

# The Church Guardian

— EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: —

L. H. DAVIDSON, D.C.L., MONTREAL.

— ASSOCIATE EDITOR: —

REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, Winnipeg, Man.

Address Correspondence and Communications to  
the Editor, P.O. Box 504. Exchanges to P.O.  
Box 1068. For Business announcements  
See page 14.

## Special Notice.

**SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS** are respectfully  
requested to remit at their earliest conven-  
ience. The LABEL gives the date of ex-  
piration.

### CALENDAR FOR MAY.

- MAY 1st—3rd Sunday after Easter.  
St. Philip and St. James, A. & M.  
" 8th—4th Sunday after Easter.  
" 15th—5th Sunday after Easter.—(Notice of  
Rogation Days and Ascension  
Day).  
" 16th }  
" 17th } ROGATION DAYS.  
" 18th }  
" 19th—ASCENSION.  
" 22nd—Sunday after Ascension.  
" 29th—Whitsun-Day.  
" 30th—Monday in Whitsun-Week.  
" 31st—Tuesday in Whitsun-Week.

### CHURCH UNITY IN RELATION TO THE HISTORIC MINISTRY.

Under this title, the Rev. Dr. Wilson  
(author of the Church Identified), contributes  
a valuable paper to the May number of *The  
Church Eclectic*, from which we take the fol-  
lowing extract dealing with one of the current  
but thoughtless, objections of opponents:—

Dr. Wilson says: The question of the origin  
and authority of the Ministry, as well as that  
of its organization, has been conducted chiefly  
with reference to the Holy Scriptures, as if  
they were given for our instruction and guide  
in this matter in such a way, that each and  
every man, taking them for his guide, might,  
by a study of them, form his opinions on all  
subjects of Church organization, as well as on  
those of doctrine and duty, and join that  
"Church," which, on the whole, he likes best;  
or in case he finds no one that suits him nearly  
enough for his purposes, he may form a new  
one. On this principle, as a starting point, we  
have had many discussions of the constitution  
of the Church, its orders in its Ministry, and  
the nature and necessity of communion and  
fellowship within its visible unity.

But we must remember that the Gospel was  
preached many years, not less than fifteen or  
twenty, before a word of the New Testament  
Scriptures was written. And Churches were  
founded in countries and cities, far and wide,  
probably not less far West than Rome and  
Spain, or in the East as far as Edessa and Baby-  
lon, in Egypt and Africa, in Greece and Illy-  
ricum, as well as in Palestine and Asia Minor,  
before any considerable portion of the books  
which now make up its canon were written,  
and long before any complete collection of  
them had been made anywhere. These  
churches, as those at Jerusalem at Alexan-  
dria, at Ephesus and Corinth, as well as those

of Antioch and Galatia, and the Island of  
Crete, were totally independent of each other.  
They were in a most important sense national  
Churches; because in all cases the limits and  
extent of their jurisdiction was bounded and de-  
termined by geographical limits and the  
political subdivisions of the people of the world.  
The Church of Jerusalem may have been re-  
garded, as in a sense it was regarded, as the  
Mother Church of them all. Antioch may  
have been the place where Christians first took  
their appropriate name. Rome may have been  
the metropolis and mother city of the world.  
But while we do find the authority and control  
of the Apostle over all these Churches, and  
even as at Ephesus and in Crete, we find men  
who were not originally apostles, as Timothy  
and Titus exercising oversight and jurisdiction  
like that of a modern bishop, we find no hint  
of any one Church or its bishop having au-  
thority over another Church or bishop, simply  
as a bishop, or in consequence of the authority  
which belonged to him as the occupant of that  
see, or as in any way attached to the see.

So much at least will be conceded by all Pro-  
testants. But it is claimed that we find no  
clear statement of the form of the organization  
of those Churches, nor of the constitution of  
the Ministry. And even Episcopalians are  
found who make a concession of this point  
and admit, that if we look to the Bible alone,  
the most that we can claim is a fair probability  
or presumption at least, in favor of a ministry  
in the three orders—Bishops, Priests, and  
Deacons.

Now, suppose we concede this point, we  
have still the important facts:—

1. That the Church in its distributive form,  
and some of the national Churches, had been or-  
ganized before the New Testament Scriptures  
were written, and the form of its organization  
was therefore well known to those to whom  
and for whom the Scriptures were written.  
Hence, for this reason, there was no need of  
description or of instruction on this point.

2. In the second place, there was no need of  
instruction on this point, since the members of  
the Church, for whom the Scriptures were  
written, are not regarded or treated as having  
anything to do with the organizing of Churches.  
The Church itself—the Apostles and the  
Ministry appointed by them—were charged  
with this work. The Bible—the New Testa-  
ment—was written to give us information in  
regard to our Lord Jesus Christ, His words and  
acts, what as Christians we ought to believe  
for our soul's health, what we ought to do as  
duty in regard to our fellow-men, and what,  
as Christians, we ought to do in relation to the  
Church and its ministers.

But Christ Himself is represented as institu-  
ting and sending the Ministry. St. Paul says,  
that "He gave some apostles, some prophets,  
some evangelists, and some pastors and teach-  
ers." (Eph. iv. 11.) And we find St. Paul  
sending others, as Timothy to Ephesus, and  
Titus to Crete, to "set in order the things  
that were wanting," and to "ordain" for the  
people their "elders in every church," and  
deacons as they might be wanted. In Acts vi.  
1-7, we find that although the Apostles—the  
whole Twelve were present—asked the multi-  
tude to look out and select seven men for the  
diaconate: yet they themselves appointed and  
ordained them to this office.

The people then, it would appear, had some-  
thing to do with selecting the men and bearing  
testimony to their fitness for the office; but the  
appointing power came from Christ Himself the  
Head of the Church, and, through those to whom  
He hath said "Lo, I am with you alway, even  
unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20).

It cannot therefore, be regarded as at all  
surprising if the New Testament does not  
contain any full and systematic account and  
directions as to the organization of the Church  
and the orders and ordination of its ministry.  
But there is another view of the matter;

and it is chiefly for the presentation of this  
view that I have undertaken to write this  
article.

The Church is declared to be "the Pillar  
and Ground of the Truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15).  
And our Lord Himself has indicated its power  
and authority in Matt. xviii. 15 and following,  
when He directs us to regard one who will not  
"hear the Church" and submit to her decisions  
and authority "as a heathen man and a publi-  
can," that is, as one who is no longer to be re-  
garded as a Christian.

Now suppose there is no clear, full, and pre-  
cise account of the organization of the Church  
and its ministry in the New Testament, so that  
we cannot prove either the fact or the necessity  
for the order of bishops from the New Testa-  
ment; we have, beyond all question, the fact  
that we cannot prove any other form or consti-  
tution of the Church and its ministry, or of  
any one of the particular bodies or groups of  
Christians that are called churches at all.  
Doubtless there are many such instances in  
which there is no account of the organization  
at all, many in which something is said of it,  
which is but an incomplete account, and some  
cases where there were believers with no or-  
ganization and no ministry resident among  
them.

But if we pass down the current of time and  
of Church history, only a few decades from the  
time of the Apostles, we find the Episcopal  
organization in universal existence and recog-  
nition.

It has been argued from this fact, and, as I  
think, conclusively and beyond the possibility  
of refutation, that that form of organization,  
both of the Church and of the ministry must have  
originated with the Apostles.

### PROVINCIAL SYNOD AND DIVINITY DEGREES.

The Dean of Montreal has addressed a letter  
to our contemporary the *Dominion Churchmen*  
on this subject which calls for notice, simply  
lest any misapprehension should arise as to the  
position and action of the Provincial Synod in  
reference to Divinity Degrees. We agree with  
the Dean that the question of the jurisdiction  
of the Provincial Synod and of its powers in  
reference to Divinity Degrees and Diocesan  
or other Theological Colleges, are just where  
they were before the appointment of the com-  
mittee to report to the next Provincial Synod.

Neither the Bishop of Montreal, nor the  
Dean, nor the Montreal Diocesan Theological  
College are in the slightest degree pledged to  
any particular view in reference to these ques-  
tions. The simple fact is that the immense  
majority of the Provincial Synod had full confi-  
dence in its jurisdiction and competency to  
decide this matter on behalf of the Church of  
England, whilst a minority demurred to this  
view. Had no understanding been arrived at,  
this question of the jurisdiction of the Pro-  
vincial Synod would ever this have been prac-  
tically tested by the assertion of the right on  
the part of the Provincial Synod though the  
enactment of the Canon proposed by the Bishop  
of Quebec.

It is also certain that the resolutions of both  
Houses postponing the matter through the  
appointment of a committee followed upon the  
pledge given by the Bishop of Montreal; which  
pledge alone led to the deferring of immediate  
action by the Provincial Synod, and in reliance  
upon which the matter was left over in the  
hope of an amicable settlement till the next  
Provincial Synod. Until this the Bishop of  
Montreal has bound himself in express terms  
not to consent to the taking of any steps to-  
wards obtaining for the Montreal Diocesan  
College, the power to confer such Degrees, and  
this certainly binds the Bishop's action as  
President of the Montreal Diocesan Synod and