

The Church Guardian

— EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: —

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

— ASSOCIATE EDITORS: —

REV. H. W. NYE, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean, Bedford, P.Q.; REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Address Correspondence and Communications to the Editor, P.O. Box 504. Exchanges to P.O. Box 1950. For Business announcements See page 14.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

* * * SUBSCRIBERS IN ARREARS are respectfully requested to remit at their earliest convenience. The very low price at which the paper is published renders necessary a rigid enforcement of the rule of payment in advance. The label gives the date of expiration.

Will Subscribers please examine Label and REMIT PROMPTLY!

CALENDAR FOR MARCH.

MARCH 7th—Quinquagesima.
 “ 10th—Ash Wednesday.
 “ 14th—1st Sunday in Lent.
 “ 17th }
 “ 19th } EMBER DAYS.
 “ 20th }
 “ 21st—2nd Sunday in Lent.
 “ 25th—Annunciation of Virgin Mary.
 “ 28th—3rd Sunday in Lent.

TO SUBSCRIBERS IN NEW BRUNSWICK, NOVA SCOTIA AND ONTARIO.

W. B. SHAW, Esq., is the only person, (Clergy excepted), at present authorized to solicit and receive payment of Subscriptions in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

MR. JOHN BURNHAM, of Cobourg, has been appointed General Travelling Agent for Ontario for the CHURCH GUARDIAN; and we bespeak for him the kindly assistance of Clergy and Laity in the several Parishes and Dioceses.

THE METHODISM OF MODERN METHODISTS COMPARED WITH THE METHODISM OF ITS FOUNDERS.

We have on several occasions printed quotations from the writings of the Rev. John Wesley, which clearly show how far those who profess to be his followers have departed from his principles. A prominent layman of the Diocese of Niagara, Mr. George Elliott, has addressed a long and able letter to the *Guelph Mercury* on the same subject, in reply to certain statements made by a Methodist minister of that city. Mr. Elliott states that he has in his possession the lives of Charles and John Wesley, printed in the year 1805, by John Whitehead, M.D. This title page is headed “The life of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., collected from his private papers and printed works, and written at the request of his executors, with the life of the Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A., collected from his private journal, and never before published.” The whole forming a history of Methodism, in which the principles and economy of the Methodists are unfolded. From this work he gives some extracts, “to show the opinions of the Wesleyan body in the days of its founders—that they

considered themselves part of the Church, from which they had no idea of separating; that they received the sacraments of the Church from the hands of Episcopally ordained Ministers, and not from Lay Preachers, and that during the lifetime of the Wesleys there was no separation of the Church.”

Page 347—He says: “I am clear that it is neither lawful nor expedient for me to separate from the Church of England. My affection is as strong as ever for the Church, and I clearly see my calling to live and die in her communion, and my brother's twelve reasons against our ever separating from the Church of England are mine also.”

On page 184—“A. M. Shaw began a disturbance in our Society, insisting that there is no Priesthood, that there is no order of men in the Christian Ministry, that he himself had as good a right to baptize and administer the sacraments as any other man. I tried to check Shaw in his talk against a Christian Priesthood; at last I told him I would oppose him to the uttermost, and either he or I must quit the Society. In expounding I warned them strongly against schism, into which Shaw's notions must lead them. I warned Messrs. Vaughan and Brookman against Shaw's pestilent errors. (The italics are ours.) I spoke strongly at the Savoy Society in behalf of the Church of England.”

On page 332 the author makes these statements: The number of lay preachers was now greatly increased, and although very few of them had enjoyed the benefits of a learned or even a good education in the common branches of knowledge, yet among them were men of strong sense and great power of mind, who soon became able preachers of the Gospel. They wished to promote a plan, which no doubt they hoped might be more useful to the people, therefore some of the preachers desired that they should have some kind of ordination, and be allowed to administer the sacraments to the people. Both Mr. John and Charles Wesley opposed this attempt, as a total dereliction of the avowed principles on which the societies were first united together. When they became itinerant preachers and began to form societies they never intended that the societies should be separate churches. The members were exhorted to attend their respective places of worship, whether the established church or a dissenting meeting; and the times of preaching on the Lord's Day were purposely fixed to give them liberty so to do. It is evident the Methodist societies were formed on these broad and disinterested principles, however narrow-minded and interested men may have may have misconstrued or endeavoured to pervert them. It was a new thing, but the two brothers were fully persuaded that this was the peculiar calling of the Methodists.

On page 342—I wrote to my brother as follows: One thing only occurs to me now, which might prevent in a great measure the mischiefs which will probably ensue after our death, and that is much greater care and deliberation in admitting preachers.

Let us pray God to show us if this has not been the principal cause why so many of our preachers have lamentably miscarried. Ought any now preacher to be received before we know that he is grounded in the doctrines we teach particularly in the communion of the Church of England, and should we not be well assured that the candidate is no enemy to the Church?

Page 345—In a letter to the Brethren at Leeds, he says: Let nothing hinder you from going to church and sacrament.

Mr. Elliott concludes his letter with a reference to the writings of “one of the most learned and pious men in the Methodist body since the days of Wesley, Dr. Adam Clarke,”

which are diametrically opposed to the pretensions of modern Methodists:—

In his learned and voluminous commentary on the Holy Scriptures, on 1st Epistle Timothy, 3rd chapter, 1st verse, he says: “*Episcopacy in the Church of God is of divine appointment, as such should be maintained and supported.* The State has its Monarch, the Church its Bishop.”

On the 2nd verse, same chapter: “In former times bishops wrote much and preached much, and their labours were greatly owned of God. No church since the Apostles' days has been more honoured in this way than the British Church. They have been an honour to their function, and that since the Reformation the bishops have in general been men of great learning and probity, and the ablest advocates of the Christian system, both as to its authenticity, and the purity and excellence of its doctrines and morality.”

On 13 verse, same chapter, he says: “But bishops, presbyters and deacons existed in the Apostolic Church, and may therefore be considered of divine origin.”

It also appears that in the Diocese of Ontario a Tract entitled “Why I am a Methodist,” has been diligently circulated. It elicited a number of letters in reply from another layman in that Diocese, which letters appeared in the *Pembroke Standard*, but have now been printed in pamphlet form. They are written in a charitable and moderate though firm tone, and ably meet and expose the fallacies of the arguments and reasons given for leaving the Church, and that too for the most part by quotations from Wesley himself. This work is one which ought to have a very large circulation, and which will be found most useful in parochial use. Would that these Christian brethren might return to the fold whence they went out, and that, not for any advantage to it as a National Church, but that the Unity of the Body might be to this extent restored, and the prayer of the Saviour to this extent realized.

THE PRINCIPLE OF FASTING.

Canon Luckock, in his very attractive and instructive addresses, now published under the title of “The Footprints of the Son of Man as traced by St. Mark,” (T. Whittaker, New York), in commenting on the second chapter of St. Mark, vs. 18-22, says:—

“We must not conclude from this that Christ forbade or even discouraged the principle of fasting. It was the Jewish surroundings which He condemned. Rabbinic Pharisaism had wholly misconceived its true object; it had taught men to believe that such mortification was a means of averting God's anger, and of atoning for sins. To the Pharisees it was no instrument for the subjection of the lower to the higher nature, no ingredient in the cup of penitence, no sign of deep humiliation for offence against God, but a meritorious act, entitling him who practised it to Divine acceptance. As such it gained no encouragement, no recognition, in the teaching of our Blessed Lord.

“Neither did He approve of their mode of fasting. The Spirit of the Gospel is not the Spirit of the Law. The one is love, the other is fear. The Jew sat in sackcloth and ashes; the Christian anoints his head and washes his face.

“We have only to turn to the Sermon on the