

He is a decided liberal sympathizer...

...will appear on for the opinions of

CHILDREN.

...aid Society of ... children of ... This year ... to provide for ... increased to over ... great deal of work ... in clothing ... in feeding the ... money to spare to ... as give so much ... Christmas time ... expecting to receive ... disappointed if ... more disappointed ... one only treat you ... is the case with ... far away in the ... miles every Sun ... enough clothes to ... and the Christ ... nishes for them, is ... year. Now, the ... all the city Sunday ... the country Sunday ... We want you to ... and see what you ... have a little money ... ourselves, and buy ... them; and we want ... the things to us im ... St. upstairs, be ... a great distance. ... Indian children ...aviour Christ, who ... lives, and it is in ... His sake who said, ... to me, and forbid ... ally are forbidding ... come to Church or ... when they are ... me simply for love ... they must in the ... by the little gifts ... you can all help us ... Church cares for ... well as she does for ... re and duty will be ... try to help in this ... so much in need of ... others to help you, ... ble "to work with ... give to them that ... brought on Friday ... No. 1 Elm Street, ... acceptable, to be ... er, 87 Blecker St.,

... published in ... me to give some ... old have preferred ... learned professor ... asks; however, I ... on the subject. ... her reject tradition ... Article, which ... private judgment ... y break the tradi ... ch, which is not ... d be ordained and ... ght to be rebuked ... o the like), as he ... on order of the ... of the magistrate, ... he weak brethren." ... handed down from ... ally or in writing ... the Scriptures are ... that is, handed ... outh. There are ... Ecclesiastical Tra-

dition, which has been used by the Church from the beginning. Second—Herminutical Tradition, that is, the creeds, liturgy, &c. And third—Oral Tradition, which last, the Church of Rome says, was given by our Saviour and His Apostles, and which has come down to the present time; but which we deny as there is no recognition of it in the Scriptures. Look at the effect of Oral Tradition. It was given to man in three different ages of the world. First, to Adam, and men became so corrupt, that the truth was lost, and God was obliged to make another revelation; secondly to Noah, which was at length almost lost, until God made Himself known again; thirdly, to Abraham. Afterwards God committed the written law to Moses on the tables of stone.

That Christ and His Apostles said many things which were never written cannot be doubted, but how are we to know what they were? The Church of Rome would say by tradition. There cannot be anything more uncertain than that. Why were the Jewish and Christian Scriptures committed to writing. It was to preserve them against the casualties of an oral communication. There is nothing more uncertain than the sending of unwritten messages. Start an oral communication eighteen centuries ago—what perversions it would encounter in the long line of descent. It would pass through so many hands, suffering from the manipulations of every one of them, so that long before it would reach our times, the alterations and mutilations practiced upon it by ignorance, superstition, and prejudice would almost destroy its identity, and put it past recognition. "The form of sound words" which the Church inculcates upon her children are, first—the Holy Scriptures; second—the Consensus and Praxis Ecclesiae, gathered from the fathers, councils, and historians. The authority of Holy Scripture is paramount and ultimate, that of the Consensus and Praxis secondary and confirmatory. What the discipline and rules of the Church were—we learn from the fathers. The New Testament was not written until from thirty to sixty years after the death of Christ. There were, therefore, worship, discipline, organization, and a creed established before the New Testament was written. The New Testament is not at all systematized—but the doctrine taught by Christ and His Apostles are constantly referred to, and there is a recognition of them throughout the whole. The teaching and preaching of the Apostles was as much the Word of God before the New Testament was written as it was after. But in order to avoid corruption through tradition the New Testament was written. We have the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and St. Athanasius Creed, which are summaries of the Gospel. The Nicene Creed was founded on the ancient creeds by the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, and was adopted as the rule of faith by the universal Church in all subsequent times.

The traditions embodied in the Jewish writings grew up, like our English common law, from particular cases and decisions, as a standing commentary on the Written Law. The canonicity of the New Testament was, I believe, decided by the Council of Carthage. So far as we know, the first Council to enumerate the books of the New Testament was that of Carthage, A.D. 397.

The Church of Rome has substituted what is called the Apostolical Tradition for the pure Word of God. According to the Council of Trent, Apostolical Traditions have the same authority as the Word of God itself. According to some of the Cardinals, Tradition is the foundation of the Scriptures, which cannot subsist without Tradition, while Tradition subsists very well without the Bible. Cardinal Ballermino, one of the greatest theologians of the Roman Catholic Church, asserts that the Scriptures without Tradition are neither necessary nor sufficient, and some Traditions are greater than the Word of God, and more obligatory to be observed, which, of course, is contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. The stream of Jewish tradition is embodied in the Targums. An account of the early oral Targums and Jewish Talmudic tradition, is given by different writers. As in the case of the Oral Law, and afterwards of the Oral Massora, the force of circumstances compelled the final writing down of the Targum. In the Talmuds some fine illustrations of the Word of God are given. When I was quite a youth, I read some of the Talmuds.

"And when the Queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon, she came to prove Solomon with hard questions at Jerusalem—and Solomon told her all her questions," 2 Chron. xvi. 12. It is now many years since I read the Talmuds, but in the Talmud of Gemara the following very beautiful illustration of the above passage is recorded. I quote from memory. The Queen of Sheba, attracted by the great reputation of Solomon, set out to visit this celebrated potentate at his own court, with the intention to ask questions, and to realize the extent of his matchless wisdom. The interview commenced in the presence of the whole court. At the foot of the throne stood Sheba's Queen, in each hand she held a garland of

flowers—the one composed of natural, the other of artificial art emulated the lively hues and the variegated beauties of nature, so that at the distance it was held by the Queen for the inspection of Jerusalem's monarch, it was deemed impossible for him to decide as her question imported—which was the natural and which the artificial wreath. The sagacious Solomon seemed posed; a solemn silence pervaded the assembly; the son of David inspects the garlands with attention. The Jewish Court looked solemn, it was a time of awful suspense. At length an expedient presented itself to this highly favoured king and philosopher, observing a cluster of bees hovering on the outside of one of the windows, he commanded it to be opened, the sovereign mandate was obeyed, and the bees rushing into the Court alighted instantly on one of the wreaths, while not a single one fixed upon the other. The decision was no longer difficult—the mystery was now unfolded, the learned Rabbins shook their beards in rapture, and the wondering Sheba, the potent empress of the South, had now an additional reason to be astonished at the wisdom of Solomon. I have given this illustration so that Mr. Lee may have some idea of the Tradition of the Talmuds of the Jews.

The Church of England in her 6th Article says:—"In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church. All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical." With regard to the Apocrypha, the Article says:—"And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life, and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." The word canonical means that which may be taken as a rule, and is used to distinguish them from those books which may not be taken to establish any doctrine. The Apocrypha are books of doubtful origin and authority. "They are so called from a Greek word, which signifies hidden, because their authors were not known, nor are the proofs of their mission upon record, for which reasons their writings were not received in the Canon of the Jewish Church."

The Bible contains the revealed will of God, and is a perfect rule of faith and practice. A plain Christian, by prayer and diligent reading, may understand as much of it as is necessary, without the assistance of learned criticisms.

October 10th.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

A PETITION FROM THE INDIANS.

SIR,—The subjoined letter has just reached me. It is a literal translation of a petition sent to me by the Indians of Negwenenang, under Mr. Renison's care. It speaks for itself, and I am sure the prayer will be answered. I can, myself, bear witness to the need of the new church, having visited the mission a few weeks ago. The old one is of logs, the interspaces filled with mud, all crooked and broken, while a score of crevices gape here and there, so that the winter wind will soon come whistling through them, stinging so sharply that the heat of the new stove, so kindly provided by some friends will not be felt six feet away. No wonder that they ask "help that they be no longer famished (frozen) where they pray."

Contributions will be thankfully received either by myself (at Huntsville, Muskoka), or by the Treasurer, A. H. Campbell, Esq., 17 Manning Arcade, Toronto.

Owing to the remoteness of the mission, and the great expense of purchasing and portaging material, at least \$1,000 will be needed.

E. ALGOMA.

To the Big Black Coat:

DEARLY BELOVED,—We, the Indians here of Negwenenang, now make a beginning in order that eighty logs may be prepared for a church which is to be built. This is all our ability. We are very poor. Money none have we. But we beseech you to help us pretty much, that we may give till the church be completed. As for our gift, this is all it is like, namely, eighty logs, and nothing more.

We thank you for your past help, and now we still believe in you, that you will help us, we be no longer famished when we pray. We, the Indians, will do our best. Yes, and we do thank you that you have been merciful to us, who are very poor. Signed, FREDERICK A. OSEKAPIDKA, SEYMOUR OSESERKUNG, PETER PEDIGOGUN, JOSEPH MUGWA, and others.

CHRONIC COUGHS AND COLDS and all Diseases of the Throat and Lungs can be cured by the use of Scott's Emulsion, as it contains the healing virtues of Cod Liver Oil and Hypophosphites in the fullest form. See what W. S. Muer, M.D., L. R. C. P., etc., Truro, N. S., says: "After three years' experience I consider Scott's Emulsion one of the very best in the market. Very excellent in Throat affections." Put up in 50c. and \$1 size.

SKETCH OF LESSON.

21ST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY. OCT. 21ST, 1888.

Saul's life spared.

Passage to be read.—1 Samuel xxiv. 1-8; xxvi. 1-12.

How dreadful it is for two persons to be always quarrelling; and how sad, when the one is disposed to be friendly, to see the other persist in his unfriendliness. So it was with David and Saul. We have seen Saul persecuting David; now see those persecutions continued in two instances, which show in a marked way how differently Saul and David behaved to each other.

1. 1. Saul and David at En-Gedi (xxiv. 1-8.) To escape from Saul, David went into the very rugged country about En-gedi, and hid himself in one of the caves in the steep mountain side. But even here Saul followed, and happened to enter the very cave in which David was. Unable to see David as he went in from the light, David, looking out from the darkness, could plainly see him. How easily could David have killed Saul. Indeed the men who were with him, urged him to do so. But David would not listen to them; he would not lift his hand against the Lord's anointed. He however approached Saul quietly, and cut off a piece of his robe. Then, when Saul left the cave, David followed, and from a distance, showed the king the piece of the robe, pointing to it as an evidence that he did not seek the king's hurt, and that Saul, therefore, ought not to listen to those who said he did. (v. 9-15.) When Saul saw how he had been in David's power, and how David had spared him, he was very sorry for his jealous and suspicious conduct, and made friends with David. (v. 16-22.)

2. Saul and David at Hachilah, (xxvi. 1-12), but alas! Saul soon became unfriendly again, and went out once more against David, the Ziphites telling him where David was. When David knew this, he went at night, when Saul and all his people were asleep, right up to the place where Saul lay. Again the king was in David's power, and Abishai (who had accompanied David) desired with one blow to slay the king. But as before David would not touch the Lord's Anointed. He however took away his spear and the girdle of water which was at his head. Then from a safe distance, he upbraided the people for not protecting the king, (v. 18-16.) and showed Saul the spare and the girdle he had taken, begging him to make peace. (v. 18-20.) So Saul was again greatly affected, and promised that he would no more seek to harm David. (v. 21-25.)

II. Now in both these instances we see—

1. The Relentlessness of Saul. For Saul knew that David was to be king, (ch. xiii. 14, xv. 28, xxiv. 20.) Also that he was innocent of any offence against him. Yet he hated him, and persecuted him with the utmost bitterness. He was determined to have his life. And so he pursued him into the most difficult and inaccessible places, (ch. xxiv. i, 2.)

2. The Generosity of David.—Surely David would take the first opportunity of ridding himself of so relentless an enemy, and feel that self defence would justify him in killing him. But no; though opportunity offered again and again, David's piety would not permit him to lay violent hands on one whom he recognized, in spite of his wickedness, as the Lord's anointed, and his generous and forgiving spirit would not allow him to hurt even the enemy who was seeking his life. What a contrast is the behaviour of these two men.

AN EASTERN LEGEND.

Where the Mosque of Omar now stands in stony Jerusalem, and where of old the gorgeous Temple of Solomon reared its lofty head, was once a field, the joint property of two loving brothers. The younger of these brethren was a bachelor, the elder a married man and the happy father of several children. Together did these good brothers cultivate the field, which had been left to them in common by their mother on her deathbed. It happened one harvest time that the brothers reaped the field, and gathered the yellow sheaves into two equal-sized stacks. Now, while the harvest-moon shone upon the earth, it peeped into the window of the younger brother, who lay awake gazing on the beautiful sight. A sudden thought came into his mind: "My brother has a wife and a family to maintain, and yet our stacks are of equal size. That, in my opinion, is not as it should be. I will arise, and take a few sheaves from my stack and add them to my brother's. He will not see what I have done, and he will not therefore refuse my gift."

So thinking, the younger brother arose from his bed, and went and took several sheaves off his own stack, and laid them on his brother's, and then went back to bed. But in the same night, only