

A. We must repent, and make restitution. If we keep unlawful gains, we keep the sin too. St. Luke xix. 8.

Q. What are great securities against this sin?
A. Contentedness, trust in God, and industry. Hebrews xiii. 5, 6; Eph. iv. 28.

Q. Name one other way of breaking the eighth commandment?

A. Withholding alms from the poor, and offerings from God and His Church.

THE TEMPTATIONS.

For information as to the probable scene of the temptations, and a general explanation of their character, the reader is referred to our issue of February 9.

The temptation in the wilderness was mysterious as every act of our redemption is mysterious, but it was literally true. Every incident of the narrative, and every aspect of our Lord's life and character forbid us to entertain even for a moment the suggestion that it was only a trance, a vision, a mere illusion of the mind as the sceptics have maintained. It was a personal encounter between the Prince of Light and the Prince of Darkness. But how? it has been asked, could any allurement be a temptation to Him who knew no sin? The answer must be found in the further question, What is temptation? It means simply trial, and consists in the contest between principle and inclination. In the case of ordinary men it comes both from within and without. From the sinful lusts of the flesh within as well as from the world and the devil without. There is ever a traitor within us ready to throw the gates open (illustrate by story of Tassia); but Christ, though it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, and though "in all points tempted like as we are," was "yet without sin." For although he possessed to the full all the sinful passions of our nature, yet they had no unbridled dominion over the ever indwelling perception of what was right, or over the ever ruling will of God, in perfect harmony with which His own human will was attuned. In his own words Satan had nothing in Him. No rebellious, evil lust ready to open the door and lend a helping hand to bind its master in Satan's chains. But the trial was real, for there was an opposition between obedience to His Heavenly Father's will, with just so much doubt suggested as to make choice perplexing, and the desire to satisfy the natural and otherwise sinless cravings of hunger. Sin, as Gregory observes, is first by suggestion, then by delight, and lastly by consent. The two latter of these are from our evil nature, and therefore could not be in Christ. But insinuation or suggestion, which is from the devil, this He had to endure; but it continued to be without and found no place in Him.

The temptations of our Lord Jesus Christ then lays open to us the reality and nature of our own. It lifts the veil which is upon our eyes, the unconsciousness which is upon our hearts, and shows what is really going on at all times in the spiritual world around us, by what we are beset, and what are the mysterious powers that are exerting themselves upon us. We learn too in the first place that it is no sin to be tempted; nor is our being tempted any proof of our being sinful. Perfect beings may be tempted as the angels in heaven, and sinless ones, as Adam in the garden, and Christ in the wilderness. In the second place we learn that nothing can convert a temptation into sin but the consent of our own wills. The worst temptations, so long as they are without our will, are no part of us; by consent they become adopted and incorporated with our spiritual nature, and so long as we refuse to yield it matters little what temptations beset us. They may distress and darken, and even for a time seem to defile our hearts, but they cannot overcome us. In the third place we may learn from this temptation the nature and limits of the power of temptation. First, it is plain that Satan has no power over the will of man except through itself. It must be won by self-betrayal, or not at all. Next it would appear that he can have no direct power over the affections. He must approach them as they lie round the will, through the eye and the ear, the touch and the imagination. Through the senses the avenues of temptation are ready and direct, and all the world around us ministers to dangers, and this teaches us where to watch against the approaches of the Tempter.

The first temptation shows us the sin of seeking our livelihood in any unlawful ways, by fraud, stealing, speculation, gambling, or by such trades, speculations, or undertakings, as involved any dishonesty, any suppression of principle, or any mistrust of God's care for us.

The second temptation is simply this, that our Lord should obtain the powers and gifts of the world by transferring his allegiance from God to Satan. It shows that to seek for worldly power or influence by the use of unlawful means is a direct revolt from God. For what do men really acknowledge in the fact of using unlawful means, such as force, wrong,

falsehood, deception, equivocation, to accomplish their ends, but that they are putting their trust and venturing their hopes of success in the powers of darkness. And any man who invokes them makes himself a subject of that kingdom, and a liege and worshipper of its prince.

The third temptation is the type of a very subtle and dangerous class of temptation; those I mean which beset persons of a truly religious life. Sins of presumption, self-trust, and spiritual pride.

CROSS BABY.—Nothing is so conducive to a man's remaining a bachelor as stopping for one night at the house of a married friend and being kept awake for five or six hours by the crying of a cross baby. All cross and crying babies need only Hop Bitters to make them well and smiling. Young man, remember this.—*Traveller.*

Biblical Notes and Queries.

Question.

Will some clergyman be good enough to state in answer to this, what the Church of England really teaches respecting the necessity and essentiality of Baptism? And also what she teaches concerning the future destiny of infants who die unbaptized? Whether it is possible for such to enter heaven, or not?
J.W.B.

Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full and we do not hold ourselves responsible for their opinions.

SIR.—The enclosed letter was sent to the office of the *Evangelical Churchman* more than three weeks ago. Two numbers have been issued since, but no notice has been taken of it. Will you be good enough to give it insertion, perhaps the Hon. gentleman would prefer answering my questions in your columns.
Yours etc.,
J. LANGTRY.

To the Editor of the *Evangelical Churchman*.

SIR.—In the report of the proceedings of the annual gathering of the P.E.D. School, on the 19th ult., the Hon. S. Blake is reported to have said among other things, "While feeling very doubtful with such lecturers as the Messrs. Langtry and Ford, who openly pronounce themselves sacerdotalists, etc."

In reference to this statement will you allow me to ask Mr. Blake to give a plain categorical answer to the following questions.

1. What is sacerdotalist?
2. Wherein does the person guilty of being a sacerdotalist differ in doctrine or practise from the doctrinal statements and prescribed usages of the Church of England?

3. Where, and when did the Rev. Messrs. Langtry and Ford openly pronounce themselves sacerdotalists. For myself, I have never pronounced, proclaimed, professed, or even thought myself to be a Sacerdotalist, Ritualist, Sacramentarian, or anything else, but only an honest and true-hearted son of the Church of England. According to the natural grammatical and necessary meaning of her doctrinal statements, and prescribed usages. I may however be mistaken, and as I do not wish to live with the sin of heresy upon my soul, I shall be greatly obliged to Mr. Blake if he will tell me plainly what this Sacerdotalism is, which he implies disqualifies me to be a teacher in the Church of England, and wherein I have been guilty of it. And I promise him that I will either retract it publicly, or cease to be a teacher.
Yours, JOHN LANGTRY.

"POIEIN, TO OFFER."

SIR.—In reply to Mr. Carry's communication in your last issue I beg to observe that I did not say, in my last letter, that I could find but one place where *poiein* is translated to offer, but that among all the various passages quoted in the lexicons in illustration of the various meanings of the word, I could find but one where it is so translated. The lexicon I chiefly referred to is Robinson's Greek and English lexicon of the New Testament, in which the verb *poieo*, with its numerous significations, occupies quite ten columns. In Liddell and Scott's lexicon the same word occupies two and a half closely printed columns, and I do not find the word "offer" used once as a rendering of the Greek text, although I do find *poiein hira*,—Latin: "*sacra facere, to do sacrifice*," and to do sacrifice of course means to offer sacrifice; but this is Alexandrian. The whole question, however, is most satisfactorily treated of in an admi-

nable Charge to his clergy delivered recently by the Bishop of Ontario, and which has been kindly forwarded for my perusal by a friend.

As I said, in my last communication, I am quite prepared to accept Mr. Langtry's translation, myself; but I still object to it in connection with a tract issued for general distribution among our congregations.

Peterboro' Feb. 11, 1882. VINCENT CLEMENTI.

LAWLESSNESS IN HIGH PLACES.

SIR.—For the third time within a short space acts of lawlessness have been performed by clergymen of the Church in Toronto, which, if performed by High Churchmen, would have evoked a howl from Messrs. Blake, Sheraton, A. H. Campbell, and the party in general. Not long ago the Rev. Septimus Jones, having already a large and commodious school-room, placed his new church at the disposal of the Yorkville Bible Society, and allowed them to hold a public meeting within its walls, and ministers of Protestant sects to perform acts of worship therein. On the occasion of some memorial service in the Metropolitan Church the Rev. W. S. Rainsford also took part publicly with the sectarian ministers in the devotional exercises therein gone through. Only the other day the Rev. Septimus Jones assisted at a wedding in a Methodist meeting house in Yorkville, and officially pronounced the benediction. This, I suppose, was his first episcopal act as president of the Ministerial Association, and acting bishop for Toronto. As such he can, I apprehend, give himself a dispensation, and absolve himself from the consequence of communicating in things sacred with those outside the Church.

ROBERT J. WILLIAMS.

Toronto, Feb. 6th, 1882.

ALGOMA.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me, through the medium of your valuable paper, to protest against the inertness and downright neglect that are characterizing the older dioceses with regard to the diocese of Algoma.

Since the decease of its beloved Bishop, on whose indefatigable energy in collecting the means to continue the work in his diocese, the clergy were forced to depend for the larger part of their stipend, the self-denying little band of missionaries labouring for their master in that bleak barren tract of country known as Algoma, have been totally forgotten by their prosperous brethren in the front districts. For five months there are some who have not seen anything in the shape of money, except the mite that their people have been able to afford through the collection, etc. Is this justice? God knows that when they receive the whole of their salaries they can never afford anything but the bare necessities of life.

But enough: I will not trespass on your kindness any more. Hoping that this rough reminder will have the desired effect.

Yours sincerely, T. E. LLOYD.

INFALLIBILITY AND INVISIBILITY.

SIR.—Mr. Bovan's apt remarks on the visibility of the Church lead me, with your permission, to add: Take away the "Infallibility" of the Bishop of Rome, and where is Popery? Take away the "Invisibility" of the Church, and where is Low-Churchism, Methodism, &c.

These twin anti-Christian tenets are the prime disturbers of the Holy Catholic Church. Not even the divinity of the Son of God is plainer stated in Holy Scripture than the visibility of the Church of Christ; and yet the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Toronto teaches that the Church of Christ is invisible. Hence its low esteem of the ministry and sacraments, hence its existence in opposition to Trinity College; hence the existence of the *Evangelical Churchman* in opposition to the *DOMINION CHURCHMAN*; hence the wide-spread dissensions among our congregations, retarding fearfully our Christian progress.

Would that Low-Churchmen would acknowledge the broad fact, blazoned on the page of Holy Writ, that the one, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Church is visible and indestructible; then we would be one united phalanx, fighting under the Banner of the Cross, against Christ's foes, the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Yours, &c.,
Baysville Jan. 28th, 1882. A. SLEMMONT.

ART AND OIL.—The Norfolk (Va.) *Virginian* of Jan. 16th, 1881, refers to the remarkable cure effected by St. Jacobs Oil in the case of Prof. Cromwell,—known the country over for his magnificent Art Illustrations—who had suffered excruciating torments from rheumatism, until he tried the Oil, whose effects were magical.