

arts. Happily, we are able to deny this last statement. A nation who could manufacture urns and drinking cups, bronze arrow heads and spear heads, bodkins and necklaces, can scarcely be regarded as wanting in such knowledge. "They wear," says Diodorus Siculus, "bracelets and armlets, and round their necks thick rings, all of gold, and costly finger-rings, and even golden corselets; they have dyed tunics, flowered with colours of every kind, and striped cloaks fastened with a brooch, and divided into numerous many coloured squares." The art of dyeing, and that, too, in patterns, does not resemble any "savages" at the present time; neither do we find them so far advanced in civilization as to work mines, as these "barbarian Celts" must have done, to procure the precious metal, if they did not barter it with other nations, a fact which shows them not to have been the "savages" they have too frequently been painted. Even their vices, amongst which intemperance stands pre-eminent, prove them to have been acquainted with the manufacture of intoxicating liquors; whereas it is generally the vice which the "paleface" brings to the notice of the uncivilized heathen and not that the rude barbarian manufactures. Again, they were the *only* nation that possessed a national mint in Western Europe apart from Rome, as is evident by the numerous coins of Cynvelin (Cunobelinus) which have been discovered from time to time; it will therefore appear as if they were not far behind the civilization of the Eternal City itself. It is however, but fair to add these coins may have been minted by the Romans for the Britons. Strabo, narrates British goods had a tariff levied on them. To crown all, laws which, in the main, have come down to us from those early times, governed the people. Reserving for a separate chapter an account of the Druidic religion, it may be briefly said that vestiges of Egyptian worship have been traced in Britain, as the Celtic deity Belenus was paid divine honours by the Aquileians.

To sum up in the words of the author of the "Popular History of England": "The Britons, as known to the Romans, were a people of high courage, disciplined and obedient to authority, and yet impatient of subjection; not unacquainted with some important arts of life; exchanging commodities for money of copper and iron; mining and smelting their native tin; possessing an agriculture not wholly unscientific, for they understood the process of marling, and raised cattle in great numbers; a naval people, with boats and probably vessels of burden, sailing far away into a tempestuous sea; a warlike people, with swords, and shields, and chariots that could not be fabricated without some mechanical knowledge; a religious people, building temples of gigantic proportions and raising memorials of the dead in earthworks that rival the wonders of modern engineering. Their priests were their law-givers and the great ministers of whatever moral or material civilization they possessed; and we see that the most perfect element of the learning of the priests was considered to exist in Britain. Were these teachers and law-givers surrounded by few votaries and subjects? "The population is very great and the buildings very numerous," says Cæsar. All merely savage nations never replenish a land, because they never subdue it to their use."

Why much of this was to be swept away by the Roman nation was known to Him Who maketh the fierceness of man to turn to His praise; humanly speaking, it may have appeared sad to note

"only the wan wave
Break in among the dead faces, to and fro
Swaying the helpless hands, and up and down
Tumbling the hollow helmets of the fallen,
And shiver'd brands that once had fought with Rome."

Not so to the Ruler of the world. As in the case of the original nations of Palestine, He saw how necessary it was to destroy the existing state of affairs that a purer might be introduced.

NOTES ON THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

By REV. G. OSBORNE TROOP.

No. IX.

The revelation of the great fundamental doctrine of the Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity may be said to have been perfected on the day of Pentecost, when the operation of the Third Person

of the God-Head was fully manifested: we may, therefore, easily see the propriety of observing the following Sunday in honour of the Ever-blessed Three in One. While in the Early Church the day was kept as the Octave of Pentecost, the fact, that the same Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were used then as now, is of itself sufficient to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity was from the first associated with the observance of that day, which later on received the name of *Trinity Sunday*. Blunt says that the day was first appointed as a *separate Festival* in honour of the Blessed Trinity by a Synod of Arles, in A. D. 1260. The same writer draws attention to the interesting circumstance that "both in the ancient English and in the ancient German office books, all the Sundays afterwards until Advent are named after Trinity; whereas, in all offices of the Roman type they are named after Pentecost." "It seems probable," he adds, "that this distinctive ritual mark is a relic of the independent origin of the Church of England, similar to those peculiarities which were noticed by St. Augustine, and which were attributed by the ancient British Bishops to some connection with St. John. In this case it is, at least, significant, that it was St. John through whom the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was most clearly revealed; and also that the Early Church of England appears never to have been infested by the heresies on this subject, which troubled other portions of the Christian World."—In the *Eastern Church* our "Trinity Sunday" is kept as the *Festival of all holy martyrs*; a custom apparently dating even from the time of St. Chrysostom.

There are *twenty-five* Collects for as many Sundays after Trinity, all taken from the old Missal; but as there may be even twenty-seven Sundays from Trinity to Advent, or, again, not even so many as twenty-five, our Church directs that "if there be any more Sundays before Advent Sunday, the service of some of those Sundays that were omitted after the Epiphany shall be taken in to supply so many as are here wanting; and if there be fewer, the overplus may be omitted; provided that this last Collect (the 25th after Trinity), Epistle, and Gospel shall always be used on the Sunday next before Advent." From Advent to Trinity the Church instructs us in all the *great doctrines* of "the Faith which was once delivered unto the saints"; from Trinity to Advent she urges upon us the imperative necessity of reducing our faith to practice. Would we *prove* that we believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, then in the power of the Spirit let us *walk* in "the blessed steps of His most holy life" Who was GOD "manifest in the flesh."

It now but remains to notice the Holy Days, to which allusion has not been already made, and we shall have followed "the Christian year" throughout its course. In the Church of England, each of the eleven faithful Apostles is commemorated, St. Philip and St. James the Less, and St. Simon and St. Jude, going in pairs. Days are also set apart for St. Matthias, St. Paul, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Barnabas, and St. John Baptist.

How wisely our sober Church avoids all superstition in bringing before us the Festival of St. Michael (the Archangel) and all Angels, is best shown by the Collect for that day:—"O everlasting God, Who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order; mercifully grant, that as Thy holy angels always do Thee service in heaven, so by Thy appointment they may succour and defend us on earth; through Jesus Christ our Lord."—*Amen*.

With equal wisdom does the Church of England follow the middle course between irreverence on the one hand, and idolatry on the other, in setting apart two days in commemoration of that highly favoured Virgin, who herself foretold that "all generations" should call her "Blessed." One of these days is kept in memory of the Annunciation by the Angel Gabriel to the Mother of our Lord of the Birth of Jesus. The other commemorates "The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, commonly called the Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin." A number of "Black Letter" days are found in our Calendar, which, it is hardly necessary to mention, are no longer recognized by our Church as Festivals. One day yet remains, in the beautiful

Collect for which we express our belief in the "Communion of Saints." With that Collect, the one for "All Saints' Day," these Notes may fitly close:—"O Almighty God, Who hast knit together Thine elect in our communion and fellowship, in the Mystical Body of Thy Son, Christ our Lord; grant us grace so to follow Thy blessed Saints in all virtuous and godly living, that we may come to those unspeakable joys, which Thou hast prepared for them that unfeignedly love Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Amen*.

THE END.

Correspondence.

FREE CHURCH.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—I am glad to recognize the Catholic character of the CHURCH GUARDIAN in encouraging free friendly controversy or discussion on subjects bearing on the interests and well-being of the Church militant.

In your issue of the 17th inst. appears what I regard as a denunciation of Free Churches. I hope the writer will denounce this criticism if it misrepresents his views.

In the expressions "Free Church," "The Church should be free to all!" "To the poor the Gospel should be preached!" etc., I see no grounds for "protest."

Your opponent of "free Churches" may protest; I am free to profess my adherence to a free Church and a free Gospel to the poor.

The poor should be invited to partake of the "water of Life freely," but something must be provided or the poor will have "nothing to draw with."

What we need at present for the edification of Church goers and Church members is a clear enunciation of the terms and expressions which the writer protests against.

I cannot regard a church as "free" if I must be under extraordinary restraints while worshipping there. Surely if it be a free Church I must be allowed the privilege of carrying my hassock there and placing it to protect my only decent pants from sundry defilement of those who attend as mere spectators, and care not to reverence the sanctuary. Is it a free Church if I am prohibited from wearing my best coat which happens to be my cassock? Is it a free Church which prohibits my appropriating a seat for my helpless invalid, when I am willing to pay for it? Is that a free Church which severs my children from me, and subjects me and them to the derisions and annoyances which distract me, and disgrace the house?

Mr. Editor, I have been much impressed with the article of your correspondent on free Churches; my object in writing is not so much to attack the article as to elicit such discussion as will lead to sound views and practical conclusions.

I can understand what is meant by a free library or a free museum which some denominate an auditorium; but what I ask shall we agree to call a 'free Gospel?' or what is meant by a 'free Church' more freely called a pandemonium?

I refrain further exposure of my ignorance and crude ideas on the subject, hoping that some learned pen will contribute the much needed information.

FREE GOSPEL.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Can you please inform me if it is true that the Superintendent of one of the Halifax north-end parochial Sunday Schools is opposed to and in his own person rejects Confirmation? Surely if so there is something wrong somewhere.

SCRUTATOR.

[We don't know, our correspondent had better enquire of the Rector.]

WANT of space compels us to hold over quite a large amount of interesting correspondence.

We live for the good of others, if our living be in any sense true living. It is not in great deeds that the only blessing is found. In 'little deeds of kindness,' repeated every day, we find true happiness.