

ing at the first meeting of its General Committee representatives from no less than eighteen Sunday Schools, launching upon its career. One of its important objects—to my mind the most important object, that of settling a system of teaching—was referred to a Select Committee for their consideration and report. It is of the utmost consequence that the system to be finally adopted shall receive the imprimatur of some authoritative body, which this Committee certainly is, and so far as we at this distance can see, it is unfortunate that the result of its labors have been anticipated by this publication.

Will you kindly enlighten us on this point? It is important to us, for we have been looking forward to the action of your Diocese as furnishing a guide for ours—but if the scheme I have referred to is to be recognized, we should like to know who is responsible for it. And we should also like to know, why the undoubtedly good and sound literature of the English Institute was not selected in its entirety, without encasulation, and without the interjection of the unchurchly international series. In the meantime, however, we accept the scheme, as it really is some little improvement on the International, pure and simple, but we hope yet to see the beautiful and learned literature of the Institute established throughout the Dominion as firmly as it is in England.

When you answer these questions, I shall have something further to say.

Yours, &c.,

Dec. 15, 1880.

W. LEGGO.

THE MARRIAGE LAW.

SIR,—The Rev. Mr. Rainsford asserts "that a decided majority of sober truth-seeking men are persuaded of the lawfulness of these marriages," i.e., a man with deceased wife's sister.

In asking for signatures to the petition to Parliament now in circulation in this Diocese (Niagara) against the proposed *ex post facto* legislation, I have not met with one refusal from men, and out of about thirty women—nearly all regular communicants—before whom I have so far laid the petition, I have received only one refusal.

Facts are stronger than abstract statements.

CHAS. E. WHITCOMBE.

Stoney Creek, Dec. 24.

My mission is in the country. Would some one tell us the latest date at which we may send in the petitions to the House?

E. W.

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly afford mespace in your valuable paper to make a few remarks upon the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and to give some reasons why the legalizing of it should be opposed?

Let us turn to the 18th chapter of Leviticus, and take the 8th verse as explanatory of the meaning of the first words of the 7th verse—then that verse probably means—"Her who is sacred to thy father, yea, even thy mother, shalt thou not marry; she is thy mother, thou shalt not marry her." The duty of *man* is herein set forth, as is the case all through to the end of verse 20, yet inferentially we are herein taught the duty of *woman*, for that which is wickedness for a man to do is wickedness also for a woman. I hope that analogously to this, I may be able to shew that we are, in this chapter, taught that a woman shall not marry the husband of her sister (i.e., the marriage with deceased wife's sister.) As to verse 18 "neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her...beside the other in her life time," it has been argued (and Bishop Woodsworth attributes the argument to St. Basil) that "in her life time," or "during her life," is not to the exclusion of "after her death," but that it implies the latter also. Now, one could not be said to take a wife to her sister, beside the other, if the other were not living; much less can "during her life," in the marginal translation of the verse, mean anything else than "while she is living." For the marginal translation is, "neither shalt thou take one wife to another to vex...her during her life." This is distinctly a prohibition of polygamy, and if "during her life" implies also "after her death," then does the verse prohibit a man from marrying again after the death of his wife; but we know such marriage to be not contrary to the will of God. Then we may assume that "during her life," in the one translation, does not imply what it cannot mean in the other. Let us, however, turn to verse 16, where a man is forbidden to marry his brother's wife, and let us substitute as follows:—For man, woman; for brother, sister; for wife, husband. In other words, apply the same injunction to a woman, instead of to a man.

By the same course of reasoning and by that course alone, we infer that a man may not marry his grandmother. This from verse 10, where a man is forbidden to marry his grand-daughter.

Substitute for man, woman, and for grand-daughter, grand-son, i.e., a woman may not marry her grand-son; Ergo, a man may not marry his grandmother, and who will deny that the chapter teaches this? What a man may not do, a woman may not do.

A man may not marry the widow of his brother; a woman may not marry the widower of her sister, and why? Verse 6 tells us the reason, "none of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him." The chapter goes on to declare who they are that are near of kin to a man; and we most reasonably infer that those degrees of affinity or consanguinity prohibited to man are also, in the same degree, prohibited to woman, and that verse 6 has undoubtedly the following meaning, "none of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, or to her."

Be it observed that Calvin and Luther alike saw this marriage prohibited in the 18th chapter referred to. The Church of England has always seen it, and so has the Church of Rome. There, doubtless, are within the pale of the Church, both of the clergy and laity, some who do not and who refuse to see it, none the less does the Church see this prohibition. And it is no party question.

Let it once be accepted that God in his Word prohibits the contraction of this marriage, and it must follow that no Christian country can legalize it. Some seem to think that although it is well enough for the Church to keep this marriage among the prohibited degrees yet as a law of the land, it ought to be tolerated—for that there are many citizens who do not belong to the Church, and the law of the land is for all. But why is it the law of the Church? Because it is the law of God, and the Church shews this by God's Holy Word. The law of God must be obeyed by all mankind. God is the Lord of the whole earth. This is no ceremonial law, but a moral law, and though the children of such marriages are illegitimate, yet we cannot alter that which God has decreed, and the children must suffer for the sin of their parents; however hard this may seem, God has threatened to visit the sins of the fathers upon their children.

Let us beware lest much evil fall upon our land as fell upon Canaan of old. How can we expect God to prosper our country if she deliberately establish a law directly opposed to His injunction.

Let every Christian, then, do all in his power to prosper our country if she deliberately establish a law directly opposed to His injunction.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

SUTHERLAND MACKLEM.

Clark Hill, Chippawa.

Family Reading.

MAMMON IN THE PEW.

From a contemporary we extract the following keen but deserved satire upon modern methods of raising money for Church purposes:—

A learned bishop, in commenting recently upon the change that has taken place in the relations between the Christian Church and the World, remarked that Mammon now rents a pew and helps to conduct the institution. It would be instructive if some one would take the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and try to imagine how the narrative would have read if it had been written as a record of the movements of the Church and the Church people nearly two thousand years later. The contrast between the condition of things when Mammon was persecuting the Church and when Mammon is holding a pew, and helping to pay for the choir, would, perhaps, be rather startling. Even more instructive would be an attempt to conceive the present condition of things as existing in the Apostolic age. Suppose, for example, that such a record should contain information like the following:—Paul was announced by public advertisement to preach a special sermon on Charity. "The brother of Onesimus came to hear Paul preach, but as he was a person of very humble birth and all the pews upon the ground floor were rented by wealthy people, he was shown to a back seat in the gallery. The Church edifice at Antioch cost two hundred and five thousand dollars; one-third of which remained as a mortgage upon the building. The brethren strove earnestly to reduce the debt, and with this intent they held a bazaar—at which pincushions and ice cream were sold, and during which, there was much excitement over a raffle for a cake. The gold-headed cane that was offered to whichever clergyman obtained the greatest number of votes, was awarded to Paul, who had three hundred and eighty-one votes; while only two hundred and seventy were given to Peter, and one hundred and eleven scattering. The attempt to raise the money having, however, failed, the edifice was sold by the sheriff, and was purchased by a Roman who fitted it up for a circus. Apollos having been

attacked with a light form of bronchitis, went to Melita for the benefit of his health, and the Church in which he ministered was closed all summer."

"Philip, having for many years performed pastoral duties faithfully in a parish of Ethiopia, a number of members of the congregation grew tired of him and they cut down his salary to get rid of him. When he resigned, a younger man was called, but nobody extended a call to Philip, and, as the pay he had received during his ministry was quite inadequate to admit of his making any provision for his old age, he soon found the experiment of living on air unsatisfactory, and so very speedily ended his days. Paul preached at Corinth with power and fervor, and at the conclusion of his sermon he asked that a hymn should be sung. It was given in an artistic manner by the choir, the solos for the soprano and alto being unusually brilliant, while Paul was especially pleased with the left-hand playing of the organist during the performance of the florid accompaniment. A Gentile from Alexandria who attempted to sing was requested by the sexton not to interrupt the music. When Paul visited Ephesus he was entertained by Alexander the copper-smith who, although not a believer, held a pew in the middle aisle of the church, belonged to the vestry, and contributed so liberally to the Church objects that he was more highly regarded than any of the converts whose circumstances were not so good. Paul, while in the pulpit, preached with force against sin; but, of course, carefully avoided saying anything that might hurt Alexander's feelings."

"While Paul was at Philippi the Governor appointed a day for the Christians to return thanks for the mercies of the past year. A solemn service was accordingly held, which was attended by all those who could spare time, including the wives and daughters of several millionaires, the aggregate annual value of whose property amounted to \$10,000,000. A collection was taken up for the purpose of spreading the Gospel in less favoured parts, and the united offerings of the faithful amounted to \$20,52; several munificent contributions of no less than twenty-five cents having been made by the wealthier members of the congregation," &c., &c.

A narrative which should treat such a subject, in such a manner, might be open to a charge of undue levity; but such an accusation could not fairly be made by those religious persons who approve of the things upon which the travesty is based. The Christian Church to-day sanctions, to a greater or less extent, these very things; and it is not any more shocking to imagine St. Paul approving an effort to reduce a Church debt by the help of a raffle, than it is to regard the fact that such methods are actually employed. The Church of to-day is a power for good, and it contains tens of thousands of good people. It is doing noble work and doing it earnestly; but Mammon does sit in the pews and help to pay the expenses; and there are few ministers who have courage enough to stand up in the pulpit and to tell the rich sinner in the pew the honest truth about his conduct. It is respectable to go to church, and those people who go because it is respectable have become so necessary as contributors to the expenses that the preacher suffers frightful embarrassment when he desires to do his duty. The modern preacher is in a sense in the position of the sportsman who could fire straight at his prey while the prey was far apart from him, but who was deeply perplexed what to do when a bird which he wanted to shoot came and perched on the barrel of his gun.

MORNING STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

The best time for Bible reading is in the morning. The mind and body are fresh, after the repose of the night, and the highest powers of thought may be brought to bear upon the chapter selected. But, with most people, each recurring morning brings its own pressing tasks. Business cares, the daily toil, and the duties of the household, are the first and most engrossing concerns. Some hours must pass, with many, before they can find time to sit down to any quiet reading.

I would plead, however, with every one who may happen to look at this article, that the plan be honestly tried, of taking some words from God's