

adopt that for which the evidence was decidedly preponderating. They were to invite the aid of scholars of any religious body or nation. These laws were totally and sadly neglected, as we expect to shew in this paper.

Those who have been pained by the omissions and changes of the New Version are assured that they have been made upon doubtful and slight evidence. In the first place, God has not left Himself without witness as to what is, beyond doubt, His word written for us. For 1,450 years the New Testament was preserved by means of written books, by being translated into many languages, by being publicly read, and the books so used preserved to our day: and by the early Christian Fathers frequently and fully using texts in their writings. Thus we have the testimony of some 1,000 MSS. which have come down to our day, the Lectionaries and the Versions, besides the Fathers.

During this long period the New Testament was made secure to us by a vast multiplication of copies, continuing all down the ages in an ever increasing number; at length by a new art, the Bible was committed to the safe-keeping of the press.

Many of the MSS. have perished, but no other book of ancient times is represented by anything like the number of MSS. which have been preserved of the New Testament. Of these, the copy marked B. and another called *Aleph*, are thought to belong to the 4th century. The copies called A. and C. to the 5th century, and so on, increasing in number year by year. But it must also be remembered that the translations are in some cases older than even these MSS., and are therefore of great authority; while the Christian Fathers will carry us back to the first century and down to the age of printing.

Thus we have the MSS., the Lectionaries, the Versions and the Fathers coming down side by side, where they agree we have a text beyond dispute; and where they differ, we seek for the evidence which is decidedly preponderating. Of the numerous MSS. some five (A., B., *Aleph*, C., D.,) have within the last twenty years established a tyrannical ascendancy over the imaginations of the critics. Yet these MSS. differ among themselves, and from the great body of the other MSS. and from the writings of the Fathers also. The result has been that a Greek Testament was prepared (from which our New Version was taken) vastly more remote from what the Evangelists actually wrote, than any which has appeared since the invention of printing. But then, it is claimed, these 5 MSS. are the oldest extant, therefore they must be the purest. It may be, that the very reason why they escaped, while many others perished, was that the writers had made so many mistakes that these copies were useless. Or, it may be, that the Gospel endeavoured by falsifying the MSS. to injure the cause. Indeed, it is believed that Marcion the heretic reduced the Lord's prayer some 1730 years ago, (for the mischief can be all traced back to him) to the mutilated condition in which it now appears in the New Version.

It is impossible in a short newspaper article to go fully into these matters, yet many may read your paper who read but little more on such subjects. It is for such persons that we write. Many of these have, no doubt, been startled by the sad changes of the New Version, and we wish to lay before them a few plain proofs that these changes, in many cases, depend upon false grounds. Let us take one example. The Gospel of St. Mark has against the last 16 verses this marginal notice, "The two oldest Greek MSS. and some other authorities omit from verse 9 to the end; some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." Of the 1,000 MSS. which have come down to our day, two only omit these words. One of the Revisers has stated, that certain Fathers testify that these verses were not written by St. Mark. Of these, one does not happen to mention them, and another quotes them as part of St. Mark's Gospel! Versions two hundred years older than these two MSS. have these verses as part of this Gospel. Every known MSS. but two, every ancient Version, and 31 Fathers, (18 of whom, at least, used copies as old as the two MSS. named,) all agree in acknowledging these verses as part of the Gospel of St. Mark. A more grievous perversion of Holy Scripture can scarcely be found than Luke 2, xiv. "Peace among men in whom he is well pleased." This reading is only found in 4 of the said MSS., two of them were anciently corrected, another has the correct reading, but in another place. While for our grand old reading we have, every MSS.

save the said 4. The words are used by the Eastern Church from the beginning, while no less than 56 ancient witnesses assure us that the reading of the New Version is a fabrication and a blunder; this is strengthened by the fact that this testimony comes from every part of ancient Christendom. As to the versions, two have this new rendering, while three are in our favour, therefore this weight of evidence is with us.

(To be Continued.)

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

THE MARRIAGE LAW.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The dangers which threaten our marriage laws from the relations in which the Roman Church in Canada stands to the State seem not to have been sufficiently considered. The Bill lately before Parliament was brought in by a Roman Catholic member. Of course we understand what that means. It is not that the Church of Rome herself is anxious about the matter, for she goes quietly on enforcing her own laws of matrimony, no matter what the laws of the State may be. This movement did not originate with Rome, but with the Association of English Law-breakers. These, knowing well that no change in the marriage laws could be made in Canada against the opposition, or without the distinct sanction, of the Church of Rome, to carry their point, are willing to make any concession and to hand over practically legislation on the subject of marriage to the Roman authorities of the country; thus, whatever form the bill takes, will be dictated from Rome. An "authoritative" statement on this subject, and a very significant one, was made a few days back in the *Montreal Gazette*. It runs thus:—"The course the clergy desire to adopt in this instance, or in a similar one, is very simple. The Catholic Church has always permitted such marriages, and in some particular instances would go even further, in permitting marriage between a woman and her deceased husband's brother, and between uncle and niece, and aunt and nephew. But of course such unions are rarely sanctioned by the Church, and all proposals of such a nature, when approved by the Diocesan Bishop, must of necessity be sent to His Holiness for confirmation or refusal. M. Girouard's bill is to render marriage with a deceased wife's sister valid in the eyes of the law. When such unions are sanctioned by the Church dispensations are required. This bill will receive the approval of the Catholic Church authorities. The bill only gives a part of what is wanted." Now, this is admirably candid. The Church of Rome in Canada declares itself prepared to sanction marriage "with a husband's brother, with an aunt, and with a niece," and that "this bill only gives a part of what is wanted." What the Church of Rome demands is the legalizing of all the degrees which she dispenses, and she accepts this bill only as an instalment. Is it not certain that at no very distant period her demands will acceded to? The Roman Catholic vote is a large one, and more, it is a solid one. Politicians will always be prepared to buy it by concession, especially if the concession is demanded, as now, with intense earnestness by a few of wealth and influence who have violated the law, and is resisted by the great body of those who care at all for such matters only in a feeble and half-hearted manner. Is it not amazing that Protestants, and especially Protestant statesmen, do not see the dangers to the liberties of the country, as well as to its morals, which such concessions involve? "This bill is only a part of what is wanted." Ought we not to know the full extent of what is wanted before we begin to give in to these demands? What is the full extent? How many degrees does she claim authority to dispense? Dr. Pusey, in his evidence before the Royal Commission of 1849, has shown that "it is now laid down that the Pope may dispense every degree except between parent and child, and brother and sister," and "every degree of affinity, even between a son and his mother-in-law." This is universally held; but besides, "a very large body of Roman authorities hold that the marriage of brothers and sisters is dispensable, and even of grandfather and granddaughter." This, then, is the full extent of the claims of the Church of Rome—that her authority to dispense with every degree, except, perhaps, that of parent and child, be recognized by law. It is so recognized in the Province of Quebec already as a right secured to our French Canadian fellow-subjects by treaty, and it is now openly advocated that this recognition should be extended to the entire Dominion, and it is quite certain that if a beginning is now made this will be done; and if these degrees are made dispensable by the Church of Rome, of course they will be thrown open as free to all other religious bodies.

But what will the effect of such a change in the law be upon the country in general? It may be thought that the social condition of Protestants under such circumstances will be no more injured than of Roman Catholics, and we may be pointed

to the pure family life of the French Canadians of Lower Canada. Those who so argue strangely forget the difference between the conditions under which Protestants and Roman Catholics will live with respect to such alteration of the law. The Table of Degrees of the Church of Rome will remain unaltered, a Table more stringent than ours, adding one degree, the 4th, to the Levitical degrees. It will be dispensable indeed, as I have stated above, but then each particular deviation from it will require a special dispensation, which must be referred to and be sanctioned by the Pope; and so costly and troublesome is the process that, practically, dispensations are open to none but the wealthy classes; and besides, by the Roman doctrine something of religious blot remains upon these marriages, which the dispensation does not remove. These things act as strong deterrents from such unions, which are thus seldom known among Roman Catholics.

But there will be no such restraints upon the other religious bodies which form the mass of our Canadian population. The Church of England will, we may believe, never give way theoretically, but in the practical absence of all discipline among us, will there not be found unfaithful, worldly priests who, for a morsel of meat, or from fear of a moment's unpopularity, will silently admit to the Holy Table any one of influence who may venture upon transgression of any degree, and especially if it be not illegal? Not long since an attempt was made to compel a clergyman in England to admit to the Lord's Table a wretch who had married his own son's widow. There are now living in Ontario two men, one in the wealthy classes, who have married their grandfathers' young widows, one of them, I think, a member of our Church. Is it impossible that this incestuous pair may at this moment be admitted to our Holy Table? Do we not know how tremendous is the pressure brought to bear in such cases, and how much moral courage is required to resist. It is so in regard of Degrees which are now illegal, what will it be when they are legalized, though still forbidden by the Church? One of the most eminent and holy of our Bishops told me himself how he had treated the first attempt on the part of a Churchman in his Diocese to break through our Table of Degrees by marrying his wife's sister. The very next Sunday he sent a formal written excommunication of the guilty pair, which was duly read from the altar of the Church to which they belonged. Of course, they withdrew, and of course, were welcomed by the Methodists. But what was the result? The aged apostolic bishop died, and one of the first things his successor in the episcopate did, was to empower the clergyman of a congregation in his episcopal city to re-admit these wretched people, with this bond upon their souls, and while still living in their sin, to the Blessed Sacrament! If this is the way the discipline of the Church of England is administered in high places, am I not fully justified in saying that we, situated as we are now, have no pledge that our Table of Degrees, even if we maintain it intact, shall not in time become a mere dead letter?

And if we pass to other religious bodies, the only one that pretends to any strictness upon this matter is the Presbyterians, and we know how faithless they have proved in the United States, and how when challenged in their last General Synod in Canada respecting the wife's sister, they miserably shirked the question by appointing a committee "to watch the course taken by the Legislature." I fear it is certain that if marriage with a wife's sister is legalized in Canada, the Presbyterian bodies will alter their law accordingly. None or the other Protestant bodies, I fancy, has any rules upon the subject. The result, then, will be this, that if the law be altered to permit the Church of Rome outside of Lower Canada, to dispense with the dispensable degrees of her Table, freedom at the same time must be granted to all other religious bodies throughout the Dominion, not to dispense with those degrees, for nothing of the kind is known among them, but to marry within the same degrees without any check or restraint of any kind. The results, I need not say, will be disastrous. Those results the Church of Rome cares nothing for. Whatever tends to disintegrate and show the moral weakness of the various religious bodies outside her pale will be counted a gain by her. No considerations of the degree in which she will be morally responsible for, the accompanying moral evils will prevent her from accepting anything of the nature of a concession to her own claims; and to have the marriage law of this great Dominion of England laid at her feet, and her Papal dispensations recognized and legalized will be felt to be a triumph indeed. But is this a state of things to which any true lover of his country can look forward with satisfaction? Is not our true position in this matter expressed in the words of ancient wisdom *obsta principijs*?

H. R.

16th February, 1882.

BE CAREFUL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Would it not be well that "Table-Talk" that is published should be such as can bear the scrutiny of actual facts. Sweeping assertions concerning our ministry are often made at table, but they are considerably modified when brought to the test. Table-talk of all kinds is often careless, and "Outis" has evidently been led astray this time by the careless prattle of some untrustworthy informant.

H. B.

TURNING TO THE EAST.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The letter of "A. W. S." betrays so much ignorance that I am constrained to ask you to publish a few lines in answer. Whether the practice "was known in the Diocese thirty or forty years ago" I cannot say, but, as an old Englishman, I can say, from my own experience, that it was known in use more than fifty years ago in England; and as I have never seen in England any variation from the practice in any building provided with a chancel so that part of the congregation were facing north and south, I should infer that it is probably universal. When in the Georgian era the fashion was adopted of erecting two pulpits—one for the prayers, the other for the sermon—and the old custom of saying the prayers in a stall or in a desk facing north, was abandoned, the custom of turning to the east was also naturally abandoned by the minister; but I presume that it has been invariably practiced from the time of the adoption of our Reformed Prayer Book in all places where the prayers have been said at a chancel or choir stall, as in Cathedrals, College Chapels and other buildings similarly arranged. We are told that in Poland, at the recital of the Creed, the nobles used to draw their swords as testifying their readiness to shed their blood in defence of the truth; and I think that the turning of minister and people all in one direction, to any point of the compass, is very expressive of the one mind and one spirit with which all are expected to unite in their adherence to the confession of their faith. The occupants of the chancel merely turn so as to face in the same direction as the majority of the congregation in the body of the church.

Yours, etc.,
AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN.

Feb. 25th, 1882.

BURIAL FEES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS.—I had not the remotest intention of stirring up the ire of your correspondent "Veritas," when I made the enquiry through your columns respecting the right of a Minister of our Church to charge \$10 to the estate of a deceased member of his flock for performing the offices of the Church over his remains. I must still say, however, that I have never found any authority for such a charge either in utterances from "the pulpit," under which I have "been sitting" my "whole life," or in "the Bible" which is in my "hands" sometimes. I always supposed, until Veritas" enlightened me, that lawyers were paid in a very different way from clergymen; by fees for each piece of work performed, while the latter are supposed to be paid by an annual stipend, made up of rents of glebes, endowments, or yearly or weekly offerings, combined to form an aggregate sum, which I most freely admit is often much less than it should be, and might with great propriety be augmented by any honest means. But I must say I used to think that even marriage fees, like the counsel fee to a barrister, and the physician's fee in England, were merely honorary, and could not be recovered by an action at law as against a "common debtor." As for burial fees, I never dreamed that I was under any legal obligation to pay my rector any special charge when any of my family are buried with the rites of the church. If it is commonly known that such a fee is legally chargeable it may account for the singular phenomenon I have often witnessed of poor persons who have attended church their "whole life," getting dissenting Ministers to bury their dead.

As for anything "contemptibly unjust and dishonest" in my inquiry, I simply throw back the charge in the face of the one who made it.

The Minister of the Gospel, who, for the sake of \$10, induced a Churchwarden to swear to a point of law, could, under the circumstances, be compelled by a process of law to pay over the money withheld under that pretext; but I am concerned only so far as it brings a scandal on the Church.

Your obedient servant,

ENQUIRER.

BISHOP RYLE'S VIEWS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS.—When a writer shews much acumen, or is very expressive as the expense of accuracy, his readers may feel certain that his cause is a weak one. Your correspondent "Argus" is inaccurate in these instances.

1. The use of the term "Protestant Faith."
2. "Bishop Ryle will never be found breaking the laws of the Established Church."
3. Bishop Ryle takes no comfort in offering up prayer for the dead, nor does he believe in the Confessional.

1. I challenge "Argus" to give one expression from the Prayer Book that will justify the term "Protestant Faith." On the contrary, the Creeds, the Preface, and the prayer for all conditions of men, have "Catholic Church," or "Catholic Faith."
2. Bishop Ryle is bound by law to wear the vestment called a cope when he celebrates in his Cathedral. His Lordship does not do so.
3. The Bishop must take comfort in offering up prayer for the dead, or why should he every Sunday devoutly pray that "we" should "them," may be partakers of God's Heavenly Kingdom," or, at every funeral he solemnizes—that "we with all"