

garded as a dead body, he could not have "taken thereof with his hands," verse 9, without breaking the express conditions of his Nazarite vow (Num. v. 6).

In his Introduction the Archdeacon touches on the moral characteristics of the book, and he says: "It must now be clear to every Christian that the exterminating wars of Joshua, the fearful and indiscriminate vengeance inflicted by Israel on the offending tribe of Benjamin, the treachery of Ehud and of Jael, the wild revenge of Samson, the blood-vengeance of Gideon, and other events herein narrated, are *not to be quoted as examples for modern times.*" The concluding words of this remark, which we have emphasized, are surely not necessary, unless in his opening word "NOW" the Archdeacon desires his readers to look back to periods when the fierceness of strife between Christians, or between Christians and heathen, resulted in sanguinary surprises. Balfour of Burleigh, in Scott's "Old Mortality," might have cried, no doubt, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon;" and at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or in the Crusades of Palestine and Mexico, blind bigotry gilded with an imaginary Divine sanction deeds of anti-Christian cruelty. The question is, in these days, of real importance. Mozley is, of course, well worth quoting; but for ourselves, nothing so good, so clear and full, in a small compass, has been published as Dr. Boulton's Islington paper.

The "Commentary on 1 Samuel," by Canon Spence, takes up 150 pages of a volume of 510 pages. It is not probable, however, that any of his readers will be of opinion that the learned Canon has taken too much space. His notes are eminently readable—a point of importance as regards the family circle. By all reverent and thoughtful readers, indeed, this portion of the volume is sure to be termed enjoyable as well as informing; and we should gladly, did limits of space permit, give some specimen quotations. A few expressions which we had marked for criticism we must, at present, let pass. One remark we may add. Canon Spence has done well to give some choice quotations from Wordsworth, Payne Smith, Lange, and Keil. Such works as these, and the "Speaker's Commentary" are not to be found, as a rule, on the shelves of "English Readers."

Short Notices.

Universalism; or, the Witness of Reason and Scripture concerning Future Punishment. With an Appendix on Conditional Immortality. By T. M. MACDONALD, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Kersal, Manchester. Pp. 47. Hatchards.

This pamphlet has only one fault (if fault be here the proper word): it is short. It is so very good, so prudent, so firm, one wishes it had been longer: on certain points, especially as regards "Conditional Immortality," the treatment—one says with regret—might have been more full. After all, however, the *brochure* is best as it is, if only it may attain, from its *multum-in-parvo* brevity, a worthily large circulation. Many thoughtful people, in these bustling days, will make time for a little book on controversial matters, if—important proviso!—it be really good, whereas a larger publication is apt to be looked at as hopeless. Canon MacDonald's pamphlet, as we have said, is exceedingly good, and it deserves

to be read and recommended largely. So far as we know, it is—take it all in all—decidedly the best thing of the kind. Its chief characteristic is its reverent appeal to Scripture; but the witness of Reason is suggestively set forth. A single quotation will show how the author meets the advocates of Annihilationism. We quote pages 43, 44 :

2. Reason disowns the doctrine, for there is absolutely no such thing as Annihilation known in nature: "Nature does not annihilate;"¹ and besides, "We have no reason to think the destruction of a living being to be possible. We have no more reason to think that a being endowed with living powers ever loses them, than to believe that a stone ever acquires them."²

3. It is a perversion of language to speak of existence and annihilation as the *literal* meaning of life and death. Life (whether in the sphere of the vegetable creation, or the animal, or the spiritual) is existence under such conditions as to realize the purposes for which life is given. It is not being, it is *well-being*. The life of a plant is found in union with the soil, the life of a branch in union with the living tree, of a limb in union with the living body, of a body in union with the soul, and the life of the soul is found in union with the Living God.

4. That this life of God in the soul of man, created in God's image, is the life ever spoken of in Scripture as originally bestowed, as forfeited by sin, and as restored in Christ to those that accept Him, we should have thought to be unmistakably plain.

(i.) "Come unto Me;" "Abide in Me;" "Come, ye blessed of My Father." *This is Life.*

"Depart from Me, ye cursed;" "Where I am ye can never come." *This is Death.*

"Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life" (John v. 40).

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but" (the opposite of life) "the wrath of God abideth on him" (John iii. 36).

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," etc., "ye have no life in you." "He that eateth My flesh," etc., "hath eternal life."

Separated from Christ, there is no life.

United to Christ, there is life eternal.

(ii.) Can anyone read life as merely continued existence in such passages as the following?

"I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 24-26).

"He that heareth My words, and believeth," etc., "hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, *but is passed from death unto life*" (John v. 24; comp. 1 John iii. 14). "This is life eternal, to know Thee," etc. (John xvii. 3). "Reckon ye yourselves to be alive unto God" (Rom. vi. 11). "To be spiritually minded is life and peace" (Rom. viii. 6). "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). "Lay hold on the life, which is life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19, R.V.).

(iii.) Is it possible to read death as annihilation in such passages as these?

"Let the *dead* bury their dead" (Matt. viii. 22). "This my son was dead," etc. (Luke xv. 24). "You hath He quickened who were dead" (Eph. ii. 1). "Though he were dead, yet shall he live" (John xi. 25). "You that were dead in your sins" (Col. ii. 13). "To be carnally minded is death" (Rom. viii. 6). "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. v. 6). "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death" (1 John iii. 14). "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead" (Rev. ii. 1).

Mr. White,³ following Professor Hudson, of Cambridge, U.S.A., says, "Unregenerate men are described as 'dead,' because they" (their souls) "are certain to die" (*i.e.*, to be annihilated), and so he understands these passages as predictions of what will be; *e.g.*, "Let the dead," *i.e.*, those who are doomed to be annihilated, "bury their dead." "He that hateth his brother abideth in death," *i.e.*, will be annihilated at some future time! Can it be believed that our Saviour and His Apostles agreed thus to veil their meaning from all common understanding?

¹ "The Unseen Universe," sec. 120.

² Butler's "Analogy," chap. i., note.

³ "Life in Christ," p. 306.

Thirty-eighth Report of the Thames Church Mission Society, instituted A.D. 1844. 31, New Bridge Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

We have very great pleasure in inviting the attention of our readers to the Report, just published, of one of the most useful, sound, and best-managed Societies of the time. On the work of the Thames Church Mission, as our readers may remember, an article appeared in *THE CHURCHMAN* about a year ago, bearing the honoured name of that veteran Christian worker, among the foremost in evangelistic efforts, Captain Maude. The work carried on by this Society is a Mission work which is of undeniable importance; it has been largely blessed; and if only the excellent Committee were strengthened by larger gifts and subscriptions, they would be able to enlarge and develop the work. The Report—which is really interesting, and will bear reading all through—contains an account of the proceedings at the Annual Meeting at Exeter Hall, April 25th, with a statement as to income, the work done, the pressing needs, etc., and, also, extracts from the Journals of the staff. An Appendix gives information about the Mission to Deep-sea Fishermen, the motto, as it were, of which is the testimony of Mr. John Burns, Chairman of the Cunard Line. Mr. Burns says (of the agents of this Society), “Their work on board ship in the North Sea is not only most remarkable, but most gallant in those who are conducting it.” A letter from the Marquis of Cholmondeley, one of the Vice-Presidents of this Society, is enclosed, we have observed, in the pages of this Report; and as this appeal to “Christian friends” has a very peculiar character, we cannot refrain from quoting it:

As the one survivor of that little band which met forty years ago for consultation and prayer relative to the deplorable godlessness of the seamen then frequenting the port of London, it gives me special joy to-day to add a few words to those of the Report which will reach you herewith.

It has pleased the Lord to answer abundantly the prayers of His people, and while the retrospect is such as to fill our hearts with thankfulness, the future is bright with hopes of still greater blessing.

The object thus far has been the glory of Christ in the spiritual good of those ministered to by the Society’s agents, and surely herein has lain the secret of success. May God keep His servants humbly following on the same lines.

The Report tells its own unvarnished tale, and I most heartily commend it to your prayerful perusal, and especially ask you to read the closing words of Lord Shaftesbury’s powerful address quoted on page 86.

Do not forget that the Society’s income is altogether out of proportion to the extent and importance of its operations.

The Quarterly Review. No. 311. John Murray.

This is a very interesting number. “Dean Swift in Ireland,” “Farrar’s St. Paul and Early Christianity,” “The Future of Parties and Politics,” are specially able and attractive. But “The Indian Crisis” and “The Progress of Medicine” are very good; and the review of Mr. Jeaffreson’s book, “The Real Lord Byron,” is, in a literary sense, a real treat. “Modern Farming—Hay and Ensilage” will attract many readers: it is clear and encouraging. From the article on Dr. Farrar’s “St. Paul” we may quote some observations on a point which was made prominent in our review of that book. *The Quarterly* says:

The portrait of St. Paul seems to us to be daubed with too crude a colour, when his tacit admission of the taunt, that “his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible,” is pressed into support of the assertion that he was mean and ugly of aspect even to repulsiveness. The view, too, taken by Dr. Farrar of the “thorn in the flesh,” or *stake* as he prefers to call it, strikes us as greatly exaggerated. That the affliction was of the nature of epilepsy, incapacitating him at times for

active labour, and rendering his nervous system morbidly sensitive, is far from unlikely; but the addition of chronic ophthalmia, so virulent in its acute stages as to produce delirium, and inflicting on his countenance such a "terrible disfigurement" as to crush him beneath "an agony of humiliation," needs more to justify it than a couple of obscure hints in the Epistle to the Galatians, which may be easily explained otherwise. Indeed, the harrowing picture of the Apostle's infirmities, drawn in these volumes for the sake of contrast with the vastness of his labours, must be pronounced radically inconsistent with his amazing activity and power of endurance. How, we are constrained to ask, could he have made such journeys, survived such tortures, preached with such energy and success, indited such Epistles, borne up under the strain of governing the Churches with so vigilant an assiduity, had he been the broken-down man of Dr. Farrar's portraiture—the tottering, half-blind, and wholly unstrung invalid, who needed to be "passively conducted from place to place by companions whose office it was to guide and protect and lead him by the hand," and who was so shattered in nerves "that he could not write a severe letter without floods of tears," nor "endure to be left for even a few days alone"?

In the article on the "Future of Parties and Politics" the *Quarterly* makes some quotations from the speeches of one of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues. "Three things," says the *Quarterly*, "are sought for by Mr. Chamberlain at this moment: they are manhood suffrage, equal electoral districts, and the payment of members of Parliament. The Church, also, must be disestablished. Not long ago, it would have been thought a somewhat odd proceeding in a Cabinet Minister to go about the country with a sort of huckster's cart filled with wares which his colleagues regard as contraband; but we get used to every thing now. Mr. Chamberlain's function is, as he says, 'to put the dots on the i's; or, as he expressed it on a former occasion, in phraseology which might perhaps have been improved by some of his literary friends, 'to make things go quicker and more satisfying.' That the Church was doomed we knew long ago from Mr. Chamberlain. The hatred which he bears to it is sufficiently explained by his sneer at Christianity in his Cobden Club speech. 'Nearly nineteen centuries have passed,' said he, in partial explanation of the failure of Free-trade predictions, 'and still the doctrines of the Christian religion have not received universal acceptance; and I suppose we should think it a little presumptuous to describe the Apostles as very worthy fishermen who were neither philosophers nor statesmen, but who were chiefly to be remembered as the authors of a variety of predictions which have been falsified by events.' It is not often that an English public man has addressed an audience in this strain, but it must be remembered that the Radical of to-day denies vehemently that we are a Christian nation, and Mr. Chamberlain may see no harm in modelling his speeches upon that theory. Down with the Church—that, from him, is a reasonable cry. He has told us once before that 'it had been a hindrance to all political and intellectual progress; that it was a political manufactured, State-made machine'; and that the Liberal Party would be 'blind to the teachings of the present and deaf to the evidence of the past, if they did not take the first opportunity to remove that perpetual stumbling-block in the way of progress.¹ And his raid upon the landowners of the country ought not to have excited the surprise it did, for he has told them that the 'condition of things with regard to land involved a great injury and wrong to the labourers employed on the soil.'² It is the declaration of opinions such as these that has made Mr. Chamberlain a Cabinet Minister, and if he goes beyond most of his colleagues, he gains the more hearty applause at

¹ Speech at Bradford, Nov. 14, 1877.

² Speech at Rochdale, November, 1877.

"public meetings—a fact which we commend to the serious notice of all who think that, because he is loud, pretentious, and blatant, he can be safely disregarded. It is said that there can be no harm in his doctrines while he has colleagues in the Ministry who are largely interested in land—'Lord Hartington,' for instance, 'with his future rent-roll of £200,000 a year,' or 'Sir William Harcourt, with the archiepiscopal traditions of his family.'" Lord Hartington may or may not perceive the inevitable end of the course which his Radical associates are pursuing; he may be deluded with the not uncommon idea that the 'middle-classes' will one day rise up as one man in support of the landlords, and that the 'instincts' of the people will prevent any interference with the rights of property. Or he may feel that if something goes, much will still remain; a good deal may be taken from £200,000 a year, and yet a man may be left in comfortable circumstances. Or, lastly, he may believe that nothing would be gained by his retiring from the field, and leaving every position in the hands of the enemy. If he is unable to control Radical opinion from within the Cabinet, how much less could he do so from without? This consideration may weigh much with the Whigs generally, and in some measure may account for the anomalous ground they occupy. To depart from the Liberal ranks altogether would be to leave everything to the mercy of the Democrats and Socialists. The latter may still win everything in the end, but if an evil cannot be averted, it is sometimes a gain to postpone it. But whatever may be Lord Hartington's view of the matter, or however potent with Sir William Harcourt may be the archiepiscopal traditions of his family, it is not likely that either will have much weight in influencing the final direction of legislation on the land question, or any other question concerning which Radicalism is united. . . .

"The land and the Church are to be the first objects of assault, and Mr. Chamberlain may say, as he said once before, 'I care little which of these great questions we first attack.'"

In the *National Review* (W. H. Allen and Co.) appear, as usual, several ably written articles. This magazine deserves well of the Conservative party, and ought to be strongly supported. We had marked some passages for quotation, but space is lacking. From an article on "The Lords and the Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill" by the Right Hon. A. J. Beresford-Hope, M.P., we may quote one passage, as follows:

In any continental country and in all of the United States, where the brother and sister-in-law are free to marry, the uncle and niece, the nephew and aunt, can do the same, and the Papal dispensation which is allowed in one case is allowed in the other. A writer in the *Saturday Review* ten years since analyzed the royal and very noble entries in the "Almanach de Gotha," and found that the volume contains "four patent instances, within our own time, of marriage between a widower and his wife's sister, one between a widower and his brother's widow, and six between an uncle and a niece; and this irrespective of the coincidence of one sister-in-law being also a niece. So the last-named and most repulsive alliance stands in a majority over both the others." The list has since been swelled by the present occupants of the throne of Holland, who are uncle and niece.

With *July Little Folks* begins a new series, most attractively. This charming magazine we are always glad to recommend.

* * * We are again obliged to postpone several Notices of Books, and omit references to current topics.

¹ The *Spectator*, December 30, 1882.