

tian presbyterate of eldership in Apostolic days, and what do we learn?

1st. That the elders were appointed to their office by the Holy Ghost.

2nd. That the apostle held them responsible for the teaching and instructions they gave the flock.

3rd. That he committed to their charge during his absence, the souls and spiritual destinies of all the Ephesian Christians.

The whole Canadian Church has been placed under deep obligations to Canon Carmichael for his noble defence of Episcopacy against the attacks of those who ought to be its defenders but who have so far forgotten themselves as to deny its Divine institution and authority.

The duty of all loyal Churchmen ought to be very plain in so important a matter as this, and Canon Carmichael a so-called "Low" Churchman, with characteristic zeal and ability, has come forward to vindicate this cherished principle of the Church of England from the assaults of professed friends. We hope and believe that the Canon's course will be endorsed by 99-100ths of the "Evangelical" Churchmen of Canada.

## NOTES ON THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

By REV. G. OSBORNE TROOP.

### No. III.

Only five Sundays after the Epiphany were reckoned by the Church of England from 1549 to 1661. Whenever a sixth Sunday occurred before Septuagesima the Collect, Epistle and Gospel of the fifth were repeated. The old rubric reads as follows: "The sixth Sunday (if there be so many) shall have the Collect, Epistle and Gospel that was upon the Fifth Sunday." Blunt, from whom I have derived the above information, also tells us that the Collect now used for the sixth Sunday after the Epiphany is written in the margin of the well-known Durham Prayer Book, and appears to be an original composition of Bishop Cosin's; although there is some similarity of expression between it and an Easter Collect of St. Gregory's Sacramentary, which seems to indicate that the one was in part suggested by the other. But, in any case, we are greatly indebted to the learned Bishop; for the Collect he has given us is as sublimely beautiful as any in all our noble collection. It will be remembered that the whole service of this sixth Sunday is often required for the 25th or 26th Sunday after Trinity; and no thoughtful student of our Prayer Book can fail to be struck with its peculiar appropriateness, whether as a completion of the Epiphany system, or as an introduction to the glorious season of Advent.

After the conclusion of the Epiphany season our Services begin to breathe the penitential spirit of the approaching forty days' fast of Lent. By the examples and discourses of our blessed Lord and His Apostles we are taught how indispensable to the spiritual growth of the Christian is the practice of humility and self-denial.

The first Sunday in Lent, being about 40 days before Easter, among the Early Christians was called *Quadragesima* Sunday; and Lent itself was known as the *Quadragesimal* Fast. Hence the Sundays next preceding received the names of *Quinquagesima*, *Sexagesima*, and *Septuagesima*, as being *round numbers* 50, 60 and 70 days before Easter respectively. It will be observed that the Prayer Book also gives to these three Sundays the alternative and more exact titles of "The next," "The second," and "The Third" Sundays before Lent. These titles were added in 1661. The Collect for *Quinquagesima* was composed by our Reformers in 1549. It may well form a most scriptural introduction to the Lenten season. "O Lord, Who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; send Thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before thee: Grant this for Thine only Son Jesus Christ's sake."—*Amen*.

The last day before Lent is commonly called Shrove Tuesday. This name is not recognized by the Church of England; but it is, perhaps, worth while, in passing, to notice its origin. "Shrove" is from the old English word *Shrive*, to confess. Among Roman Catholics confession is thought necessary as a preparation for Lent; hence the day on which this confession is made in the Romish Church is called Shrove Tuesday. With a striking inconsistency, the greatest excesses in all kinds of self-indulgence prevail on this day in Roman Catholic countries, and with a sad irony do we find these excesses summed up in the suggestive name applied to them of Carnival, which means "*Farewell to the flesh*."

Ash-Wednesday is so called from the ancient practice of blessing the ashes made from the palms given on the Palm Sunday of the preceding year, and signing the cross with these ashes on the heads of penitents. The officiating minister in this ceremony said while performing the act: "Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust shalt thou return." These customs were of course abandoned at the Reformation, and in their stead was substituted the Communion Service.

The word "Lent" seems to be derived from one or the other of two Anglo-Saxon words—*Lenden*, spring; or *Lengian*, to lengthen, because the days

increase in length at this season. As to the observance of the Lenten fast, it appears that a fast has, from the earliest times, been kept before Easter, for several centuries varying, however, in the period of its duration. Even now the Eastern Church differs from the Western in beginning Lent on the Monday after *Quinquagesima* instead of on Wednesday.

Christ's freeman, who wishes to walk in that path only in which the Word of God may be a lamp unto his feet, may find full authority for the spiritual observance of this season of fasting prescribed by the Church in the fundamental principle of our discipleship—"If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me." Since the Master Himself prescribes *daily* self-denial, who can consistently object to denying himself for forty days? Surely the greater but includes the less. We are apt to forget that the term "fasting" is by no means to be limited so as to apply to food only. In the words of the Collect for the First Sunday in Lent we pray for "grace to use such abstinence" from all which hinders our progress in the heavenly race, that our flesh may be "subdued to the Spirit."

A careful student, by the way, will, of course, notice that counting in Ash-Wednesday the exact number of days to Easter Day is 46: the number 40 is obtained by omitting the six Sundays, which are not reckoned by the Church as days of fasting; not, be it observed, that the Church presumes for a moment in this to remit Christ's injunction of daily self-denial. Our Lord and His Apostles sanction both by precept and example the setting apart of special seasons for watchfulness and prayer, and it is in this spirit that our Church calls upon her faithful children to observe at stated periods a strictness of devotion which busy people, from the very nature of the case, could not maintain throughout the whole year.

The Collect for Ash-Wednesday is for the most part a new composition made in 1549. The Collect for the first Sunday in Lent, composed at the same date, seems entirely new. The Collects for the remaining Sundays in Lent are all taken from the Sarum Missal. The Fourth Sunday is called *Mid-Lent* or *Refreshment Sunday*, as is supposed from the subject of the Gospel for the day. The Fifth is known as *Passion Sunday*, because our Lord began on that day to openly foretell His sufferings; *Palm Sunday* is the name given to the Sunday next before Easter, from the custom which formerly prevailed on that day of blessing and carrying about palm branches in commemoration of Christ's triumphant entry into Jerusalem, when the rejoicing multitudes cut down branches from the trees and strewed them in His way. The week preceding Easter is known as *Passion Week* or *Poly Week*, evidently because into its solemn hours are crowded, the momentous scenes which gather round the Garden of Gethsemane and the Cross of the Sinless Sufferer.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Speaking of recent agitation in England in favor of this measure, the *Guardian* says:—

There is no more convincing symptom of a bad cause than the constant reiteration by its partisans of statements which they know, or easily might know, to be baseless. When men have to resort to false statements to make out their case, we are quite safe in concluding that they run short of solid reasons and attested facts, and are well aware of their poverty. There is no misrepresentation that has been more often repeated than the one that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was lawful until invalidated by Lord Lyndhurst's Act of 1835. The fallacy of this silly perversion of the facts has been again and again exposed, never more effectively than it was by Lord Hatherley at the meeting which took place in St. James's Hall on February 26, 1880. The speeches and proceedings at that meeting, held to oppose any alteration in the laws which enforce the "Table of Prohibited Degrees," might well, we think, be printed and circulated in a cheap form. There was very much in them which might prove serviceable now in counterworking this miserable crusade, or perhaps we ought rather to say "jihad," against the peace and purity of our homes. Lord Hatherley clearly demonstrated that there had been no change in the law of England as regards the point in question since the Baptism of King Ethelbert. Prior to the passing of Lord Lyndhurst's Act these marriages were just as unlawful as they are now. But it then belonged to the Ecclesiastical Courts to try the validity of marriages, and the Civil Courts, for obvious reasons of public policy, prohibited any suit for impeachment of a marriage after the death of either of the parties to it. Those who had contracted these unlawful connections took advantage of this interference. They were wont to procure the commencement of a mock suit for voiding their own marriage in the Church Courts, and afterwards by devices to which the condition of the law ecclesiastical too readily gave facilities, they got the suit protracted till one or other of them died. Then the marriage could not be challenged any longer. It was this artful scheme for dodging the law which Lord Lyndhurst's Act was designed to obviate. It declared all such marriages *ipso facto* void for the future, instead of being merely voidable as they had been in the past by sentence of Court. All this has been explained again and again.

We earnestly hope that the Bishops and Churchmen generally will be on the alert. It is very im-

portant to insist continually on the inevitable social and domestic consequences of the change in our Marriage Law which is demanded. The Church has with one voice declared that the marriage in question are incestuous and forbidden by the law of God, and for a Churchman that is enough. The first dispensation for a marriage within the Table of Prohibited Degrees was granted by Pope Alexander Borgia—a very bad authority in morals. And the occasional errors of individual clergymen or scholars count, in this as in other matters, for nothing against clear and express witness borne by the Church of Christ. Those who puzzle themselves by referring to patriarchal times should be reminded that their precedents prove too much if they prove anything. The example of Jacob does not show that a man may lawfully marry two sisters unless it likewise prove that he may keep them both as wives at the same time. But, in truth, the equality of the sexes which lies at the root of monogamy is not to be discerned in patriarchal life at all: and is only seen, as it were, at a distance in the law of Moses. To infringe on the equal rights of the man and the woman in this matter is to recede from a fundamental principle of Christianity. We advise the defenders of our Marriage Law to keep fast hold of this principle, and not allow themselves to be worried into discussions about the sense of particular texts. No doubt the stock texts from Leviticus and elsewhere have been darkened and complicated by controversy; but it is clear enough that if the man and the woman have equal rights, and the man is to have leave to marry his wife's sister, the woman cannot logically be interdicted from marriage with her husband's brother. And yet this is peremptorily forbidden by Lev. xviii 16. And why, unless affinity and consanguinity are to be treated alike for the purposes of marriage?

In a word, it is evident that to grant licence to marry two sisters in succession is fatal to the whole principle on which the Table of Prohibited Degrees is based. The advocates of change ask only to have one link removed. But they, no less than we, know well enough that when that link is gone, the binding force of the others is gone too. There is no country in which marriage with a deceased wife's sister is permitted along with a prohibition to marry the wife's niece. In truth, the latter relationship is one step further off than the former. And with these the other prohibitions on the ground of affinity must be, as they always have been, removed likewise. And the basis and understanding on which the household ways of countless English homes are conducted is completely subverted. As matters now stand, our wives' relatives are our own relatives, and are treated accordingly. Our wives' sisters and nieces, our brother's wife, or widow, and her relatives come and go, visit backwards and forwards, live honourably in the near intercourse which relationship sanctions, and protects. Mr. Labouchere and his allies will break up all this if they can. We earnestly trust that their attempts will be defeated—and decisively defeated—for the persistent agitation of the subject is too often used as a means for deceiving women to their ruin. They are told that the law is sure to be altered soon, and that the unhallowed union to which they are tempted to consent will be legalized. It is time these wicked machinations were, so far as is possible by public action, foiled.

## 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 NEW VERSION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Having seen a criticism on the New Version by the Revd. W. E. Gelling in your paper of the ninth of March, I cannot refrain from expressing a few thoughts which suggested themselves to my mind on perusing the same. In the first place I am glad that the criticism did not originate from Mr. Gelling himself, but was only prepared from an article in the *Quarterly Review*, but at the same time I think it a pity that any one, particularly a clergyman, should give so sweeping a condemnation to a subject of such very great importance and universal interest, without having thoroughly and unbiasedly investigated the matter. Now to be able to do this the person who takes upon himself to criticise, must at least be as perfect a scholar as those who undertook so great a work as revising our Holy Bible. And even then he would not have the advantage of comparing his thoughts, opinions and investigations with those of a company of learned men, whose whole thoughts were probably concentrated upon the same matter. Therefore the most able of critics would be at a disadvantage, were he single-handed to attempt to criticise this great work, which is the outgrowth, no doubt, of constant prayer, deliberate research and joint discussions. Those who have set forth the New Version have done so with the views to truth, and which truth they arrived at by the most laboured research, comparing the results and taking as the standard what the greater number thought to be the truth. Are any of us on a platform from which we may competently criticise so great an undertaking? We are all loyal subjects of the Old Version, and,

no doubt, many ignorant people like myself (of course the laity) have hardly thought at all about it being a translation. It has been God's Word to us from our earliest childhood, and every sound of it as familiar as our own name. We therefore all feel a certain sorrow that it should be altered. The fact gives us a shock, that is all very natural, but that shock does not injure us, it does us good, it wakes us up. What will an unbiased mind say to itself? Though every alteration may give a wrench, let us have as near the truth as possible, since our Bible is a translation. It is easy to condemn the changes that have been made, and yet to be completely ignorant of the principles on which the Text was criticised. Words may seem to us abrupt and defective, because we have been accustomed to smoother words which might not, however, give the exact meaning. This reminds me that the other day I was reading in the *Monthly Packet* the translation of some German poetry; it was good English and smooth, but if it had come under the eye of a German I am, sure he would never have recognized the verses. I will give you an instance to shew you what translating and translating is.

"Denn in des Grabes stille Kammer  
Dringt keine Lebens Klage mehr,  
Da bleibst zurück der viele Jammer,  
Nur Gottesriede wohnt unher,  
Dort wendet sich der Dornen Pfad,  
Wohl dem der über wunden hat."

## Translation in Monthly Packet.

For in the peaceful grave no sound  
Is heard of fret and care:  
The gods in stillness watch around,  
No sorrow enters there.  
The way of thorns is o'er at last,  
All joy to him who safe has passed.

## More correct translation.

Complaints of life they do not find  
The quiet chamber of the ground,  
Much misery remains behind,  
And only God's peace reigns around,  
The path of thorns turns at this place,  
Happy the man who's won the race.

To get the reflection of the authors mind in our English translation, we must first thoroughly grasp the meaning of the original and then endeavour to reproduce that meaning in words of exactly the same interpretation. We must not choose words that sound smoother to those, perhaps less elegant, but more forcible; nothing must be added to make the sentence more complete, if not in the original. A person may be considered a good translator, that is he may give the principal meaning of the original in smooth and flowing language, and at the same time much of the force and pith and peculiarity of style of the original may be completely lost. He may also have a considerable knowledge of a language, and yet not have so complete a knowledge as to be able to give back as it were the subtle essence of the writer's mind. We see by the above translation how completely the translator has diverged from the original, with the attempt to put another language into flowing and graceful English, much exactness may be sacrificed, and in a matter where we are seeking the exact truth, surely the form in which we get it, as long as we do but obtain it, is of minor consequence. By following out this thought, we certainly may blunt at least one of the arrows which some, with ignorant and reckless hand, are letting fly against the New Version. The English *Guardian* says "the English of the New Version is in 'stiff, pedantic and not idiomatic,'" and further, "Few of us are good Hebrew and Greek scholars," but many can tell, no less than relish, a bit of pure and racy English." Then let them go to other works for such delicacies, but give us a translation of such exactness, that it may but be like the lisping of a child, as long as it expresses the language of the Kingdom of Heaven, and let us receive this certainly great and important work with unbiased minds, thankful that we may receive through it more light than has perhaps yet shone upon us, and that many who have possibly been careless of reading their Bibles may, if only through the spirit of investigation, be stirred up to become better acquainted with its treasures.

L. A.

March 2nd, 1882.

## ROTHESAY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—I note your remarks upon the choice of a Rector made by the Parish of Rothestay. It should, I think, be assumed that the people of that Parish possess a fair degree of intelligence and good judgment, and that these were brought to bear upon the choice. But, even if it be conceded that a Rector of more experience were desirable, the parishioners knew of none such, unless they went into another Parish and took out from his position someone who was established in his charge, and doing good work therein. This they desired not to do.

ROTHESAY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Will you, or some of your readers supply my lack of information, and tell me what is the meaning of and difference between the terms used in the English Houses of Convocation:—

## Gravamen.

## Reformandum.

Gravamen et Reformandum and Articulus Cleri. The answer may interest more than one.

ENQUIRER.