

CHURCH GUARDIAN.

UPHOLDS THE DOCTRINES AND RUBRICS OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

APOSTLE. ELDER. PRESBYTER.

The following is a specimen of "logic," and the comment is from *The Churchman*. The logic is in reply to remarks made by *The Churchman* on a recent publication by a Presbyterian, in which this matter of names was not very clearly stated.

"Why, bless your heart, dear friend, that is as plain as a b c. Peter was one of the Apostles, was he not? Yes. Well, look at his first letter, first chapter, first verse, 'The elder which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder' (a 'fellow elder,' R.V.). Now, the Greek word translated 'elder' is, you know, *Presbyteros*, presbyter. Peter, then, was a presbyter, and he organized churches, and he ordained fellow-presbyters to rule in the churches. Does not that make the churches very strictly *Presbyterian*?"

We feel half sorry to disturb the unconscious ignorance or the serene joy of any one who thinks he has solved a problem, and reached the correct answer, when, in fact, his work is all wrong. He has made a prodigious mistake at the outset; and, starting in that way, he was sure to reach a false conclusion. He begins by assuming that "Apostle," and "elder," or presbyter, mean the same thing. We do not deny that St. Peter was an elder, nor could we deny that he, like the other Apostles, was a "fellow" Jew. And so every Bishop *i.e.*, Apostle, is likewise a priest. But it is contrary to the first principles of all reasoning, and to even intuitive knowledge, to say that the less must include the greater. The logic of our friend runs thus: Every Apostle was, besides being an Apostle, an elder. Therefore, every elder is nothing but an elder; but this is no logic at all.

The several governors of the different States composing this nation are likewise citizens, yet they do not rule by virtue of their citizenship. The judge presiding in court is also a lawyer, yet the sentence which he pronounces carries weight only because of his higher judicial office. The Apostles organized and ruled churches, not as elders, but as Apostles. St. Peter, in the passage referred to, was doing what any Presbyter, or Deacon, or even Layman might rightfully do—giving an exhortation. His words are, "The elders which are among you I exhort." Had his function on this occasion been that of ordaining, or ruling—that is, had it been Apostolic—he would no doubt have said, "Who am an Apostle."

THE PRAYER-BOOK.

THERE are those who are almost afraid to eulogize the Prayer-book lest they should be thought to foster formalism, or be regarded as formalists. With such I have no sympathy. Next to my Bible, I love my Prayer-book, and I hesitate not to proclaim its excellency and advocate its use. Nay, more, I will say that the more the minds of the members of our Church are fashioned by its prayers and its praises, the more they imbibe its devotional and eucharistic spirit; the more the Prayer-book lives its life, and breathes its breath into our souls, the holier shall we be, and the more glorious will our Church appear.

Yet I would not overrate the Prayer-book. It does not overrate itself; it is subordinate to the Bible, and there is its proper place. If an astronomer, after spending many days in lecturing upon the nature and influence of the sun, should devote one lecture to the moon, would it be regarded as disparaging the sun? Especially if he should show that but for the sun the moon would not shine or do her office!

Such is my position now. Every Lord's day do I preach about the sun, the glorious Sun of Righteousness, the central orb of the moral universe binding all Churches to Him—lighting all Churches with His beams—and by the sweet

attractions of His love, causing them all to roll around Him, and make music as they roll. Tonight, however, I come to speak of a distant satellite. I do not even propose to speak of our Church, which, like the earth, moves in a stately orbit around this sun, but of the Prayer-book, that moon that moves round the Church. Like the moon, the Prayer-book is only a satellite of the Church. Like the moon, it borrows all its light from the Sun of Righteousness—like the moon, it always turns its bright face to the Church—like the moon, it creates the great tidal wave of prayer and praise—like the moon, it shines in the night of the Church's earthly being, and like the moon, it follows the Church, as the Church marches through the signs of her ecclesiastical zodiac, around the central orb of life and glory, even Jesus Christ.

Such is the position of the Prayer-book, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is not the greater light to rule the day, but the lesser light to shine upon our night of ignorance and infirmity; and to guide our feet along the pathway of prayer and praise, which shineth more and more until the perfect day—the perfect day of heaven.—*Bishop Stevens.*

A DISSENTER'S VIEW OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

On the question of disestablishment of the English Church, Mr. G. Vance Smith, writing in a late number of the *Modern Review*, says: "Is it quite clear that disestablishment will lead to the religious equality for which those who are demanding it are no doubt anxious? One great sect, that of the Disestablished Church, starting from its vantage ground of long-existing endowment and privilege, will still overshadow all others, and the Nonconformists, it is much to be feared, will be as far as ever from a true equality. The very possession of ancient churches and cathedrals—into which it is scarcely possible to see how other religious bodies can be admitted—will give a great and manifest superiority to the present Church of England, even when it has undergone the process of 'disestablishment and disendowment.' It will, without doubt, be the Church of England still. It will still so call itself—not without reason—and in that character it can have no possible rival. It will remain and be recognized as the sole and legitimate owner of the numberless traditions of the glories of that ancient Church. The Nonconformists, by their own act, will have cut themselves off from these, and given them up to others. This they will have done, instead of claiming their rightful share in the common inheritance; instead of taking their place within the shelter of the common fold, and participating, as most probably they might do if they would, on equal terms in the privileges which, by national law, are the common property of Englishmen. All this of their own choice they will have abandoned, and so while 'disestablishing' others they will surely gain but little of either grace or glory for themselves."

A WRITER in the *Living Church* very amusingly puts our friends of the Reformed Episcopal Church in a quandary. He says:

"It is well known that the 'Reformed Episcopal Church' has not ventured to furnish a Catechism for its children, and that it also founded its strongest objection to the Church from which it seceded, on the ground of the very clear statement in its Catechism, as to the spiritual status of its baptized children; speaking of them, as it does, without reserve, as Members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven." It has been suggested that the "R. E. Church" stands in this attitude before the public:

The public asks: "This baptized child; is he a child of God, or a child of the devil?" And they

reasoned among themselves, saying: "If we shall say 'of God,' they will say: 'why did he leave the P. E. Church? But, if we shall say 'of the Devil'—all the parents will stone us, for they be persuaded that God loves their little ones. And they answered and said: '*We cannot tell whose child he is.*'"

News from the Home Field.

PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

SATURDAY, April 29th.

The Synod met at 10 a. m., and opened in the usual form. After some preliminary discussion on points of order, it was found to be the opinion of the House that the terms of the summons expressly excluded business of any kind which did not refer to the election of a Bishop for Algoma.

A message from the House of Bishops was then read, as follows:—

"The Metropolitan begs to inform the Prolocutor that the House of Bishops has passed the following resolution, and requests the concurrence of the Lower House.

"JOHN FREDERICTON, Metropolitan."

Resolved, That this House is prepared to give effect to the wishes of the Lower House as explained in their resolutions of yesterday, but that this House deems it expedient that this Synod should pledge itself to use every effort to induce the several dioceses of this Ecclesiastical Province to contribute such sums respectively as will afford an income of \$4000 per annum for the support of the Bishop of Algoma for a term of five years, and this House recommends the following scale: Toronto, \$1000; Huron, \$700; Niagara, \$500; Montreal, \$500; Ontario, \$400; Quebec, \$300; Fredericton, \$300; Nova Scotia, \$500; total \$4,000.

"JOHN FREDERICTON, Metropolitan."

This message was received with loud applause. After some discussion Ven. Archdeacon Jones moved, seconded by Mr. A. H. Campbell—

"That the House concur in the message of the House of Bishops."

The motion was carried on division, almost unanimously, only three members dissenting. Hon. Justice McDonald moved, seconded by Rev. Canon Carmichael—

"That a Committee be appointed to give effect to the resolution of concurrence in the message of the House of Bishops, just past, and to prepare the necessary resolutions in reference thereto, and that the special committee do report to this House as soon as possible. The committee to consist of the following: Rev. Dr. Sullivan, Rev. J. A. Kaulback, Rev. Prof. Roe, Rev. John Langtry, Rev. Canon Brigstocke, Rev. W. F. Campbell, Rev. F. W. Kirkpatrick, Messrs. A. H. Campbell, H. S. Scott, S. Bethune, Judge Kingsmill, J. A. Henderson, J. J. Mason, E. J. Hodgson and the mover and seconder."

A message was then read from the House relative to the death of the late Bishop of Algoma—

"The Metropolitan begs to send to the Prolocutor the following resolution passed by the House of Bishops, and requests the concurrence of the Lower House.

"JOHN FREDERICTON,
"Metropolitan."

"The Bishops, clergy and laity of the Church of England in Canada, in Provincial Synod assembled, desire to place on record their sense of the serious loss sustained by their missionary diocese of Algoma in the lamentable and unexpected death of its first Bishop, and the high value they entertain of his Christian character, his blameless, self-denying life, and arduous, successful labours during his brief Episcopate.

"Frederick D. Fauquier was chosen Bishop of Algoma in 1873, after discharging a pastorate of 28 years in the parish of West Zorra, in the county of Oxford, in which he proved himself an exemplary, earnest parish priest, and at the time of his election held the office of Archdeacon of Front.

"His character was conspicuous for gentleness, gentle kindness and a sensitively scrupulous conscientiousness; his life for a devout piety, a holy consistency, and a self-forgetful devotion to the calls of duty and to the demands of his Master's service.

"As Bishop he won the affection and confidence of his clergy to such a degree that they deplore his death as a bereavement of a beloved father, a trusted guide and counsellor.

"With a field of labour of vast dimensions, arduous and difficult, with inadequate support from the Church at large, often cast down with sore discouragement by this lack of friendly countenance and aid he succeeded by patient endur-