusalem were a mixture of all this in various proportions. An unreason possessed the people; a disreason, a diseased reason, the ruling magnates. The old genius for holiness has become a genius of sorcery and sophism. Christ satirized the priest in His story of the good Samaritan, and the Pharisee in His story of the praying publican and Pharisee. When Jerusalem was not redeemable, He threw the blame of her fall and fate upon the ruling caste, with mingled invective and indignation.

W. W. PEYTON.

(*To be concluded.*)

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE FUTURE PUNISHMENT OF SIN.

VII. MODERN OPINIONS.

IN the former papers of this series I have endeavoured to show that the writers of the New Testament agree to teach that utter ruin awaits those who reject the salvation offered by Christ, that we have from the pen of St. Paul words which he could not have written had he not believed that in some cases this ruin will be final, and that

¹ *Life of John Sterling*, p. 85. People's edition.

we have similar language in the recorded words of Christ. On the other hand, although the purpose of salvation is again and again said to embrace all mankind, we have not found throughout the New Testament any clear statement that this purpose of mercy will in all cases be accomplished. Nor have we found any statement asserting or implying that the unsaved will ultimately sink into unconsciousness.

With these results of our study of the New Testament we will now compare the teaching of several conspicuous and representative modern writers. I shall refer to Dr. Cox's *Salvator Mundi* and *Larger Hope*; to Archdeacon Farrar's *Eternal Hope* and *Mercy and Judgment*; to Mr. White's *Life in Christ*; to Prebendary Row on *Future Retribution*; to Dr. Clemance on *Future Punishment*; and to a recent work by Mr. Fife on *The Hereafter*.

Dr. Cox protests against certain popular opinions which he states as follows :

"These dogmas, which happily are losing force daily, and daily moving through a lessening circle, are,—that there is no probation beyond the grave; that when men leave this world their fate is fixed beyond all hope of change; that if, when they die, they have not repented of their sins, so far from finding any place of repentance open to them in the life to come, they will be condemned to an eternal torment, or, at least, to a destructive torment which will annihilate them."¹

The positive teaching which Dr. Cox would put in place of the above is fairly represented by another extract :

"Meanwhile, the purpose of God standeth sure. It is His will, His good pleasure, that all men should be saved by being led, through whatever correction and training may be necessary for that end, to a full and hearty recognition of the truth; which truth will be testified to them in its appropriate seasons, and by appropriate methods, in the ages to come, if it has not been brought home to them here: so apparently and so forcibly testified that at last they will no longer be able to withstand it, but will heartily betake themselves to the Father against whom they have sinned, and submit themselves to His righteous will through the Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus."²

¹ *Salvator Mundi*, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 189.

Still more plainly :

“While our brethren hold the redemption of Christ to extend only to the life that now is, and to take effect only on some men, we maintain, on the contrary, that it extends to the life to come, and must take effect on all men at the last.”¹

In other words, the writer expects the ultimate salvation of all men.

In support of this expectation Dr. Cox appeals to the Bible, with the limitation that “he who has drawn a conclusion from Scripture which reason and conscience imperatively condemn, should need no other proof that he has misinterpreted the Word of God.”² In his appeal to the Bible, Dr. Cox excludes as not decisive the Old Testament, because written in the twilight of an earlier covenant; and the Book of Revelation and the parabolic language of the Gospels, on account of the difficulty involved in the interpretation of figurative modes of speech. But he points out, not unfairly, that these excluded parts of Holy Scripture contain passages, *e.g.* Luke xiii. 21, xv. 4, which seem to support his main contention. The great need for caution in the interpretation of figurative language I have already admitted. And it will be noticed that in the foregoing exposition I have relied upon it only so far as it confirms the plain language of other parts of the New Testament.

In proof that all men will at last be saved, Dr. Cox appeals to the many passages, discussed in my second paper, which assert that God’s purpose of salvation embraces all men. This argument assumes that all God’s purposes will eventually be accomplished in all men. And this assumption I cannot accept. Certainly I cannot make it a basis of further argument. For all around me to-day I see God’s will resisted by His creatures. And the creation

¹ *Larger Hope*, p. 11.

² *Salvator Mundi*, p. 24.

of creatures capable of resisting even for a moment the will of the Creator is to me a mystery so profound that I cannot affix limits to the extent to which the Creator will permit that resistance to go. It is to me quite conceivable that God, after committing to man the awful prerogative of choosing his own path, should make the final destiny of each man dependent on his right use of that choice. The argument before us implies that this final decision has been withheld from man. Of this I see no proof.

In support of his expectation that all men will be saved, Dr. Cox quotes Acts iii. 25, 26, "In turning away every one of you from his iniquities." But Meyer's exposition is certainly allowable, and seems to me better: "When each one of you turns away from your iniquities." He also quotes Acts iii. 21: "Whom heaven must needs receive until the times of the restoration of all things." This last phrase at once recalls Matthew xvii. 11: "Elijah cometh, and will restore all things." Certainly this restoration is not the salvation of all men. Moreover in the former passage St. Peter teaches that the Second Coming of Christ will not be "till the times of the restoration of all things." Now the entire New Testament teaches that Christ at His Coming will pronounce on some men a tremendous condemnation. Consequently, the universal restoration which will synchronize with that awful condemnation cannot be a salvation of all men. Easier far is it to suppose that the restoration of all things in Acts iii. 19 refers to the New Heaven and Earth described in Revelation xxi. 1, and especially to verse 5: "Behold, I make all things new." And we have already seen that across that bright vision falls the deep shadow of those who are excluded from its glory. The other passages quoted as asserting or suggesting the ultimate salvation of all men are discussed in my second paper.

Dr. Cox further supports his general contention by asserting that "the punishment of the unrighteous is at once

retributive and remedial.”¹ I understand him to mean that all punishment of sin is designed to save the sinner. And the tenor of his book implies that in all cases the design will be accomplished. That this is the design of the punishment to be inflicted in the great day, he endeavours to prove by appealing to the significance of the Greek word *κόλασις* in Matthew xxv. 46, “These shall go away into eternal punishment.” That this appeal is unsafe, I have in my fifth paper² endeavoured to show.

We now ask, How does Dr. Cox deal with the passages which seem to assert or imply the ultimate ruin of the unrepentant? The most decisive of these passages he passes over in total silence. Of those which assert that destruction or something equivalent to it is the *end* of sinners, he makes no mention. We have no exposition of Philippians iii. 19, “whose end is destruction;” of 2 Corinthians xi. 15, “whose end shall be according to their works;” of Hebrews vi. 8, “whose end is to be burned;” of 1 Peter iv. 17, “what will be the end of those who disobey the Gospel?” Nor have we any reference to the solemn words of Christ recorded in Matthew xxvi. 24, Mark xiv. 21, “good were it if that man had not been born.” Dr. Cox calls attention³ to the purifying effect of fire. But he has not noticed that those cast into the fire on the day of judgment are never described as metals which are refined by fire, but always⁴ as vegetable matter, which is never purified, but is always utterly and finally destroyed, by fire.

On the other hand, Dr. Cox discusses at length the words *damnation*, *hell*, *eternal*, and shows that they have not the meanings sometimes attached to them. The word *damnation*, as shedding no light on the matter before us, I have not found needful to discuss. For the word *hell*, the Revised Version has substituted *Hades* and *Gehenna*. The

¹ *Salvator Mundi*, p. 205.

² On p. 212 of this volume.

³ *Salvator Mundi*, p. 133.

⁴ See pp. 66, 67 of this volume.

latter of these words I have discussed on p. 208 of this volume. The word *eternal* I have discussed in my first paper. I agree with Dr. Cox that it is by no means equivalent to *endless*. But I cannot agree that it denotes something pertaining to the Christian age or any other definite age. It denotes always long duration, a duration reaching backwards or forwards to the speaker's mental horizon.

The volume entitled *Salvator Mundi* opens with a quotation of our Lord's words recorded in Matthew xi. 20-24: "If the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they had long ago repented in sackcloth and ashes." Dr. Cox points out, fairly, that this implies that influences tending to repentance had been brought to bear on Capernaum which had not been brought to bear on those earlier cities; and argues that the men of Tyre cannot be lost simply because God withheld from them advantages given to Capernaum. In this I heartily agree. But the writer goes on to infer¹ that there must be for the cities of the Plain a probation beyond the grave. This inference I cannot admit. We have no right to say that, if there be no probation after death, all the inhabitants of Tyre or even of Capernaum will be condemned in the great day. They who have heard, clearly and fully, the Gospel of Christ have their probation therein. And, for those who deliberately reject the Gospel, the New Testament holds out no hope. But they who have never heard the good news of salvation through Christ, and they to whom it has been imperfectly presented, and they whose circumstances made reception of the Gospel specially difficult, will be judged on other grounds. There is a light which enlightens every man. And each will in the great day be approved or condemned according to his treatment of that universal light. They who have heard the Gospel will, if they follow that light, be thus led to Christ, and to eternal life. They

¹ On p. 17.

who have not heard it, but have turned, perhaps partially and imperfectly, towards the light they saw dimly from afar will, we may confidently believe, attain by another route to the same eternal rest. This seems to me to be indicated in Romans ii. 26, 27. For, that "the uncircumcision will be reckoned for circumcision," and will judge some of the circumcised, can only mean that some far off Gentiles, through their obedience to the law written on the hearts of all men, will enter into the rest awaiting the people of God. Christ has other sheep who are not of this fold. But this by no means implies a probation beyond the grave. For even the most unfavourable circumstances in life afford a test of character. Every man has day by day an alternative of choosing the better or the worse. And the better or worse is to him right or wrong. Moreover, of a probation beyond the grave, we have throughout the Bible no reliable indication.

The real error is the belief, not yet extinct, that none will be saved except those who have passed through a great spiritual crisis, and who rejoice in the conscious favour of God. This belief has no ground in Holy Scripture. Both Christ and His Apostles leave open a door of hope that many who on earth have not confidently rejoiced in God will yet be judged worthy to enter into His eternal joy.

In his *Larger Hope*, Dr. Cox brings as an argument for the ultimate salvation of all men the fact that the ancient prophecies seemed to announce temporal dominion for Israel; and from this infers, not unfairly, that the truth sometimes lies, not on the surface, but beneath the surface of Holy Scripture. He thus endeavours to weaken the force of the passages which assert, or seem to imply, the ultimate destruction of the wicked. This reminder proves that the meaning which lies on the surface is not always the correct one. But it does nothing to prove that a meaning which lies on the surface is necessarily or probably false,

or that a meaning which does not lie on the surface is probably true. This "New Argument" is merely an appropriate warning against hasty and confident generalizations from the words of Holy Scripture.

This warning is followed by an interesting "New Testament Illustration." In 1 Corinthians v. 3-5 St. Paul pronounces on an immoral Church-member an extreme, and apparently final, sentence. The guilty one was to be "handed over to Satan for destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." But, as we learn from 2 Corinthians ii. 5-8, he was afterwards forgiven and restored. From this Dr. Cox infers that there may be ultimate pardon for some against whom has been passed what seems to be a final sentence.

This illustration proves that underneath the judgments of God there may be an unexpected reserve of mercy. And this proof I gladly welcome. But, like the foregoing argument, this illustration is only a warning against confident assertion touching God's treatment of the unsaved. It does very little to support Dr. Cox's main assertion. In St. Paul's condemnation there is express mention of ultimate mercy for the condemned. But for those condemned in the great day we have throughout the New Testament no ray of hope.

In the preface (pp. xv-xxi) to his *Eternal Hope* Arch-deacon Farrar refuses, somewhat reluctantly, to assert that all men will be saved, and rejects also "the theory of Conditional Immortality" and "the Roman doctrine of *Purgatory*." And he protests against "the common, the popular view in our own Church." This popular view he states on p. 17 of his *Mercy and Judgment*, specifying four points :

"1. That the fire of 'Hell' is material, and that its agonies are physical agonies.

2. That the doom of 'everlasting damnation' is incurred by the vast majority of mankind.

3. That this doom is passed irreversibly at death on all who die in a state of sin.

4. That the duration of these material torments is necessarily endless for all who incur them."

Against the first two of these four statements I join heartily in the Archdeacon's protest. We have already seen that in the most conspicuous passages in the New Testament the word *fire* is certainly metaphorical. The only passage which, so far as I remember, speaks of the relative proportion of saved and lost is Matthew vii. 13, 14: "Many are they who go in thereat: . . . few that find it." And this speaks only of those who in Christ's day were already in the way of life, not of those who will ultimately be saved. It is a very unsafe foundation for a general statement touching the proportionate final doom of men.

The third assertion to which Dr. Farrar objects, I am not prepared to endorse. For he explains "a state of sin" to be "a state in which there have been no visible fruits of repentance." That all such will be lost, I am by no means ready to assert. He refers appropriately to boys and others not manifestly pious, and cut off suddenly by death. To discuss the fate of such persons is altogether beyond us. The Gospel was given, not to enable us to pronounce sentence on our neighbours, but to show us the path of life. On the other hand, it is very unsafe to make their case, about which we know so little, a basis of argument. It is quite conceivable that to them the Righteous Judge may give a just award apart from any probation beyond the grave.

The fourth opinion again mentions the "material torments" which I have already disavowed as not justified by Holy Scripture. Instead of the phrase, "torments necessarily endless," I greatly prefer the words of St. Paul, "whose end is destruction."

In other words, each of the statements against which the Archdeacon protests seems to me to go beyond the teaching of Holy Scripture. Consequently, much of his protest and argument does not touch the findings of these papers.

Dr. Farrar's own opinions are thus stated on p. 178 of his *Mercy and Wrath* :

"1. I cannot but fear, from one or two passages of Scripture, and from the general teaching of the Church, and from certain facts of human experience, that some souls may be ultimately lost;—that they will not be admitted into the Vision and the Sabbath of God.

2. I trust that by God's mercy, and through Christ's redemption, the majority of mankind will be ultimately saved.

3. Yet, since they die unfit for heaven—since they die in a state of imperfect grace—I believe that in some way or other, before the final judgment, God's mercy may reach them, and the benefits of Christ's atonement be extended to them beyond the grave."

The intermediate state is to me a mystery so profound that I can form no opinion about what will take place between death and judgment. But I must again protest against the assumption or suggestion that salvation of some who die without the conscious favour of God necessarily involves a probation beyond the grave. It seems to me that to every one who has ordinary intelligence and comes to years of maturity life presents a fair test of character, and therefore an adequate probation. But the result of that probation is often not visible on earth.

On pp. 410–480 Dr. Farrar discusses the teaching of the New Testament on the Future Punishment of Sin. But for the more part his exposition is an attempt to show that it does not support the four opinions quoted above. Consequently, in large part, his arguments do not touch the results attained in these papers. In other cases, I think that the discussion in my earlier papers will show that Dr. Farrar's expositions are inadequate. As an example I may quote his long exposition of Matthew xxvi. 24, "Good were it for that man if he had not been born." My previous

exposition of this and other passages, which was written in view of what the Archdeacon has said, renders further discussion of them needless.

Dr. Farrar does not share the complete confidence with which Dr. Cox expects the ultimate salvation of all men. On the other hand, both writers agree to expect a probation beyond the grave, either for all the unsaved or for those whose spiritual opportunities on earth have been small. But it seems to me that they have done little or nothing to prove that these expectations were shared by the writers of the New Testament. On the other hand, I heartily agree with their protest against many popular accretions which have gathered round the teaching of the Bible on this momentous subject. Moreover, in his later volume Dr. Farrar has gathered together a mass of valuable information about the opinions held by various writers on the Future Punishment of Sin.

In his well-known and able work, *Life in Christ*, Mr. White endeavours to prove that the Bible teaches expressly that the end of the wicked will be final cessation of consciousness, an endless sleep, preceded by actual suffering proportionate to the guilt of each. He thus differs from the two writers mentioned above, both in his opinion about the Future Punishment of Sin, and in his confident appeal to Holy Scripture.

In support of his main contention Mr. White appeals to the teaching of Christ, so abundantly recorded in the Fourth Gospel, that God gave His Son to die in order that they who believe in Him may not perish, or be destroyed, but may have eternal life. From this he rightly infers that they who reject the salvation brought by Christ and received by faith will be excluded from eternal life and be destroyed. These terms he interprets to mean extinction of consciousness. His entire argument thus turns on the meaning of the two Greek words rendered *destruction* and *life*.

Mr. White asserts strongly, *e.g.* on pp. 356-375, that we are bound to give to these words their plain and ordinary meaning. I notice in passing that it is very unsafe to accept, without careful investigation, any significance as the plain meaning of the words of an ancient language. For it is very difficult to avoid reading into them a meaning derived unconsciously from the modern use of their English equivalents in the circles in which we move. The only safe method of determining the meaning of an ancient word is to study its use in the literary remains of its native language. This, for the word *destruction*, I endeavoured to do in our first paper. We there found the word used in many passages in which it could not have the sense of extinction. But, everywhere, it conveyed the sense of utter and hopeless ruin. This we accepted as the plain meaning of the word in question.

The only proof, so far as I can see, adduced by Mr. White for the sense he wishes to give to the Greek word rendered *destroy* is its use in several interesting passages quoted by him from the *Phædo* of Plato, and referring undoubtedly to the extinction of the soul. He then argues that the same word cannot mean both extinction and endless misery.

The word never means either the one or the other, but, as I have endeavoured to show, utter and hopeless ruin. At the same time, both extinction and endless misery are forms of ruin, and may be so described. But, if so, the peculiar form of ruin must be otherwise specified. This Plato does in the passages quoted in the volume before us. He shows clearly in the first quotation what sort of ruin he has in mind. "They fear that when the soul leaves the body her place may be nowhere, and that on the very day of death she may be destroyed and perish."¹ To guard against misunderstanding, he says in the second quotation :

¹ *Life in Christ*, p. 362.

“Herself (the soul) be destroyed and come to an end.” So in the third, “that the soul . . . is blown away and perishes.” This apparent repetition proves that to Plato the word rendered *destroy* or *perish* was not in itself sufficient to convey the idea of extinction, but needed to be supplemented by other less ambiguous terms. In the passages from various Greek authors of various ages quoted in my first paper the context makes equally clear that the destruction referred to was not extinction, but only the loss of all that gave worth to existence. These passages Mr. White has not discussed.

Mr. White’s only other argument, or rather another form of the same argument, is that life beyond the grave is in the Fourth Gospel and elsewhere made contingent on faith. This argument implies that the absence of life is the absence of existence or at least of permanent existence. And of this Mr. White gives no proof. It is useless to say that existence is an essential element of the idea of life. For the absence of a whole by no means implies absence of each of its essential elements. It implies merely the absence of one of them. If, as I have endeavoured to show, life beyond the grave includes both conscious existence and blessedness, the loss of blessedness is loss of life, even though the unblessed one continues consciously to exist.

Thus fails, in my view, Mr. White’s entire argument. Throughout his large and in some respects interesting volume I can find no proof except that contained in “the plain meaning” of two Greek words. And, to me, this meaning is disproved by the use of these words in classical Greek and in the Greek Bible.

It is needless to discuss Mr. White’s chapter on “The Immortality of the Soul.” For I have already in my third paper disavowed that phrase as ambiguous and as unscriptural. Nor apart from this phrase do I find in

the Bible any teaching about the nature of the soul which sheds clear light on the Future Punishment of Sin.

The strongest point, as it seems to me, of Mr. White's volume is its protest against the exaggeration and distortion of the teaching of the Bible not unfrequently found in popular theology, and especially in some popular sermons. On behalf of such exaggerations I have nothing to say. These papers are not written in defence of modern popular theology. But I think that the exaggerations are somewhat exaggerated by Mr. White. And the present generation has witnessed a great improvement in this matter. To this we may hope that Mr. White's volume has contributed. On the other hand, I am compelled to believe that, while protesting against popular misrepresentation, Mr. White has read into the words of Holy Scripture a sense quite alien from the thoughts of the Sacred Writers.

The foregoing is a very imperfect account of Mr. White's interesting volume. He endeavours to show that man was not at his creation endowed with endless conscious persistence, but that this was made contingent on his obedience; and that, after man had sinned, Christ died in order to give back to man the endless permanence which his sin had forfeited. With this theory I have dealt only so far as it bears on the Future Punishment of Sin. In my next and last paper I shall have more to say about the Natural Immortality of Man.

Like the works noticed above, Prebendary Row's book is a protest against popular theories of *Future Retribution*. These theories, every one of which I heartily disown, he parades at wearisome length at the beginning of his work; and illustrates them by unfortunate quotations from a popular modern preacher and from a devout Roman Catholic priest. So attractive to Dr. Row are these theories, that they reappear in almost the same dress, and occupy a later chapter of the same volume; and through-

out the work they are ever in view. Now it is quite right to overturn error. But this can be done effectively only by first building up positive truth. Much better would it have been if our author had begun his work by expounding the teaching of Holy Scripture, and had then gone on, from this secure platform, to overturn prevalent error.

In the main, Prebendary Row accepts Mr. White's theory of the ultimate annihilation of the wicked, and maintains it by the arguments already discussed. To these he adds nothing. He argues "that it is impossible that such words as *ὄλεθρος*, and others of a kindred meaning, which are fairly represented in English by the word 'destruction,' and others of similar signification, could have been understood by the members of those Churches as meaning an endless existence in never-ending punishment; and that if it had been the writers' intention to express such an idea, they could hardly have chosen a more unsuitable word in the Greek language to denote it."¹ With all this I agree; and indeed can go further in the same direction. To the early Christians the words rendered "destruction" could not mean either "endless existence in never-ending punishment" or annihilation, but only utter and hopeless ruin.

In a chapter entitled, "Does Human Probation Terminate at Death?" Dr. Row endeavours to show, by arguments similar to those of Cox and Farrar, that we have reason to expect that for those who have had few religious advantages on earth there will be a probation beyond the grave. And he presses strongly the argument that, without any special fault of their own, many die in a state utterly unfit for immediate access to God, and therefore need a further purifying process. But this by no means involves a fresh probation. For another probation would make a man's ultimate destiny contingent on his action after death, whereas it is quite conceivable that there may be beyond

¹ *Future Retribution*, p. xxiii

the grave a spiritual development in which each will make progress only in the direction chosen on earth. Certainly, the manifest need of development is a very unsafe ground of hope that they who on earth have chosen the bad and refused the good will have another opportunity of reversing or persisting in their bad choice. Moreover, the conditions of the unseen world are to us so utterly unknown that speculation is useless. Sufficient for us is the Gospel promise of eternal life for all who accept it.

Dr. Row rejects in strong terms the teaching advocated by Dr. Cox. He writes :

“ I therefore cannot think the mode of interpretation of these terms which is adopted by the Universalist to be less non-natural than that which assigns to them the above meaning. Surely it is a mode of dealing with language which no one would adopt, unless compelled by the exigences of a theory.”¹

His own opinion is expressed in the following paragraph :

“ It is a blessed truth, affirmed by the Christian revelation, that there is a time coming in the future when God will have reconciled all things unto Himself ; and when evil will cease to exist in the universe which He has created. There are only two ways in which this can be effected—either by the conversion of evil beings, or by causing them to cease to exist. The Universalist affirms that it is in accordance with the Divine character that the mode in which this will be effected will be by their ultimate conversion. This the language of the New Testament, taken in its obvious meaning, denies. It remains, therefore, that the second alternative is the only possible one ; that evil beings will be annihilated, either by the exertion of God’s almighty power, or because He has so constituted the moral universe that, under His providential government, the disease of evil will ultimately destroy man’s spiritual and moral being, just as incurable physical disease destroys his bodily life.”

This argument I commend to those who teach that all men will eventually be saved. It does not seem to me to have received from them the attention it deserves. Certainly, it is another way of explaining some of the

¹ Page 387.

passages on which they rely. But I have already, in my second paper, endeavoured to show that it rests on a very insecure basis; *viz.* the assumption that God's universal purpose of salvation will be accomplished in each individual embraced by that purpose. Of this we have no proof.

The teaching of Mr. White has found an able advocate on the Continent in Dr. Petavel, Lecturer at the University of Geneva, who has written several pamphlets on the subject, especially three essays, of which an English translation has been published in America, with a preface by Mr. White. Dr. Petavel labours to prove that man is not naturally immortal, and that death is the sinner's doom. But he has not cleared away the ambiguity which gathers round the words *immortal* and *death*; and he adduces no proofs of his main thesis, namely, that the wicked will be ultimately annihilated, except those already discussed.

In my next paper I shall deal with a small but very able work by Dr. Clemance, and with a most comprehensive and useful volume by Mr. Fyfe; and shall then conclude this series of papers by a summary of the results attained.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

BREVIA.

“*Imago Christi.*”¹—In accordance with Gibbon's useful rule I set down, before opening this book, what I expected to derive from it; and on closing it I compared my expectations with the result. “What was the actual aspect of Jesus? What was His manner? How does His personal conduct stand in relation to the ethics of modern life? What is the connexion between the moral nature of Christ and His redemptive work?” These were the questions with which the reading began, and on each of these points much light had been shed before it was finished.

¹ *Imago Christi.* By Rev. James Stalker, M.A., D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)