

The Church Guardian,

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Published in the interests of the Church of England.

NON-PARTIZAN!

INDEPENDENT!

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR: REV. JOHN D. H. BROWNE, Lock Drawer 29, HALIFAX, N. S.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: REV. EDWYN S. W. PENTREATH, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

A staff of correspondents in every Diocese in the Dominion. Price, ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF a year in advance.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America, Circulation double that of any other Church paper in the Dominion.

Address: THE CHURCH GUARDIAN, Lock Drawer 29, HALIFAX, N. S.

The Editor may be found between the hours of 9 a. m. and 1 p. m., and 2 and 4 p. m., at his office, No. 51 Granville Street, (up-stairs), directly over the Church of England Institute.

The Associate Editor can be found daily between 9 a. m., and 12 at the Branch Office, 515½ Main Street, Winnipeg, opposite City Hall.

THE THREEFOLD MINISTRY.

THE *Guardian*, of New York, and the *Southern Churchman*, of Richmond, Va., are two of the most ably conducted Church papers on this Continent, and both represent what is called the "Evangelical" party in the Church. Recently, the former has been handling rather severely our Toronto contemporary, the *Evangelical Churchman*, for some articles in which it took the Presbyterian view of Church government. Returning to the attack in its issue of last week, the *Guardian* says:—

"In the *Guardian* of June 30th we quoted from the *Evangelical Churchman*, of Toronto, its statement that the doctrine of a Divine Institution of the Threefold Ministry, was first openly proclaimed in the Church of England by Bancroft and Laud, and revived in the present century by the Tractarians.

"We also said, that such an assertion would not bear a reference to authentic testimony. This position we proceed to justify.

"I. Our appeal is to the Ordinal itself, first published in 1550. In the Preface to that Formulary, it is distinctly stated, "that from the Apostles' times there hath been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Thus the fact of the existence of a Threefold Ministry in the Church from the Apostles' days is set forth.

"II. The Preface does not state how these Orders came to be in the Church; whether by Divine appointment, or human arrangement. But if we turn to the Ordinal itself we find these words following:

"(1.) In the Ordinal for Deacons; "Almighty God who by Thy divine Providence hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in Thy Church."

"(2.) In the Ordinal for Priests; "Almighty God, giver of all good things, Who by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in Thy Church."

"(3.) In the Ordinal for Bishops, the same words are used as in that for Priests.

"In these words, is set forth, in the most solemn way possible, i. e., in prayer to God, the origin of the "divers Orders of Ministers" in the Church. They are these, by the ordering of "Divine Providence," by the action of "the Holy Ghost," that is to say, they are a "Divine Institution."

"III. When we ask, what these "divers Orders" were held to be, there is, surely, only one answer to be made; They are, and they must be, the "Bishops, Priests and Deacons" of the Preface. So in 1549, the Ordinal asserted the Divine Institution of the Threefold Ministry.

"IV. Whatever other changes may have been made in the Ordinal, none have been made in the statements above cited. They stand now, and have stood always, just as they were made in 1550; and they form the Synodical Declaration of the Church of England touching the Threefold Ministry; asserting, in the most distinct manner, its Divine Institution.

"To say, therefore, that Bancroft, or Laud, or any individual divine, was the first to assert it, is to take issue with historic facts.

And the *Southern Churchman* has this to say upon the same subject in response to some remarks of the *Central Presbyterian*:—"He (the editor of the *C. P.*) is aware that at his *Union Theological Seminary* the students are taught the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism is what it is *jure divino*. And this has puzzled us; for Rome is what it is, *jure divino*; Orthodox Eastern *jure divino*; Coptic Christianity *jure divino*; Congregationalism *jure divino*; Baptists *jure divino*; and by the same divine ordering, Presbyterianism is what it is. Now all cannot be ordered by this divine law, for they differ. *Jus divinum* says have pope; *jus divinum* says have no pope; *jus divinum* says have parity; *jus divinum* says have imparity; *jus divinum* says be immersed or no baptism; *jus divinum* says be poured upon and that is baptism. What strange play we make with divine ordering. One makes it for this and another for that; but it cannot be. If there be a *jus divinum* of ecclesiastical polity, it cannot be all these, and it may be none of them. But this claiming divine authority by all these various and contradictory politics is a contradiction and a sham.

"But as our neighbor, through his ecclesiastical Seminary, claims *jus divinum* for Presbyterianism, we want to show it has not; cannot have it by any argument that is worth the paper it prints its claim upon. We have shown again and again in these columns, according to the testimony of secular and Church history, that after the first century diocesan episcopacy was everywhere. In Britain, or Gaul, or Italy, or Africa, or Asia, no matter where, the Church is ordered by diocesan bishops. And our argument is plain; that from the death of most of the Apostles, A. D. 65, to the end of the century there was no time in which this prodigious change could have taken place, on the supposition that the Apostles left the church presbyterian. This would seem as plain a matter as anything in the world. But our neighbor points us to some very rapid changes in the history of the world; the fall of man in Eden, and the defection of some of the seven churches in Asia. We grant the rapidity; but then these were noted, were plain, the time in which they took place put down, so that everybody can see the prodigious and rapid change. Now if in forty or fifty years this *universal* change of the entire Church from presbyterian government to episcopal had taken place we should have had some notice made of it. But it is not noticed; neither profane nor ecclesiastical history gives so much as a hint of it; hence we infer it never took place, and that when we see

the Church after the first century universally episcopal, the only reason for it is, the Apostles left it so. Hence it is demonstrated that the Apostles did not leave the Church presbyterian, but episcopal; and therefore Presbyterianism cannot claim the *jus divinum*.

"We asked, where in the family or in the State, in heaven or on earth, is there such a thing as parity? Our neighbor replies, but so as to give it up. He says there was parity among the Apostles; parity among the Episcopal bishops of the United States, parity among the one thousand bishops of Africa and so parity among the two hundred Presbyterian bishops in Virginia. But the point we made was, not whether there was parity among the children of a family, but parity in the family; not whether there was parity among the citizens, but in the State. The bishops are on equality, and presbyters are on equality; but there is no parity in the Church, some officers being higher than others. And this is true in heaven, where there be thrones and dominions and powers; it is true on earth and in families, there be governors and governed; it is true in the State, in the army, in the navy; no matter where we turn we find no parity, but imparity everywhere. Now does any one suppose that the only place where this *universal* law is not applicable is the Presbyterian church?

No, neighbor, we agree with you in much, but your Presbyterian parity is a fault; it is not in accord with Scripture. The *jus divinum* of ecclesiastical polity is having diocesan bishops, who are superior to presbyters and deacons. This is the law which the apostles of Christ left for us to follow.

AN INTERESTING 'VERT.

UNDER the above caption the *Presbyterian Witness* says:—

We have received the *Demerara Chronicle* of 12th of June containing an account of the ordination of Mr. John Greathead, who had been for many years General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Mission in Demerara and who had seen the error of his way and sought admission into the ministry of the Church of England; but of this we have no particulars. At his ordination a local Canon Farrar preached a sermon in which he at once claimed the divine authority for the "Three Orders." He tells that Mr. Greathead was a faithful preacher in the "Wesleyan Body" for over thirty years. John Wesley is eulogized as a "saint of no mean rank and degree." He wants to sit at his feet and learn of him, and he wants all Wesleyans to do likewise. Wesley's feet are metaphorically the "Large Minutes of Conference," where one finds this declaration signed by all genuine Wesleyans: "We engage to follow strictly the plan which Mr. Wesley left us at his death." The "Large Minutes" are delightful to Mr. Farrar's soul, and no wonder; he finds in them such gems as follows:

"An Assistant" (or as he is now called "a Superintendent") "is called for his charge by loving the Church, and resolving not to separate from it. Let this be well observed. I fear when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them. ("Large Minutes," 319.)

The wonder is that Mr. Greathead remained in the Methodist "body" so long with these "Large Minutes" presumably in his carpet bag. Mr. Farrar makes the following quotation from Wesley