

Assistant in the
ore he went there,
his diocese.
onsiderable defi-
he help, on which
continued at least
the year. Any re-
ratefully acknow-
Winnipeg P. O.
irely supported by
ee feel that this
Still, they believe
ge, much has been
en in the school,
y. They desire
e kind sympathy
many friends who

ool desire to con-
ol, the Committee
the Indian Indus-
diocese, which is
Rev. F. E. Wilson,

angelizing efforts of
f this diocese, the
end to them either
particular mission.
ns would be speci-
at Oak River, the
Mission on Rainy
have hitherto sup-
to support one of
f the Church would
may be sent either
pert's Land, Hon.
ag, or to the Ven.
ident of Indian

A. BURMAN.
incipal R. L. I. S.
that my address is

n.

words in connection
ond's letter on the
in your issue of

ag from the record
econd of the chief
world since man
gion, true or false,
as history written
do not find any
Mr. Symonds, from
m which one can
be shaking spoken
to the Hebrews re-
at requires to be
t appears to me to
long ago, namely,
ation as a nation,
h polity, in which
and worship" gave
ity, but the shak-
bloodshed, perhaps
ened in the world.
pression "the de-
monds, "is the de-
and the primary
he following verse,
dorn the temple."
reference is made
h was "exceeding
gold and silver, as
the second temple
n was so much in-
some of those who
yet was it to be
emple, not by its
by the presence of
to it. And so the
l whom ye seek,"
nly come to His
d. There He was
ed Simeon as the
with the doctors
d filled that House
o Him shall the
hich occurs in the
is rendered in the
expectation of all
ot confined to the
entiles, as we learn
ians Sentonius and
ere was an ancient
broughtout all the
l determined that
those that should
ony of Tacitus is
y," says he, "were
t it was contained
ests that at that

very time the East should prevail, and they who were to come out of Judea." "The man whose name is the East," is the title given to the Messiah by the prophet Zachariah. I cannot therefore help retaining my belief that the character of the Saviour, as "the expectation of all nations," was literally fulfilled.

"As to the remainder of Canon Logan's explanation of the passage, without wishing to deny its possibility, there appears to me no foundation whatever in the prophecy for the opinion that the shaking of the heavens, etc., refers to the changes the world underwent during the next four hundred years."

The following is part of the prophecy in question, and appears to be the correct explanation of the whole: "I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them, and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother." Near the time of the giving of the prophecy of Haggai, the Assyrian empire, which comprehended Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Syria, Phoenicia, Judea, Persia, Arabia, and Egypt, had been overthrown by the Medes and Persians, under Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian. And the Medo-Persian Empire was in turn overthrown by Alexander the Great, and the Macedonian Empire established B. C. 331. To this conquest Alexander added India. After the death of Alexander the empire was divided into four kingdoms, by his four principal generals. And in turn, the Romans overthrew and secured the Grecian Empire in parts: Macedonia, B. C. 168; Greece, B. C. 145; Syria and Asia Minor, B. C. 66; Jerusalem, B. C. 63; Judea B. C. 37; Egypt, B. C. 30; Arabia Felix, B. C. 96. The prophecy deals largely with nations, but never hints at the remodeling of the Bible, a large portion of which was unwritten when the prophecy was delivered, "I will shake all nations." And from this the Apostle argues that the dispensation of the Gospel shall never be changed. "And this word," says he, "yet once more signifies the removing of those things which are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things that cannot be shaken may remain," and then it follows, "Wherefore, we receiving (not a remodeled Bible that cannot be moved) but a kingdom that cannot be moved." It was usual for the Jews to describe the times of the Gospel by "the Kingdom of the Messiah," and so the Apostle calls the dispensation of the Gospel "a kingdom which cannot be moved," in opposition to the Law, which was an imperfect and alterable dispensation.

WM. LOGAN.

Nov. 8th, 1898.

Observations on a Paper Read by Canon Hammond, entitled "Polychurchism."

Read at a recent conference on Re-union, and recently re-printed in the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The term Polychurchism, used by way of reproach and condemnation, is not a reasonable one in the mouth of a member of the Church of England, unless such a one holds that our Church is the only Christian Church in existence. A priest of the Roman Church can denounce Polychurchism with perfect reason, for he holds that there is only one Church in the world, and that the Roman is that Church. He holds that the Catholic Church is a single organized body at unity and completeness within itself, with a visible head—that head being the Pope; and that all other organized bodies claiming to be Churches have no rightful claim to the title, but are schismatical organizations. Such a one, therefore, stands on perfectly logical ground in assailing Polychurchism. But a member of the Church of England does not. Passing to the argument of the paper itself: It is manifestly based on the principle that the only true test of the claim of any organized body to be a Christian Church, is its conformity in all respects to the facts, examples, and developments of Church life, as found in the New Testament. This principle has an element of soundness in it, but, rigidly applied, it will lead to the conclusion that there is no Christian Church in the world at all. For there is no Christian organization in existence which fully satisfies this condition. This was the conclusion arrived at by the founders of the Plymouth sect, and it is the foundation of their polity. The Church of Christ they have concluded to be in a state of ruin. They say that it has ceased to exist as a compact and complete body—that none of the many organizations calling themselves Churches are such in reality, neither Roman, Eastern nor Anglican; neither Methodist, Presbyterian nor Congregational; all alike are mere human organizations, all containing, more or less of true Disciples of the Saviour, whose duty in existing circumstances is to separate themselves from their evil surroundings, to come out and associate together in simple brotherhood, and wait for the Lord's return

and the time of restitution of all things. To this conclusion the argument of the paper on 'Polychurchism' must inevitably lead if logically carried out. Let its propositions, however, be stated and examined one by one.

First. "Holy Scripture knows of no Church, of no local Church even, which is not God's Church." On this it is to be remarked that this is precisely the ground taken by Congregationalists, whose congregations are almost all, even now, and were all formerly, styled the "Church of Jesus Christ, meeting in" such and such a place. They strenuously maintain that they are Churches of Jesus Christ, and are the true successors and representatives of the Churches of God, or Churches of Jesus Christ, in Corinth, Ephesus, Thessalonica and other places in Apostolic times. This they claim to be their true ecclesiastical status, and that the terms 'dissenters' or 'non-conformists' are merely political, and have no place out of England, where the Church is established by law. It is noticeable, however, in view of this first proposition, that the Church of England never uses this phraseology; never calls herself 'The Church of God in England,' or 'The Church of Jesus Christ in England,' but simply 'The Church in England.' So far, therefore, the Church of England does not fulfil this primary condition, though many Congregational churches do.

Second. Holy Scripture knows of no Church in any city or country other than the Church of the city or country.

This statement is incorrect. There was in Rome a church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila. Certainly this was not the whole body of disciples in Rome, for the rest of the disciples there were directed to salute this Church. There was in Colosse a church in the house of Nymphas. This was not the whole Church either, for the same reason. There was a church in the house of Philemon. But undoubtedly, in general, the local church was of a city or town, e.g., the Church of God at Corinth, the Church of the Ephesians, the Church of Laodicea, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and so on. But except in one doubtful instance, there is no mention of a Church of a Country, Province, or Nation. The churches of Galatia are mentioned, also the churches of Macedonia, the churches of Judea are mentioned in the Epistle to the Galatians. The plural in Acts ix. 31, is disputed, but all the above are acknowledged. But still it is undoubtedly the case that every individual church mentioned in the New Testament is in connection with some locality, and not with any principle, doctrine or rule. It must, however, be borne in mind that the original Presbyterian Church was named locally—it was the Church of Scotland. And they who seceded some fifty years ago adopted this local cognomen. They called themselves the "Free Church of Scotland," and are so called to this day. Neither of these, however, have any counterpart in Holy Scripture. But neither has the cognomen "Church of England."

This rule would have a sweeping effect on this side of the Atlantic for it would unchurch our sister communion the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, whose title is based on the assertion of a 'principle' or 'rule,' and is not a mere territorial designation.

Third. Holy Scripture knows of no Church in any city, country, or in the world, other than the visible community of the baptized. This is a definition or declaration that can be applied to every organization calling itself a "church" in modern Christendom. All Christian bodies calling themselves "churches" baptize as a preliminary entrance to the Church. Those who have not been baptized in infancy are baptized in after years, before being considered as within the Church. The Society of Friends do not baptize; but then they do not call themselves a Church. The Salvationists do not claim to be a Church either. Neither do they baptize. Whatever individuals of any community may say (and individuals of every Church and communion do, at times, say things entirely at variance with the principles of the organization they belong to), the above is undoubtedly the only way in which the doctrine and practice of baptism can be spoken of in non-episcopal organizations. If a nonconformist minister recently boasted before a London school board that he had never been baptized, he announced himself clearly as having broken the law or custom of his Church; unless, indeed, he was a Unitarian. If the Wesleyan body contains, or recently did contain, persons who declined to be baptized, there was a similar breaking of the law on the part of some person or persons of that communion. If "we are now told" that Baptism is allowable but optional, it should be stated by whom this has been said. If said by a Quaker or Salvationist, it is perfectly consistent with their position. If said by any member of any other Christian organization, it must either be attributed to ignorance, or to that disposition to make eccentric statements that some people are so much given to in all Christian bodies. It might easily be shown by adopting the same line of remark that Baptism is no part of the requirements of the

Church of England, for there can be no doubt that there are persons in England, nominally connected with the English Church, who, through negligence or ignorance, have never been baptized. But the Canon's mode of argument under this head is quite unworthy of himself as an educated man, and of the seriousness of the subject. If the Church of England were to be judged by the strange things that any of her ministers or laymen have said or written, during the last fifty years, she could easily be made to appear an irreconcilable bundle of contradictions and absurdities. We regard to a visible form of admission being necessary, the ticket of the Methodist Church, so far as visibility is concerned, fulfils the condition perfectly. And though the Canon ridicules this ticket, it corresponds very nearly with the tablets that were in use in Apostolic times. Still, in spite of the ticket, Baptism is a fundamental law of the Methodist body, and has always been. Putting these considerations aside, however, there is noticeable a vein of thought running through this paragraph which has within it the germ of serious error, for it is implied therein that the administration of the mere outward rite of baptism, quite apart from the state of mind of the recipient, constitutes the person baptized a member of Christ's Church. This is not the doctrine of the Church of England, or of any nonconformist body. The baptism of the Church of England is the baptism of persons who have repented of and renounced their sins, and professed their faith in Jesus Christ. Infants are not baptized unless their sureties engage this for them. Adults are not until they do it for themselves. In this matter all nonconforming communions agree with her both in theory and practice. The contention that by baptism many persons are admitted into some society other than the one which baptizes them, will not hold, and is not proved by the examples given. In all the instances of baptism in Holy Scripture, the person baptized was received into the communion of those who baptized him and no other. This is true, both of those who were baptized by John the Baptist, by the Disciples of our Lord during His life time, or by any of the Apostles or their fellow workers after His ascension to Heaven. How far, in these times, baptism into any non-conforming body gives entrance into, and connection with, the Universal Church, the 'blessed company of faithful people,' each Church must determine for itself. The Church of England acknowledges baptism, when administered in the name of the Trinity, even by non-conformists; an acknowledgment which goes some way towards a conclusion that they have a valid ministry and true status as Churches of Jesus Christ. The Baptist community, as is well known, acknowledges no baptism but its own. It is noticeable, however, that our Prayer Book provides for the baptism of persons of riper years, on assurance of repentance and faith, and provides, also, for baptism by immersion.

Fourth. The Churches of which we read in the old Book of God formed one body. This is admitted by all communions of Christians. But there is a difference in their mode of understanding the meaning and scope of this bodily unity. The statements and the reasoning of the author, under this head, are singularly confused and cloudy. For he states that this 'body,' this one body of Christ, must be 'visible,' that it is of the essence of a body to be visible, as an 'invisible body' is a contradiction in terms. Let us look at this contention, and examine it. The word 'visible' must here be intended to mean that which can be seen with the bodily eye. For the very thing which is contended by those from whom he differs is, that this bodily or corporate character of the many congregations or churches which make up the body of Christ, can only be seen with the eye of the mind. These two things—seeing with the bodily eye, and seeing with the mind's eye—are both of them familiar and well understood terms. But they represent radically different ideas. Now, can anything in a Christian Church or community be seen with the bodily eye, and if so, what? Let us think clearly, and avoid confusion. Any assembly of people in one place can evidently be seen with the bodily eye. A single congregation is visible, a Sunday school is visible, a meeting of persons for prayer, or for conference, or for the celebration of Holy Communion, is visible. If there are a number of such assemblies in any organization, each one is visible to the bodily eye by itself—but only one can be seen at a time. Each congregation is a body of persons, the word 'body' being strictly appropriate to its usage. But if there are a number of such assemblies united as one organization, and so composing one body, that body cannot be seen with the bodily eye. The Methodist body is not visible, though a single Methodist congregation or class meeting is. The unity or oneness of a large organization composed of many separate portions may be seen with the eye of the mind, may be apprehended with the understanding. And it can only be so seen. It is not visible to the bodily eye. The definition of the 'Visible Church' in the 19th Article, is, therefore, strictly one might almost say, scientifically