

28, 1898.

on to build
its action
lained, that
live of the
e week let
s God hath
rding as he
, not grudg-
a cheerful
the Word
in all good
rich in this
rich in good
communi-
communicate
God is well

for Church
l Testament
of religious
led by God,
obey, and
nal circum-
ple equally
ulation, the
science and
discharged
ires to apply
o so. The
e of giving,
s varied and
opment that

irit of Christ
h, must feel
work of pro-
vine instinct
within him.
ust minister
the Church
ting to the
e Lord hath
s, we must
self-evident.
a our lives,
attention of
for the good
mercial, not
howing men
is, and how
ly force that
luty to enter
ability in the
st, and such
meet reward.
or His work,
orted by the
a man can-
he next thing
can be. To
ivilege of pro-
d in our cor-
, if all mem-
g to gift or
d the Lord's
the Gospel.
mission work
s have been
men, to men
workers with
is the age of
erprises, and
therwise, but
en compared
ving her Lord
generation to

generation, gradually through the power of the indwelling Spirit changing the thoughts and ideas of mankind, diffusing sweetness and light, and righteousness and love, gathering within her fold multitudes from all nations and races, and while still fighting with evil, yet perceptibly conquering, and having the assurance of a permanent triumph. Life is a positive thing, and each one of us must discharge our duty in our day and generation, and when the time comes for us to depart, we, in that hour, can have no better consolation than the knowledge that we, when strength was ours, were co-workers with Christ in the greatest cause on earth—in the work that He became incarnate to accomplish—the eternal redemption of man.

We must look at that principle in giving wherein judgment is pronounced according to the quality of the act. Our Lord says, "This poor widow hath cast in more than they all. For all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God, but she of her penury hath cast in all the living she had." With God there is no respect of persons, and to that large class of His children who cannot give much of this world's wealth to His cause, this incident of the poor widow and the Divine estimate of her, comes like a great revelation to them, that they can be co-workers with God like those more advantageously situated, under the great, law "That if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." God makes it possible for all His children, in whatever position, to be co-workers with Him in the great work of redemption.

(To be Continued.)

NEW YEAR.

We are now entering upon another year, and trust the gentle reminder enclosed in this number will be a sufficient hint for all to kindly renew their subscriptions promptly and avail themselves of our liberal offer of premiums, which are so highly valued by all who have seen them. We wish all our readers a Happy and Prosperous New Year.

REVIEWS.

THE WITNESS TO IMMORTALITY IN LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE. By George A. Gordon, minister of the old South Church, Boston. 8vo., pp. 310, price \$1.50. Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; Toronto: Rowell & Hutchison.

No subject can be more interesting, and our author treats it with great reverence and discretion. He writes for believers, and accepts immortality on trust as he believes in God, whom love knows, but no evidence can demonstrate. In asking the testimony of poets and philosophers he follows the stream of time from below upwards, and is particularly successful in his distinction between the Hebrew prophet and poet as setting out with different aims. The chapter on the testimony of Jesus Christ is worked out with great care and beauty, and the last chapter, as drawing all the threads together, is very impressive, as our author writes clearly and has a definite message, with which all must sympathize. With a thought in the introductory chapter we were entirely at one, and yet it is seldom thought of. It will yield food for thought and be a fair sample of the whole book. "Among good people the thought of the future life is precious, not primarily on their own account, but on account of their dead whom they cannot bear to think of as lost to existence. A true man does not fear death for himself, but for his friends: it is not his own grave that is dreadful, but the grave of those whom he loves. Many a weary mortal would gladly lie down and cease to be, yet he cannot endure that as the fate of those dear to him. There are moods when extinction of being would be welcome to ourselves,

but the time never comes when we are willing that our dearest should pass out of existence. The sacrifice would be not simply a loss to us; we feel that it would be likewise a loss to God. Very often we value ourselves lightly enough, but those whom we truly love we set above all price. Not what becomes of us when we die, but what becomes of them when they die is the great question of human love. In health, in work, with his home uninvaded, Carlyle turns the question out of doors: when the awful solitude came and the bitter self-accusation and the infinitely significant sorrow, he reconsiders and concludes to trust God for the vision of his vanished ones again."

THE STORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The next chapter in this drama opens with a new Parliament, which at once impeached Strafford and imprisoned Laud. A Committee of religion was appointed, and the Commons passed a Bill to remove the Bishops from the House of Lords. Laud was tried in November, 1643, but not beheaded until 1645, and then notwithstanding that the King had granted him pardon under the Great Seal.

Driven from one refuge to another King Charles found himself in May, 1646, in the hands of the Scotch, who negotiated for his surrender (in the January following) on receiving £400,000. In 1649 he was tried in Westminster Hall, and condemned on January 30th. He was executed outside Whitehall. Thus died King Charles the Martyr.* Six weeks afterwards the Parliament formally abolished Monarchy, and two months later established a Commonwealth. A period of civil and religious anarchy followed. Between 1640 and 1658 Puritanism was supreme. The clergy were prosecuted, betrayed, fined, beaten and even slain. They were ejected and exiled to the number of about seven thousand, and their places seized upon by Puritan ministers. Axes and hammers were wielded by frantic hands until every adornment of our cathedrals and parish churches lay crushed beneath the feet of the fanatics of those days. The utmost confusion in both church and state followed.† John Evelyn, living at this time, enters in his diary on Oct. 11th, 1649: "The army turned out the Parliament. No Government. All in confusion. No magistrates, owned or pretended, but the soldiers, and they not agreed. God Almighty have mercy on us."‡ Who can tell with what joy the famous chronicler could write, on September 3rd, 1658: "Died, that arch-rebel Cromwell, called Protector! Buried like a king, but the joyfulest funeral I ever saw."§

The Restoration, which brought Charles II. to Whitehall, changed the whole face of England. The Bishops, the oldest occupants of seats in the House of Lords, were reinstated, and prayer was again offered in both Houses of the Legislature. The Book of Common Prayer was again brought into use, and some of the clergy who had been ejected by order of the Puritans were restored to their livings.

On April 15th, 1661, a conference was held at the Savoy Palace in the Strand, which resulted in the revision of the Prayer Book by Convocation. The Book, as revised, was issued in 1662, since which time, except in regard to certain occasional offices, the Prayer Book has remained unaltered.

*For whom a Special Service was appended to the Prayer Book, until it was removed so late in the year 1859. He is there spoken of as "King Charles, the Martyr."

†The following extracts from the journal of one of the Puritan fanatics, William Dowling, illustrates the spirit of the times: "Haverhill, Jan. the 6th. We broke about a hundred superstitious pictures, and seven Fryars hugging a Nun, and the picture of God and Christ, and divers others very superstitious, and 200 had been broken down before I came. We took away two Popish inscriptions with *oro pro nobis*; and we beat down a great stoneing cross on the top of the church." On the same day, at Clare:—"We broke down 100 pictures superstitious; I broke down 200."

‡The Prayer Book was forbidden to be read under a penalty of £5 for the first offence, £100 for the second, and conviction for felony for a third.

§It should not be forgotten that amongst the Puritans were many whose extreme piety and zeal put to shame the roystering and frivolous manners which too often characterized the lives of the Cavaliers.

The newly-revised Prayer Book gave offence to the Puritans, who were now obliged, by an Act of Uniformity, to receive ordination from the Bishops or vacate their livings. About fifteen hundred refused compliance, and were obliged to give up their livings. Much has been made of the ejection of the Puritans, but Dr. Calamy, an eminent Dissenter, admits that full allowance was made for tender consciences, and in many cases the law of ejection was not put into force at all.

For a season the Church made great progress, but with the accession of James II. (1685), who favored the Roman Catholics, fresh trouble was in store for it. The King thrust upon the Universities, Roman Catholic Presidents and Deans, and the highest offices of the State became gradually filled with the King's favorites. But the King's boldest effort was a "Declaration of Indulgence," dispensing with certain laws without the consent of Parliament, which he ordered (on April 27th 1688) the bishops and clergy to read. He hoped by this to gain the Protestant Dissenters to his side, but in this he was disappointed. The bishops assembled and, headed by Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Ken, petitioned the King against compelling the clergy to read the declaration; whereupon seven of the bishops were arrested and sent to the Tower.

POLYCHURCHISM AND POLYGAMY.

BY THE REV. CANON HAMMOND.

If I revert to the subject of Polychurchism once more, it is because I am firmly persuaded that the claim now of late—and only of late—so freely urged by Dissenting communions to be accounted "separate and independent churches" of Christ is the real obstacle to all home re-union. Whilst Churchmen constantly get the credit of blocking the way by their perpetual *non possumus*, the boot is really all the time on the other leg. It is we who are for comprehension; it is Dissenters who, by their very tenets, stand out for division. For whilst we freely recognize all the baptized of all the denominations as really belonging to us, as members of the Church, Christ's Church, they insist that we and they do and shall belong to separate Churches. It is primarily this claim to be "separate and independent Churches, with all the machinery committed by Christ to His Church," that creates and maintains the gulf between us. I do not say that there are no other questions at issue, for there are, but Polychurchism is the outwork, the bastion, which must be stormed and carried first. Episcopal regimen, liturgical forms, even sacramental grace are matters of secondary moment, as between the Churchman and the Dissenter, compared with the question whether our Lord Christ has one Church or one hundred rival and contradictory Churches; "one body" or two hundred and odd bodies. And so firmly has Polychurchism established itself as an article of the Nonconformist faith; so sure are devout Dissenters that the communion in which they "get good" and have, perhaps, found rest to their souls, is therefore a Church, and equal to the best, that it seems as if nothing short of a surgical operation would dislodge it from their minds. And the question is saddled with this additional difficulty that the claim having once been made, it is now almost impossible to abandon it; it is quite impossible without a wholesale confession of error, such as men are very slow indeed to make. We are all tempted, in such a case as this, to take the line of the old Scottish retainer, "It's a lee, laird, but ye maun e'en stick to it."

I propose, therefore, in this paper to take the Lucerne champions of Polychurchism at their word, and to appeal (as they insist we must) to some of the "facts of modern Christendom." Or rather, I shall appeal to the one fact of Polygamy (of which there has been in this same century, which has witnessed the rise of most of our sects, a recrudescence in America) as a sample of many more. We shall thus, unless I am greatly mistaken, find the engineer hoist with his own petard. We shall find the Methodist extremely reluctant to recognize facts, when these facts are urged upon his notice by the Mormon.

But before I do this, I most emphatically disclaim all idea of wounding or disparaging the Methodist, or any body of Dissenters. It is only for the purpose of a *reductio ad absurdum* that I put them for the moment into the same category with the Mormons. I say this as distinctly as I can. If they still complain of the comparison, I answer that they have themselves to thank for it. They invite us to institute it by taking up the Mormon ground.

Moreover, let me say that it makes nothing against my argument that the "peculiar institution" of Mormonism is now being suppressed by the Government of the United States. It is true that Polygamy