

logical result from the Archbishop's firm belief in a most mischievous doctrine than widely held; I mean the doctrine of the divine right of kings, for, incredible as it may appear, now when it is happily exploded, that pernicious doctrine, so fraught with evil to monarch and subject alike, was then and for nearly two centuries subsequently, not only held in theory by the bishops and clergy of our Church, but was actually reduced to practice, and throughout Cranmer's whole career, a fruitful source of error was his too great subservience to the head that wore the crown. To him, probably, more than to any one else was due the reference of the divorce, to the opinions of the English and foreign Universities. He certainly accompanied the missions sent by Henry to plead his cause before the Universities, and also at Rome; but it is improbable the king intrusted to him the delicate task of bribing the learned bodies, whose favorable decision he hoped, by golden arguments, to secure. It was during one of these absences from England that Cranmer was first brought into contact with the Reforming princes and preachers of Germany, who were then giving a new and fiery impulse to religious thought. From them he imbibed, or was strengthened in, the purer ideas which gave the brightest colors to his subsequent life, while a second visit to Germany tended to enlarge and confirm the opinions previously formed.

In 1533 Cranmer was summoned home to become Archbishop of Canterbury, a dignity he was very reluctant to accept. His reluctance apparently arose from real diffidence as to his ability worthily to discharge the duties of that exalted station, and also from his objections to recognizing the papal supremacy. He was, however, too useful to the king for Henry to allow conscientious scruples to stand in the way of his elevation. Finally, yielding to the pressure brought to bear upon him, he was induced to accept the office, but, before taking the oath, gave utterance to a protest favouring more of the casuistical reasoning of those who argue that the end justifies the means, than of the higher notions of morality we look for in men professing to be guided by the principles of a Reformed Faith.

In bold relief to such pitiable subservience stands out the Primate's conduct in opposing the Statute of the Six Articles, a Statute composed or inspired by Henry himself, and in which the leading tenets of the King's belief were set forth. These were, "Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Vows of Chastity, Private Masses, Celibacy of the Clergy, and Auricular Confession," all of which were, by Act of Parliament, declared agreeable to the Word of God. The denial of Transubstantiation was to be punished as heresy, the others as felony. Now, we are continually meeting with people, members of the Church of England and of other Protestant Churches, who do not scruple to assert that the Church of England owes her doctrines to Henry VIII; and by them we are time and again taunted with the ignoble origin of our worship. To such I would recommend a careful investigation of the Six Articles and other Acts of Henry's life, and I think they will be convinced that the doctrines professed and enforced by that king are widely different from those taught by the English Church. For three days in the House of Lords, as previously in Convocation, Cranmer opposed this Bill. He even dared disobey the king's express command to absent himself that the Bill might become law, asserting it was his duty to resist it. He did remain and opposed the Act, in face of the king's command, conduct which, if we consider the nature of Henry, required courage of no mean order. Then for a short time ensued a Roman Catholic reaction; five hundred Protestants were indicted; Latimer was imprisoned and forced to resign his See; Cranmer himself was only saved by the personal favour of Henry. True, the fury of the reaction soon wore itself out, and Cromwell, with the wisdom of a Statesman and the craft of a politician, though he could not repeal the obnoxious Statute, managed indirectly to destroy its effect; and Cranmer, after bending before the first shock of the storm, resumed his place when its force was spent.

While we remember the faults and weaknesses of this man, let us not forget it is to his influence wielded in the cause of Christianity we owe so material a change in the ecclesiastical policy of Henry's reign as that which permitted the Scriptures, in the English tongue, to

be set up in the churches, and also to be publicly sold. He exercised great care and displayed no little scholarship in securing a good translation for general use. Assuredly to this, more than to aught else, the English owe their present advanced position in the van of Christian races, and it may not be too much to attribute a great part of their political and secular greatness to the same cause. It would be difficult, nay impossible, to over-estimate the importance of this measure. For centuries the process had been going gradually on of liberating the masses of the people from the state of physical serfdom under which they groaned. Little by little the rigour of feudal vassalage had been relaxed, and now came Cranmer with his open Bible to strike off the fetters in which men's intellects had so long been shackled. A new life then dawned upon England; thought was released from its trammels; fresh spirit was infused into the Commonwealth. The effect was immediate and durable; it becomes more developed as the centuries roll on; it is seen, not merely in the Church, but also in the public life and the daily pursuits of the whole English-speaking race. It showed itself in the emancipation of men's minds from the old bonds, in the impetus given to thoughtful inquiry; in the vast fields of scientific discovery; in the unrivalled literature of our mother country; in the enlightened philanthropy of her statesmen, who, free themselves, could not rest till the very slaves of less happy lands were also free. And although this freedom of thought, like a spirited steed, has sometimes hurried men to extremes, yet it has continually carried the English people on and on to the first place in the van of nations.

Nor should it be forgotten that, even in Henry's time, the Archbishop's persevering advocacy of the principles of the Reformation procured the royal consent to the change of the Mass into the Communion Service, although I am aware there are those still in communion with the Church of England, who do not regard this wise reform with feelings of unmixed satisfaction. In itself, this was not so important a matter as the translation and diffusion of the Scriptures, yet it was looked upon, and rightly, as the crowning victory of the Reformers, and although this service is not the same, we now have, yet it paved the way for the Prayer Book of the following reign.

(To be Continued.)

THE ORIGIN AND OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

By REV. F. H. POTTS, RECTOR OF GRACE CHURCH, CRESCO, IOWA, U. S.

(Continued.)

Pliny the younger, Governor of Bithynia in the year 107, in his tenth Epistle, Chap. 97, addressed to the Emperor Trajan, speaking of the Christians in his Province, says: "It is their custom to meet together on a certain day before dawn and chant hymns to Christ as unto a God, and bind themselves by an oath (or Sacrament) to refrain from all evil." We know from other sources that this Sacrament was that of the Supper of the Lord, which, as we shall hereafter prove, was celebrated every Sunday, and hence the "certain day" to which Pliny refers must have been Sunday.

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in the year 115, in his Epistle to the Magnesians, Chapter 9, enjoins upon his brethren "Not to Sabbatize with the Jews, but to lead a life agreeably to the Lord's Day."

Justin Martyr, who lived only 40 years after the death of St. John, in his second Apology to the Emperor Hadrian, speaking of the practices of the Christians, says: "We all meet together on Sunday, because on that day God, having changed darkness and matter; and on that day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead."

Tertullian, of Africa, in his Apology, "Adversus Gentes," addressed to the Roman Magistrates in 183, Chapter 16, answering the objection of the heathen, that the Christians worshipped the sun, says: They, indeed, made Sunday a day of rejoicing and worship, but for other reasons than to worship the sun, which was no part of their religion."

Sunday was observed as a solemn festival by public worship and the celebration of the Holy Communion. All secular work was strictly forbidden, except works of evident necessity and

charity. All games, shows, and secular amusements were prohibited; and all civil courts and public business also forbidden by Statute just as soon as the State became Christian.

True it is, that in the East, where the Gospel prevailed chiefly among the Jews, who retained a great reverence for the Mosaic rites, the Church thought fit to indulge the prejudices of her Jewish converts, so far as to observe Saturday as a festival day of devotion, and to meet on that day, as well as on Sunday for religious purposes. But, be it remembered, this was done not because of any command, but only out of regard for the feeling of the Jewish brethren. No one was compelled to attend worship on that day, nor was it deemed wrong to engage in secular work and business in the intervals of worship; whereas, as we have already shown, all such work was strictly forbidden on the Lord's Day.

It is because these facts have been overlooked that some Christians of the present day, who live, however, 1880 years too late in the history of the Church, to make their example binding upon us, have affected to despise Sunday, and have observed Saturday in its stead. But with the great majority of Christians, the sanction of Our Blessed Lord, the practice of the Apostles and of the Church in all ages, is deemed, as in truth it must be, sufficient authority for the observance of that day, which the Scriptures term the "first day of the week," or the Lord's Day; which day, moreover, for sixteen hundred years, has been called Sunday, though some Christians very improperly style it the Sabbath. Certainly consistency demands that all things essentially Jewish should be left with the Jews, and Christians should not be opposed to using words employed by God's people for centuries.

So much, then, for the origin of the day. The question then is, How shall it be kept? Before answering this let me remark, Sunday would be much better kept than it is, if people had not lost sight of the object for which it was appointed. On the part of very many, attendance at church is come to be regarded merely as a matter of convenience rather than of duty; and hence when it is not convenient to go to church, people will stay at home. This sad condition of things has been brought about by their failing to heed what the Bible says of the object of Church-going. There is not even a hint in the Bible that we should go to Church for the express purpose of hearing a sermon; on the contrary, in the only place where a sermon is mentioned, it is mentioned incidentally. (Acts xx. 6, 7.) We read of the people's "continuing steadfast in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers;" of their "speaking one to another, in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and chanting in their hearts to the Lord." (Acts ii. 42; 1 Cor. x. 16; Eph. v. 19.) Prayer and praise, the celebration of the Lord's Supper and preaching; all these four, and not the last only, were the objects aimed at in the attendance upon the House of God in the early days.

(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.

ST. ANDREW'S WATERSIDE MISSION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—A Well Wisher to St. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission desires me to explain the figures given in an article on the Mission in your impression of April 8th. I do so gladly, as I was somewhat surprised myself to find that by some inadvertence, the accounts of disbursements, given to the Editors some months ago, were inserted, in lieu of a failure on my part to supply him with a later return, I suppose. Since that time our disbursements have amounted to about \$50, making the total about \$135, and leaving us a balance in hand of less than \$70.

At the last meeting of the Committee of the Mission, it was determined to retain as much of the \$119 given (for the Reading Room exclusively) by our friends

of the "Bellerophon," as a fund for that branch of the work. The Committee hoped that the appeal made on St. Andrew's Day would enable them to meet the current expenses of the Reading Room as well as the ordinary expenses of the Mission; but in this they have been grievously disappointed, as the total receipts since St. Andrew's Day amounts to less than \$15, so that we have been obliged to draw on this special fund, which is, of course, becoming smaller each month to a larger extent than we expected when we retained to reserve it as a fund.

As matters now stand, we have the prospect before us of opening the new season with no money in hand for general purposes; and scarcely enough to keep the Reading Room open until the close of the season. We have very few magazines on hand for distribution after the Services; and as we can no longer expect the unwearied help of the Admiral, and the presence of his boat's crew as a choir, I cannot look forward to the opening of the new season with very bright anticipations.

The Committee desire to extend the work in every way, and the hope is that some day we may be able to provide a larger and better Reading Room, and then we shall find a fund of something like \$100 of the greatest use. But that fund is fast disappearing, and with no guarantee of money to pay our way, we must soon close the Reading Room, and simply because the chief supporters of the Mission left when the *Bellerophon* sailed, and the Church people of Halifax have not begun to realize their duty to their seafaring brethren.

I am half afraid that my explanation may not fully satisfy "A Well Wisher," but I shall be most happy to give any information to him, or to any person who feels interest enough to apply, and I trust that a few may be found who will be willing to help us by prayer, as well as by giving us means to carry on the Mission.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT WYLLIE,

Chaplain, etc.

St. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—It is a truism often repeated that "the church that gets the children at the rising generation will have the men and women of the future." Impressed with this idea I could not but be struck with the following from the Bishop of Lichfield's primary charge, delivered but a short time ago; he is speaking of the efficiency of the Sunday School:—

"The offer of help in teaching is sometimes accepted too easily, without regard to the qualification of the person from whom the offer comes, and teachers, when once admitted to their work, are too often left to themselves. If the Sunday School is to do the work which it ought to do in bringing up for our Lord children baptized in His name, preparing them to be intelligent and faithful members of His Church, it is absolutely necessary that the teachers themselves shall be taught, and it is to the clergy that they must look for instruction. One or more classes for Sunday School teachers ought to form part of the arrangements of every well-ordered parish, and the instruction given should be both definite in its character, and in full accord with the teaching of the Church in her Liturgy and her Articles.

The great subjects for the Church's children are the Church's Creeds, the Church's Catechism, and the Church's Prayer; indeed, these are the chief subjects of all our teaching, both for young and old, and it might tend to give at once more definiteness and more power even to our pulpit ministrations, if we were to set before us as our object that every one of our people should thoroughly understand the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments."

While quoting this I am reminded of the articles which recently appeared in your columns concerning Sunday School Teachers' examinations. Can you tell me whether any applications for the diploma have been made from Nova Scotia?

S. S. TRACHER.

MISSION OF GRAND FALLS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—The state of the D. C. S. of this Diocese renders it doubtful whether all the Missions of the Church can be continued. Having resigned the care of that of Grand Falls, I have personally no interest in its continuance. I would, therefore, suggest some considerations, which, I hope, may interest the

people of this parish and the Diocesan Church Society to make all possible endeavors to avert the evil of closing this Mission. The section comprehended within its limits is nearly or quite twenty miles square. This precludes union with any other mission so as to enable the incumbent to hold a service at each station every Sunday. For a year and a half an incongruous connection was made with a small Mission at Van Buren, in the Diocese of Maine, but the places were twelve miles apart, and it was a great exposure to ride that distance in inclement weather. The Mission in Maine paid less than one-third of the Missionary's stipend, yet exacted one-half of his services. To this the Churchmen here assented, because what little was received from the Van Buren people could not be made up here. With the whole of this parish paying each as God blesses him, there is ample ability to raise two hundred dollars, and it is possible, perhaps, for a clergyman without a family to subsist on that sum, increased by the same amount from the Diocesan Church Society. Within the bounds of this Mission there is full work for a zealous and hard-working clergyman. The families are scattered, and many of them unable to attend Church regularly. They require to be visited at their homes, and their children to be taught at their firesides their duties to God and their neighbors, and the love and loyalty to the Church to which their baptism pledges them. Shut the Church doors here, and sustain no Missionary, and these scattered sheep of Christ's fold will be scattered among the sects or be lost on the mountains of infidelity and vice. There is another reason for not abandoning this Mission, growing out of the fact that Grand Falls is fast becoming a summer resort for the citizens of our large towns, and those of the States. If Churchmen, it would beth wound their pride and fill them with regret, to find the fire extinguished upon the altar of the only English Church within the compass of twenty odd miles, a Church which has been so long built, and in which have ministered so many faithful Missionaries of the Church, who here endured much hardness, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. I will add but one other circumstance. At the Easter meeting on Monday, the 20th ult., they were fully organized for bringing out the working power of the parish by appointing a Vestry of seven members, and two Wardens. The Vestry consists of the following gentlemen:—Wm. Watson, Thomas Merritt, Oliver Byron, James Watson, John Taylor, F. W. Brown, F. A. Howard. Of these James Watson and F. W. Brown were chosen Wardens, Oliver Byron Clerk, and F. W. Brown Delegate to Synod. The late Missionary, Rev. Mr. Eastman, in the last two years, has baptized twenty children and presented ten persons, four of them heads of families, for confirmation.

G. C. V. EASTMAN.

Grand Falls, April 17th, 1880.

BISHOP ALFORD.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—In reply to your correspondent "Enquirer," permit me to say that Bishop Alford, who is a personal friend of the Bishop of Huron, comes to this country to assist the Bishop in his Diocesan work, and in the various educational institutions which Bishop Hellmuth has founded.

The Bishop of Huron expects to be absent from his Diocese some little time in the interests of the Western University, to which, with characteristic energy and devotion, he is giving much time and attention.

In his absence Bishop Alford will act as his commissary, and he is fortunate in securing one who can also perform Episcopal functions.

Bishop Alford's status in this country will be that of a Colonial Prelate in England. He can only perform such episcopal duties as may be assigned him by some Diocesan Bishop, and is no more entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops than a Colonial Bishop in England would be to a seat in Convocation or the House of Lords.

Bishop Alford's action in seeking to be useful to the Colonial Church, for I understand he gives his services without remuneration, could be imitated with great benefit to the Church at large by some of the returned colonists who have abandoned their sees, and now, to the scandal of the Church, are unemployed at home. Bishop Tozer's return to Missionary work in Jamaica, and the coming to Canada of Bishop Alford, are indications of a better state of things than has for some time existed; and the exodus of Bishops from England to the colonies is a much more edifying spectacle than that to which, of late years, we were too much accustomed.

Yours truly,

ALPHA.

April 18th, 1880.