

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 1965. 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 }

" 22nd—Sunday after Ascension.

" 29th—Whitsun-Day.

" 30th—Monday in Whitsun-Week.

" 31st—Tuesday in Whitsun-Week.

CENTENARY OF THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOP WHITE.

A notable discourse indeed, was that preached by the Bishop of Iowa (Dr. W. Stevens Perry), in the Cathedral of St. Peter's and St. Paul's, Chicago, Illinois, on the occasion of the celebration of the above Anniversary. How true this Father of the Episcopal Church in the U. S., was to the teaching of the Church Catholic is evident, for the following taken from Bishop Perry's sermon, and by which, he being dead yet speaketh. Dr. Perry says:—

We venture to cite from the Bishop's published writings, and in his own words, without change or comment, his opinions on several questions now rife in the Church. And with reference to the name Catholic: "In proportion," says Bishop White, "as any Church in the present day comes up to the original idea of Catholicism, that of teaching what was then of *universality as to time or place*, without teaching anything else as of necessity to eternal salvation, although there may still be considerable variety in what relates to discipline and order, such a Church deserves the name of 'Catholic,' and stands in no need of the superaddition of the late name of 'Roman.'"

Bishop White plainly regarded and ever spoke of the Church as an "outward and visible society," as distinguished from an invisible Church. He refers to it as a "social body" "of divine institution," known under the name of 'The Church.'

He further adds: "The Church of Christ, whether considered in the comprehensive sense, embracing all the faithful, or as existing in different bodies, according to their respective countries, is *not* an association resting on the will of man, but was instituted under sacraments, and a ministry of *divine origin*." He speaks of our own Church as "a branch of that Catholic Church which is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."

With reference to Episcopacy and the Apostolical succession, the first Bishop of Pennsylvania uttered no uncertain sound. These are his words: "The whole scheme of the Christian ministry, as framed by the Apostles and handed down to us in succession, *implies* the intervention of an ecclesiastical order, designated for the purpose." He adds: "With the exception of those appointed by our Lord in person, *not an instance can be produced of ordination in any other way than by imposition of the hands of those duly authorized under a commission given by him to that effect.*" He proceeds to affirm that the ministerial orders, "three in number, were of *Apostolic institution*, and existed *universally* in the Church, as now among us, until within a few ages of these later times." He goes on to say that, "It appears that a *succession* in the ministry was provided by the same high authority which first declared the Gospel itself." He adds, respecting the ministry, that, "as instituted by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, it includes the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." He speaks of the *succession* as "a constituent part of her [the Church's] institutions, and coeval with her holy religion." He declares that it is not "arrogant" or "unreasonable" in the ministers of the Gospel to assert the *divine* institution of their office, as handed down from the Apostles, and to deny the propriety of every door to the ministry of man's workmanship; whether it be that of popular ordination, or the plea of an inward call. He further declares that "to justify the candidate [for ordination] in believing that he is called according to the will of Christ, he should be convinced, after due inquiry, that the Church to which he looks for ordination is a *true Apostolic Church*, deriving its authority from that founded by the Apostles; for, since they did *confessedly found* a Communion, and since it did *confessedly transmit* its ministries, there seems no possible right to the name of a Christian Church at present but in *succession* from the originally established body." Nor is this all. He adds: "It is of importance to every candidate, and much more so to the Church, that he should have his principles settled on the present point [Apostolical succession], since otherwise he will be in continual danger of setting up his *own opinion* in contrariety to what the Church has decided or ordained." And, further, he says: "We hold up the *succession* of the ministry as a *principle clearly deducible from Scripture and essential to the peace and the good government of the Church*." And again: "We affirm the necessity of succession from the Apostles."

In an ordination sermon published in 1825, the Bishop says: "It has pleased the Great Head of the Church to commit the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments to an authorized ministry. Accordingly, all violation of this order may be considered as figured by 'the wood, the hay, and the stubble.' Where this is done under knowledge of what the Scriptures enjoin, and from disregard of that high authority, the indulgence in the text [1. Cor. iii., 11.] does not extend; and it can have no place except in the case of involuntary error and unperceived frailty." In an address delivered to the students of the General Theological Seminary in 1823, the Bishop puts himself on record as opposed to "whatever has a tendency to shake the constitution of the Christian ministry, believed by us to have been handed down from the Apostles, or to obtrude on us any mode of worship diverse from the forms considered by us as agreeable to Scripture and primitive antiquity, or either to dispense with our doctrinal articles on the one hand, or to enlarge them by dogmas not clearly comprehended in them, on the other." He reminds those who "would throw down every barrier dividing our communion from some others in visible administration," because they think the

existing differences are of no importance, that this "design has uniformly exacted the sacrifice of the prominent characteristics of our system."

The Bishop held, and did not hesitate to declare, both in print and in preaching, his belief in the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*—"a doctrine," he proceeds "which we have been taught to lip in the earliest repetitions of our Catechism; which pervades sundry of our devotional services, especially the baptismal; which is affirmed in our articles also; which was confessedly held and taught during the ages of the martyrs; and the belief of which was universal in the Church until it was perceived to be inconsistent with a religious theory, the beginning and the progress of which can be as distinctly traced as those of any error of Popery."

In another place the Bishop states, combating two errors in a single sentence, that "Our Church considers this ordinance [Holy Baptism] as an actual grafting into the Church, without any such distinction as the one invented between a *visible* and an *invisible* society under that name." He further adds, respecting the recipients of this Sacrament, that "Their nature is sanctified by the possession of grace bestowed in baptism; a grace which, if improved, is sufficient for the exigencies of future life, and therefore sufficient to prepare them for early death."

Bishop White's views with respect to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper were singularly moderate. He strongly opposed the use of any word in connection with the Eucharist which, to use his own language, "involves a real or material sacrifice therein—an altar, and a priest, in the sense of an offerer of sacrifice." Yet he declares that "the very circumstance that the Eucharist is a memorial, makes it 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.' The grace is involved in the subject commemorated, and therefore must be imparted by the means of the celebration. Not only so; the promises of God are hereby visibly signed and sealed. For what less is the matter commemorated than the death of Christ, as 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world?' On what are the divine promises founded, but on the merits of this transaction? And how then can it be celebrated by an external, appointed rite, without this rite being significant of promises resting on a truth which cannot fail?"

Bishop White speaks of the infrequent administration of this Sacrament as "one of the many proofs existing that the piety of Christians is not so ardent as in the beginning." He adds: "There are few facts more satisfactorily proved, than that of the Eucharist having been administered in the primitive Church every Lord's Day." In a time when the feasts and fasts were but rarely observed, and the daily service was practically unknown in this land, the Bishop urged the observance of the one and the desirableness of the other, calling attention to "the notoriety" of the fact "that the calendar was constructed with a view to a daily morning and evening service," and adding, with reference to Saint's Day services, that it would be "an edifying example to give encouragement to a practice which has been dear to many godly persons from the earliest ages to the present."

Addressing students for the sacred ministry, he calls attention to the fact "that the chief design of holding religious assemblies should be *the engaging in the exercises of worship*" as distinguished from *preaching*. He was careful to affirm that, "in the exercises of religion, we should consult, not purity only, but also ornament." In the same discourse, he adds: "Whatever charms the eye and ear, acquireth, by means of them, an influence over the mind; and God forbid that these avenues should be