

Eusebius tells us that in his time if there was any doubt as to any man's being a Christian the question was decided by simply asking, "Do you observe Sunday?" and that determined the matter for the reply was, "How can I do otherwise? for I am a Christian?"

Apply this test now, and how very few Christians would we find in our midst. On every street corner on the Lord's day, we meet with multitudes of men and boys, to whom that day is a day of idleness and often times of sinful pleasure; and worse than that, the manner in which this holy day is desecrated by men who stand high in each community, shows very clearly how far the people of the present day have degenerated from the precepts and examples of the ages past.

We maintain then that no one is worthy of the name of Christian who does not observe Sunday. If the bible is to be our guide, how can we act otherwise? for are we not told therein, "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together?" Mark you, there is nothing said about attending church if one feels so disposed. It is our duty to feel disposed, and if we go to church with the proper spirit, it will be our highest pleasure to be there. And very properly too, for has the soul no needs as well as the body? must our thoughts be wholly given to supplying the wants of our poor, perishing bodies? Shall the more important, because immortal part of our being be wholly neglected? why should not men be dwarfed mentally, socially and spiritually, when they will not bestow any time or attention upon the development of their higher nature? Did men take no more care to sustain their physical life than they do their spiritual, they had been dead long ago. And after all, what are they but dead as to all that can make their life truly desirable? The dumb beasts of the earth fulfill their mission when they eat and drink and sleep, and in process of time, lie down and die, but is that the proper end of man? Multitudes live on as though it were; they will not acknowledge that God has any claim upon their time; it is wholly spent in satisfying the needs of their lower nature; and when at last they are worn out with the cares and pleasure and follies of life, they too lie down and die, and all is ended. This idea is entertained by very many, and they too will realize it, or rather an end which is far worse than that of the beast. Those who despise God's commands can look for nothing but the wrath of God in this world as well as in the next.

There is a strong tendency on the part of some to make Sunday a holiday rather than a holy day; a day to be spent in idleness and pleasure-seeking. Be very sure if this tendency is yielded to, the consequences will be most disastrous. God's day is now as of old, a sign; a sign either that His people remember him, or have forgotten him. If the former, He will not fail to reward and bless those who love and serve Him; if the latter, He will just as surely punish those who forget and despise Him. It was for their sins, especially that of Sabbath-breaking, that the Jews were punished by famine, and pestilence, and captivity; and no doubt it is for our sins, especially the desecration of the Lord's Day, that the people of many lands have, during the ten or more years past, been afflicted with storms, pestilence and destructive insects. Read Lev. xxvi. 1, 35; Joel ii. 21, 28.

The Prophet Malachi tells his countrymen that the failure of the harvest was caused by their neglect to provide for the services of the Temple. The Lord says: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Mal. iii. 10.

"Hard times," yes the times are hard, and what is the cure for them? Let men make the Kingdom of Heaven the first object of their life, and the service of God's house of, at least, as much importance as the needs of their own house, then, and not until then, can we, or ought we, to look for fruitful fields and general prosperity. Hard times will cease when men cease to despise God's law, and no sooner.

How sweet and tender are the many associations which cluster around the House of God! Who would not love that place where God condescends to meet us, as it were, face to face! Who that has any regard for himself, his family, or his fellows will let anything but the most urgent necessity keep him from the House of Prayer.

No one who seriously considers what evils may result to himself, his neighbors, and his country, through a neglect to observe the Lord's Day, can be indifferent to the claims of that day upon the hearts and lives of his countrymen.

Men of influence too often forget this, and it is a very sad evidence of a nation's degeneracy when so many of our public men are utterly regardless of the "day of days." But to their credit be it said that some few do realize their accountability to Almighty God, and try to serve Him as He requires. In 1859 when Gen. Scott made a visit to Puget Sound, it happened that the day of his arrival was Sunday. As soon as his presence was known, a committee waited upon him, with a band of music, requesting him to join in the procession which had gathered to honour him, and spend the day in speech-making and enjoyment. The general replied, thanking them for their intended kindness, but assuring them he could not go with them; "for said he, 'for forty years I have been a church-going man, and I consider it my duty to day to go to church, I have always tried to honor the Sabbath. If you postpone this demonstration until to-morrow, I shall be happy to be with you, but to-day God claims my time and thoughts.' I need scarcely add that he was a churchman."

As patriots and Christians we ought all of us to do what lies in our power to bring about a better observance of Sunday. Ever bear in mind the three purposes for which it was instituted; the rest of the body, the nurture of the soul, and especially the worship of God.

Remember that God will not fail to reward for time and eternity, all who honor Him and His word, by attending upon his holy temple, remember the Lord's day is still a sign either of your love of God or want of it, and Sunday spent aright, shall be to you, a foretaste of the Sabbath rest in Heaven.

CRANMER.

Paper read before the St. Paul's Church Association of Charlottetown, P. E. Island, by A. B. Warburton, B. C. L., Barrister-at-Law.

(Concluded.)

There had long been a party in the Roman Catholic Church known as the men of the "new learning," of whom Fisher was one of the best, which advocated reforms within its pale. Opposed to these men, were those who held by the old Church as it was, or the men of the "old learning." By the former it had been thought reforms could be effected without destroying the unity of the Church, but the Council of Trent, to which the friends of a reformed Roman Catholicism looked to unite Christians once more by reforming the abuses of the Church, confirmed those abuses. The Emperor established the Inquisition in Flanders, and then in England all hope of reconciliation passed away. The friends of the old worship insensibly drifted back, the advocates of Reform became more and more Protestant till the beginning of Edward VIth reign, Cranmer and others, becoming purely Protestant, broke with the older system.

There are several acts in which Cranmer took a prominent part, for which, from a 19th century stand-point, no justification or excuse can be offered. Of these were the execution of Lord Seymour and the martyrdom, for it was nothing less, of Joan Boucher. We had seen the Primate of the English Church take an honourable stand on behalf of his friend Cromwell; he strove hard to save More and Fisher, two of the best Englishmen of their time; it is stated that Mary herself owed her life to his intercession; he had suffered himself; he had not feared to withstand Henry VIII. in matters upon which that monarch had determined, and we had a right to expect better things from him than that he would become a persecutor. Yet so it was, and the burning of Joan Boucher in 1550, left a blot on the fame of Cranmer that nothing but the fires of Oxford could have taken away. Yet, while no excuse can be offered for this atrocious deed, if we regard it from our more enlightened age, it is not just to judge of it from the tolerant stand-point of to-day. In the 16th century, Reformer and Roman Catholic alike deemed persecution right and necessary. Tolerance in religion was looked upon as quite out of the question. The very body of canons drawn up by the Commission presided over by Cranmer, and of which other divines, eminent for

piety, were members, declared the righteousness of persecuting heretics, and evidently, if universal practice affords an idea, such was the generally received opinion of the time. No other excuse can be offered for him, and it is not less cogent when made by the apologists of Mary. Unlike the latter, he rarely practised what he taught and believed in this respect. Naturally a mild and humane man, even the Canons are not sufficient, in face of his ordinary conduct, to justify the charge against him of being generally a persecutor. When Dr. Lingard asserts that "Cranmer and his associates perished in the flames, they had prepared to kindle for the destruction of their opponents," he makes a statement which, in view of the history of the two preceding centuries, he is unable to substantiate and which is not borne out by facts. Personally he was a tolerant man, and although on more than one deplorable occasion he allowed the sectarian spirit and teaching of the age to overcome his native humanity, still these were the exception, not the rule. Moreover, though more than once plotted against, he never sought to punish those whose offences were merely personal. In fact, the general moderation of the English Reformers stands out clearly, and to it we owe our middle position between the Roman worship and that of most Protestant denominations. To Cranmer, more probably than to his fellow-workers, is this moderate position due.

Time prevents my dwelling on the events of Edward VI's reign, though certainly the best and most important period of the Primate's career. It is also the best known. It is not, however, the period best calculated to give us a clear insight into his character. For that we must look to the subsequent reign of Mary, during which he exhibited more strongly even than at any previous time the extraordinary combination of firmness and irresolution in him so strangely blended. Mary's learnings and disposition were well known. Her former history, her narrow-minded bigotry, inflamed by the cruel wrongs she had endured, left no room for doubt but that she would shrink at nothing to effect the restoration of the papal supremacy. Her Tudor blood was ample guarantee of the course she would pursue towards the leading Reformers. To none was the fanatical disposition better known than to the Primate. His timid nature was just the one fully to realize the desperate peril of his position. Yet, shortly after Mary's accession, with admirable courage, he drew up a declaration of his steadfastness in the Reformed Faith, and in consequence was sent to the Tower. After more than a year's imprisonment he, with Ridley and Latimer, maintained their views with great courage and skill at a disputation on the subject of the mass, held by the Queen's command at Oxford. They were borne down, not by weight of argument, but by the clamour of their hearers, and refusing to conform, were pronounced "obstinate heretics." When again, with dignified firmness, Cranmer protested against this judgment.

Remanded to prison his friends Latimer and Ridley precede him to the stake, and Cranmer is left alone to face his enemies. Then it was, after more than two years' imprisonment, worn out by anxiety, his mind probably weakened by the protracted strain upon its powers, that yielding to the solicitations of seeming friends, of men really sent to tamper with him in prison, he made the recantation of his faith, and on several occasions repeated it. That was the great error of his life, that is what deprives him of the high and holy place among the heroes and martyrs of the Reformation assigned to Latimer and Ridley. Yet we ought not to visit too heavily his backsliding. To do otherwise required no common fortitude, and Cranmer's courage was not naturally high. The test to which he was subjected was a terrible one; the bravest and best of mankind have their moments of weakness, all are not made of adamant; the most admirable characters in history have at times yielded to temptation. We can pity and forgive their infirmities, why not deal with Cranmer in the same indulgent spirit? Moreover, at the end the true spirit of a Christian prelate returned to him, and when brought forth publicly to repeat his recantation, instead of doing so he declared his bitter regret for what he had done, asserted his belief in no ambiguous terms, and being led to the stake, by a death of noble fortitude, amply compensated for the errors and infirmities of a not inglorious life.

There are, I am aware, many even in

the Church of England, who express their scorn for Cranmer because of his recantations; yet by a strange perversity in human nature they are most frequently found in the ranks of those who are ever drawing nearer and nearer to a Church, claiming to have been founded by Peter. They resent, and rightly resent, any imputation against that disciple, but forget that a sneer at Cranmer is a scoff at Peter. For whatever differences there may be between them in the former portions of their lives, there is certainly a marvellous similarity between Cranmer's recantations and subsequent repentance, and Peter's denials of our Lord and his after bitter humiliation.

CLERGYMEN'S WIVES.

BY A CLERICAL BACHELOR.

Much has been written and said on this subject, and from many points of view; but if I am not mistaken, very little has been said from a point of view which has always seemed the most noticeable to one who prefers to look below the surface for motives, rather than to take things for what they seem to be. We hear people on the one hand railing against the marriage of the clergy, forgetful of the fact that they have been allowed to do as other men in all ages of God's Church; and that a married clergy is conspicuous in every age for a high moral tone.

There are others who say and write many foolish things in favour of Clerical marriage, who close their eyes to the sillinesses, and vanities of some of their own, and their brethren's wives.

A clergyman's wife may be the making or the marring of his whole ministerial career. Who has not seen specimens of the noble self-donating woman, possessed of infinite tact, who keeps her husband up to all his duties, and relieves him of all petty domestic cares, so that he is as free for the duties of his office, as it is possible for any man to be? And who has not seen on the other hand an almost infinite variety of wives, who in one way or another are always preventing their husbands from doing any more than the most urgent routine duties? We could easily give a few dozen examples drawn from the life, but our aim is not to draw ridicule, but to enlist sympathy for a much neglected and deeply suffering class.

Miss Muloch, in "A Bravo Lady," has a pertinent remark that will give a clue to much of what I would fain say, but hesitate to, lest I be thought personal. Speaking of Mr. Scanlan and his popularity in the parish, arising from his unctuous manner with the old ladies, she tells us that he always hung his fiddle outside his own door. But better and greater men than Mr. Scanlan may, and do often, exactly what he did, and not infrequently are quite unaware of the lack of violin music within the Rectory.

There are many reasons for this. All honest men are not satisfied with their own spiritual condition, and knowing that in some measure this must be quite apparent to their wives, they hesitate to give private spiritual counsel, even when they think such counsel desirable. With regard to his public ministrations, it is doubtful if there is one clergyman's wife in an hundred who is spiritually edified by her husband's sermons. For a while after their marriage she may be conscious of some spiritual enlightenment, and for a longer time may be intellectually pleased with his language or thoughts; and then having taken his measure, she settles down to the dull tedium of listening to his discourses, in much the same way that he may preach, *i. e.*, as performing a more or less irksome duty. What wonder then if with the best intentions and aspirations they grow less and less careful about their spiritual tone, and gradually draw away their husband's also by such imperceptible degrees that neither is aware of their spiritual decadence, and in extreme cases, such as have come to the writer's own knowledge, lose all faith in God; and His mercy and love.

It is far easier to point out defects than to propose remedies; but as our remarks must be brief, we simply add a few hints that may be productive of thoughts, that may result in good. And first as to the wives themselves. Let them frankly speak to their husbands about their spiritual difficulties if there is the slightest hope of obtaining any help from them. They ought to make use of a few good books of devotion, and devotional reading, and endeavor to make the most of the Services of the Church, and not give away to discouragement

if their husbands do not prove the spiritual guides they ought to be. And lastly they ought not to forget that they are more responsible for their own souls than any other person can be, no matter what relation they may bear.

As to the clergy, if they will spend a little time at regular periods in consulting the spiritual welfare of those who are above all others committed to their charge, they would find some way of doing what now they are only half doing or neglecting entirely.

And as to the people, if they will be as forbearing as possible, and not find as much fault as possible, they may be aiding to build up their own spiritual temple, as well as that of the whole parish, assured that a good wife is of more importance to their Pastor than any other earthly circumstance, and that what she is he will be in some degree, that affects the welfare of everyone with whom he comes in contact.

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 CHURCH IN P. E. I. AND ITS BISHOP.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—There has been no small amount of power and printer's ink expended on the question of putting the Church on the Island in good order. The great cry and burden of the song was "We want a Bishop." But strange to say we have a Bishop (and one of the very best ones too), and, in the present state of affairs, a very few of the real Churchmen desire any one else.

The whole case can be put into a nutshell; let the agitators first set to work to raise a fund for the support of a Bishop; let them pay adequately for the supervision they now get, and then they may truly say, "We not only want a live man," but "we also have enough to board him out." The Islander's pocket must be the first place of attack; and to any would-be reformer or tyro-enthusiast, I promise enough work on this point of "finance" for at least 10 years.

We have parishes now paying their clergy but miserable stipends; others, closed for the lack of realising that the laborer is worthy of his hire; then what chance (at present) would a Bishop have among us. The very idea is cruel; perhaps he would have to close up in a year or two, for lack of the board. Brothers if you want a Bishop, dig deeply into the pocket, get down to the gold and give freely; then talk and write freely on the subject. Otherwise, I fear, that nothing will remain, but vain aspirations and unproductive work.

P. E. I.

BISHOP ALFORD.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—You say, "We presume, however, as a matter of courtesy, he will be invited to a seat in the Upper House and accorded the privilege of speaking, but he will have no right to vote." I trust you presume too much. I was not aware that Retired Bishops in England had such privileges; and, if that sort of thing be tried here, for a man of whom your London correspondent says, "as to his views, they are in supposition," for he barely passes for a Churchman." I think,

There are twice ten thousand Good Churchmen will know
THE REASON WHY!

SACKVILLE, N. B., April 30, 1880.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I observed a paragraph in this week's issue of your paper, to the effect that this Parish had been offered to Rev. O. J. Booth, of St. John's, Quebec, and declined by him. This is not the case, and how such an erroneous statement has become public, I am at a loss to know. No election has yet been held to fill the vacancy in this Parish, but it is expected to take place on the 10th of May, when it is hoped the vacancy will be filled. The names of several clergymen are before the parishioners; but the name of Rev. O. J. Booth is not among them. I remain, yours, &c.

J. F. ALLMON.