

The Church Guardian.

Upholds the Doctrines and Rubrics of the Prayer Book.

"Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."---Eph. vi., 24.
"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."---Jude: 3.

VOL. V.]
No. 32.]

HALIFAX. WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1883. WINNIPEG.

[\$1.50
PER YEAR.]

ECCLESIASTICAL NOTES.

THE Church of England Purity Society is destined to become one of the most powerful and most blessed organizations in our Church. Its aims are—first, purity among men; second, a chivalrous respect for womanhood; third, rescue work; and, fourth, a higher tone of public opinion. All of which are greatly needed in our times. The hope of the Church is the young men of her flock. By careful home training and early Confirmation and Communion the young man is often kept in the paths of righteousness. But, too often, many leave home, start in our cities, there give up what was once dear to them, and soon fall into the moral tone of their surroundings. We want a sacred bond of knighthood for these young men, something that will not only be negative but also positive, so that the great influence of their leavening power shall be exercised in the cause of honour, truth, and the Church. This is the aim of the new Society.

WITH the exception of some of the churches in large cities, there is great room for improvement in clerical finances. The many calls on the clergyman's purse soon shake the coffer and bring debt to the door. Luxuries the clergy do not look for, but they are obliged to live, bring up their families respectably, dress like gentlemen, and to do all this with very little money. Our Synods should aim at making the minimum salary of \$800 the standard for every worker in the dioceses. Debt and anxiety weaken the pastor's force and do more than anything else to make him lose all spirit in the work. One clerical correspondent writing to a contemporary says: "In making out my accounts to November I find that I shall be \$261.46 out." That is a sad state of things, and the Church ought to face it fairly. There are many struggling pastors whose hearts would be cheered if those who are blessed with much of this world's store would send to the rectory a substantial hamper and welcome purse as Christmas mementos.

PERE HYACINTHE has been preaching in one of the Episcopal Churches in the States, and gives our cousins some very good advice. At the close of his sermon he said: "The increase of riches is the great danger of the United States. You have here a paradise under your feet. Take care! If you forget sobriety and austerity, you will perish as a nation. My friends, why do I, a Catholic, stand here to preach to you in a Protestant church? It is because I believe in the infallibility of the people rather than in that of the Pope; but the day will come when the new cathedral chimes will summon Catholics and Protestants to one common worship; when the organ's peal will intone one hymn of praise to our Father in heaven."

A SUBJECT of great practical importance to the Church is that of enforced resignation. There comes a time in the man's life when his usefulness to the parish in particular, and to the Church at large, has gone. In a religious point of view parishes are allowed to go to ruin and the cause of religion is hindered because the clergyman cannot afford to resign. One of the questions which must soon agitate the Church is that of a plan of compulsory resignation with a pension list. How this can best be done is a subject for the

clergy and the leading laity to discuss and determine. We note the grievance and say that a remedy will soon be required.

On the Episcopate.

THE Rev. J. J. Lias, has the following on the subject:—

1. The question of the existence of an Episcopate from the very foundation of the Christian Church has been much complicated by the modesty of the Bishops of the first ages. Instead of calling themselves Apostles, they called themselves 'Successors of the Apostles,' fearing that by the assumption of the former name they might seem to arrogate to themselves an equality with the disciples of the Lord, and the twelve (lesser) foundations of the Church (Rev. xxi. 14.) Casting about for a name, they assumed to themselves one which accurately described their office, but which had hitherto been applied to the second order of ministers in the Church. The function of oversight was common to them and to the Presbyters, the only difference being that their duty was to oversee the whole Church; while the Presbyters duty was confined to the oversight of particular congregations. The fact that the name of Bishop and Presbyter were both applied in Scripture to the second order is clear from a comparison of Acts, xx, 17, with xx, 29; and Titus, i, 5, with i, 7, though the reference is somewhat obscured in our version by the translation 'overseers' in Acts, xx. 28. Hence has arisen all the confusion in modern, and even in ancient times. We find St. Jerome, when wishing to depreciate the Episcopal order, arguing vehemently for the original equality of Bishop and Presbyter. And the fallacy has been repeated to an indefinite extent now that non-Episcopal bodies exist, and are anxious to find a defence for their position in primitive Church history. It is untrue that the office of oversight of the whole Church was ever common to the second and third order of the Church. The office of oversight, it is true, was common to those two orders then, and is common to them now. What was never common to them was the sphere of its exercise.

2. The fact, that whatever their names may have been, the three orders existed in the Apostolic Church cannot be disputed. The existence of presbyters and deacons must be admitted. The third order consisted then of the Apostles themselves, who indisputably exercised jurisdiction over clergy as well as laity. (See Acts, xx. 17-35; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2; also Phil. i. 1; where what we should now call the Bishop addresses the Church at Philippi, under the care of its clergy.) The question is, whether this state of things existed continuously, or whether it ceased with the death of the Apostles, and was revived almost immediately afterwards. There can be no question that a very short interval elapsed between St. John's death and the institution of an Episcopate. St. John is supposed to have died in A. D. 97. Ignatius was martyred in 107 or 117, it is not quite certain which. Every recension of his letters—even that mutilated one which has recently been discovered in the Syriac, which only contains three out of the seven letters he is known to have written—testifies most clearly to the existence at the date of his martyrdom, of the three orders in the Christian Church, known by the same names as those by which they are now known. The

question is, whether ten or even twenty years would be sufficient for the development, in so definite and unmistakable a form, of the Episcopate as we find it existing at the time of the death of Ignatius. And it would have displayed little of that remarkable practical wisdom possessed in so eminent a degree by the Apostles, if they had left to chance the form that ecclesiastical institutions would take in so important a particular, and would have been inconsistent with the fact that the Apostles had received directions from Christ Himself concerning the foundation of the Church (Acts i. 3). Moreover we are not left without indications of the fact that the Apostles did institute Episcopacy. Eusebius, one of the most painstaking and accurate of historians, whose credit has been most unfairly assailed on grounds of pure theological prejudice, without the slightest support from facts, states explicitly that certain persons were appointed by the Apostles to the Episcopate in various churches; and we must remember that Eusebius had access to many sources of information now lost to us. Irenæus, who was personally acquainted with Polycarp, states that Polycarp was placed over the Church at Smyrna by the Apostles. And not only this, but we have Scriptural evidence, which, to say the least, points strongly in this direction. Some have supposed that Timothy and Titus were only temporary deputies of the Apostles. It may be so, but there is no proof that it was so. And in the face of the evidence which I have already mentioned for the Apostolic origin of the Episcopate, it is certainly remarkable that just precisely those powers of ordination and general oversight are ascribed by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus which have been exercised by the Bishops of the Christian Church from A. D. 107 (or 117) until this very day.

3. One thing may have added to the confusion. We are all of us apt to import into our views of the past the ideas of the present. Our notion of a Bishop is of an officer exercising his office over a defined portion of territory. This is no necessary part of the office of a Bishop, any more than of that of a priest. It is simply a regulation of mere convenience. It can hardly be supposed possible that the Primitive Church could have elaborated an extensive scheme of territorial jurisdiction when she had to struggle for her very existence. There can be little doubt that the government of the Church was at first Collegiate. The whole Episcopate governed the whole Church. Each particular Bishop resided in a particular city, and exercised special jurisdiction in that city. But the limits of his jurisdiction outside the bounds of that city were not clearly defined until later. This accounts for St. Clement's letter to Corinth, even before the death of St. John. This is the meaning of St. Cyprian's famous declaration (I quote from memory), '*Episcopatus unus est, Cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*' And this is the reason why, when any particular diocese has fallen into disorder, it is the prerogative of the rest of the Episcopate to step in and remedy those disorders.

Is the Christian in trouble? Christ is peace. Is he tempted? Christ is strength. Is he afflicted? Christ is comfort. Is he perplexed? Christ is wisdom. Is he beset with sin? Christ is sanctification.