

that the Church does not allow her ministers to baptize privately, except for weighty reasons; and even then, should the child recover, it is to be brought to church to be received into the congregation? Are you aware that you confer no favour on the minister, and if he seems solicitous as to an early baptism at the church, it is not on his own account, but on yours and the child's?—that, by baptism, Christ conveys to your infant blessings superior to the richest legacy, and that you should be thankful that you may bring your infant to Him, as He commands and invites? Would you have your minister violate rules he has promised to obey; and, for the sake of gratifying you, offend the other parents of his congregation? There is one ingenious (not ingenuous) mode by which you can secure the baptism at home: postpone the baptism until your child is dying, for then he will not refuse to come. Before coming to such a conclusion, it would be well to remember the sinful disposition it exhibits. You believe baptism of some importance, otherwise it is not desirable, a mere form being but mockery. And yet you make what is important to your infant depend on the uncertainty of its illness. You forfeit the certainty of the present, for a future which may shroud your child in death before the minister arrives. Christ calls you to suffer your child to come to Him, and, so far as you can, you forbid. You are ashamed of bringing your child to Jesus in public, but are willing to do so in private; you set at naught the prayers of the congregation in its behalf. And at the very time when you should be most grateful for deliverance from recent peril, your ingratitude manifests itself in indulged wilfulness. "Where is it mothers learn such love?" Such a disposition is not only liable to God's anger hereafter, but even here there may be a call on God's mercy for relief, but no answer: for as "He is not the God of the dead only," neither is He of the afflicted only. Let such considerations induce you on the first opportunity to take your infant to the house of God.

"Then happiest ye who blest  
Back to your arms your treasure take,  
With Jesus' mark impressed,  
To nurse for Jesus' sake."

Says Matthew Henry, "Parents should rejoice more at their children's baptism than at their birth."

#### PAROCHIAL PESTS.

BY THE REV. A. W. SNYDER.

The Catholic conception of worship is clear, definite, pronounced, but it is an idea foreign to the thought of many who call themselves Christians. The common notion is that the one great purpose of church attendance is to hear—especially to hear a sermon. The average man can hardly conceive of any other; possibly has never so much as heard whether there be any other. This notion has prevailed among the denominations so long that, among them, it is all pervasive. It made the meeting-house, filled it with pews, planned its pulpit, and ordered its observances. According to this theory, men go to church to hear preaching. It is the one great thing. Whatever of prayer or singing, or Scripture reading, there may be, is only "the preparatory service." Preparatory to what? To the preaching, of course. That is the one chief thing, the one thing to which everything else is subsidiary and must give place. But suppose a man do not care for preaching, why then go to church? Why not stay away, as in such case he generally does? The common theory and practice go together. They are perfectly consistent. But the Catholic conception of worship has no necessary relation either to a preacher or to preaching. It is founded on the relation of the creature to the Creator. It is indeed for the good of men, but above all to the glory of God. It is the bounden duty and service of all men. It builds the church, decides its architecture, tells its purpose, orders its services, places everything in it and pertaining to it. And yet we often find those who call themselves Churchmen, and think they are, and possibly pride themselves on the supposed superior brand of their Churchmanship, who nevertheless have no proper idea of worship—the worship of God.

They are invariably the disturbers of the peace of the parish and the priest. They are guided by self-will. They will rule or they will try to ruin. If only they are made much of, and have their way, all is well. If not, then all is ill. They do little or nothing from principle, at least not from Christian principle. They will attend church if they like the preacher, and possibly give a little to the support of the parish—but not much. It is always a matter of self-will and self-pleasing, honor of self. The thought of God and of His glory is not in it. They are unstable souls. No man can long count on them. They are an impediment and no permanent help. There is no parish, however small, that would not be better off without them, no matter how much money they may have. Whatever they may think themselves, they are not Churchmen. Though in the Church they are not of it. They are, in fact, heretics, that is, self-will choosers. If women—as they often are—they are never happy unless they have prominence, place, petting. If of the other sex, they must be on the vestry, or delegates to the convention, or "Superior" of the guild, or at least superior of something or somebody. They love the chief places in the parish and the praise of men. The love of God is not in them. They are good Pharisees, but neither good Churchmen nor good Christians. All our bishops know of parishes which for years these people have hindered and plagued by their presence. The bishop can flee from them. It is the poor priest that they pester, and the parish—especially the country parish—that they afflict. They are hinderers, not helpers, and should be made to know it. That they may be converted—"meet with a change" or go to their own place, should be the hope of those who have good will to Zion, and the prayer of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

#### POLYCHURCHISM.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH HAMMOND.

III. *Holy Scripture knows of no Church in any city, country, or in the world other than the visible community of the baptized.* There was one way of making Church members—the rite appointed by our Lord Himself—and there was no other. Those who were baptized, however bad they might be, were members; those not baptized, however good they might be, were not members. In other words, the visible Church had, as in fact it must have, its visible form of admission. It has been said of late that "the Church consists not of the christened, but of the Christly." Yes, the Church which we evolve from our own imagination, but not that of the Bible. The Apostolic Churches consisted not of the Christly (of course the members should be Christly), but of the christened. I think it is sometimes forgotten that our Blessed Lord no sooner began to preach than He began to baptize. He formed a visible society to which men were admitted by a visible rite. Not only so, but He declared that there was no other way into the Kingdom of God than the new birth "of water and the Spirit." And so, at the close of His ministry, He charged the Apostles to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them," etc. We are now told that "Baptism is allowable, but optional." A Nonconformist minister has recently boasted before the London School Board that he had never been baptized. The Wesleyan "Church" contains (or recently did contain) members who declined to be baptized, and its form of admission to membership is to give a printed ticket. It was not thus that the New Testament Church was constituted. Men became members of the "one body" by the "one baptism" (Eph. iv. 4). "In one Spirit" were they all "baptized into the one body" (1 Cor. xii.) "Repent and be baptized every one of you" was practically the message. "Can any man forbid the water that these should not be baptized?" was the first question asked after the outpourings of the Holy Ghost upon Gentiles (Acts x. 47).

But I need not dwell on this point, for happily most Christians are agreed on the subject. "Entered we are not," says Hooker, "into the visible Church before our admittance by the gate of baptism." "Is not baptism," says Richard Baxter, "Christ's appointed means of admission into His Church?" "By baptism," said John Wesley, "we are admitted into the Church." "By baptism," writes Dr. Beet, "the Christians at Corinth had been united to the visible fellowship of the Church of Christ." "In baptism," says Dr. Paton, "a child or adult is associated with the Church of Christ." And such testimonies might easily be multiplied. But if this is so, then observe what follows—that all separatists who have been duly baptized have been admitted into the Church, and are still in some sense members, and that all

admitted by ticket of membership, or in any similar way, were admitted thereby into a "private society" of Christians, into what Dr. Dale calls "a private Christian club." A ticket cannot admit into the Church, neither can a Church be "constituted by faith in Christ." To a visible community men must be admitted visibly.

IV. *The churches of which we read in the "old Book of God" formed one body.* It will not be denied that the Church is described as a "body" and as "one body," nor yet that it is compared to the human body, with its head and members; but you may be tempted to think that the term "body," and especially "body of Christ," which we find so often in the two circular epistles and elsewhere, cannot refer to the visible Church, to the community of the baptized. I respectfully submit to you, however, that no other interpretation is possible, and for the following reasons:—First, it is of the essence of a "body" to be visible: an invisible, impalpable body is a contradiction in terms, especially (2) when that "body" is placed in direct contrast with spirit. "There is one body," says St. Paul, "and one Spirit"; and again, "By one Spirit were we all baptized into one body," on which Dr. Beet's comment is "Body in contrast to Spirit suggests an outward and visible community and an outward rite of admission to it," whilst he remarks elsewhere, "The Church is the body of Christ, an outward and visible form, consisting of various and variously endowed members." Thirdly, we must interpret the word when it occurs in the Bible, just as we interpret it in daily life. For, in daily life, the word "body" is constantly used of the denominations—"the Churches," as you call them—just as in Scripture it is used of "the Church." Nothing is more common than to speak of the "Baptist body" or the "Wesleyan body," and it is always employed of the visible community of Baptists and the visible community of Wesleyans. Why, then, are we to put a different meaning on the word when it occurs in Holy Scripture? It is true the Church is called the mystical body of Christ, but it is so called to distinguish it from His natural body. But, lastly, what St. Paul meant by the word "body" and what his readers would understand by it, admits of no doubt; for the word *corpus* had then recently come into use to describe the guilds of workmen—the trades' unions of the Roman empire. But these were visible communities, organized "bodies." The word must, therefore, denote an organized body in the Epistles. "It is unreasonable"—I again quote Mr. Gladstone—"to resolve the term 'body' into a metaphor, not only because we may think that the plain sense of Scripture precludes it, but further, also, because the whole primitive Church concurred in the literal sense." (p. 108). "This body is necessarily outward and historical," says Bishop Westcott, "and Christ instituted an outward rite for incorporation into it." I repeat, therefore, that the Church of which the New Testament tells was one visible body, one Church; not a congeries of two hundred discordant "bodies" or "churches." In other words, if the denominations are "separate and independent Churches," as is claimed for most of them, then they cannot form "one body," and if they form parts of the one body, then they cannot be "separate and independent Churches."

But it is quite possible that what I have said so far is largely a work of supererogation. For aught I know you may be prepared to admit, what some learned Nonconformists admit, that the Church of the Apostles was one body, one Church. But then you may plead as they do—I mention Dr. Beet, for example, one of the most candid and painstaking expositors which the present generation has produced—that many things have happened which the Apostles did not foresee. You may contend that the corruptions which have crept into the Church, the gross perversions of doctrine, the manifold abuses of later days, have necessitated a separation; have left earnest men no option but to come out of it and found new and independent "churches." You may say that polychurchism, though unknown to the New Testament (as it certainly is), has been forced on us by the finger of God. I must now, therefore, address myself to this argument. And I engage to prove that nothing, absolutely nothing, can justify a separation from the Church of God, or from a particular Church, so long as it is a Church. If it becomes no Church at all, but a synagogue of Satan, then, no doubt, you may and you must leave it, but nothing (I shall submit to you), can warrant our leaving the Church, the Church of the place, the "one body" of the baptized, so long as God has not left it. So long as He remains we must remain. The members must go with the Head. Yes, and the worse it is the more we must remain. We must remain because it is His, and because He may need our help to reform it. My next proposition, therefore, is that

V. *Holy Scripture knows of no Church which was not more or less corrupt, whilst it tells of some which were grossly corrupt; as corrupt, to say the least, as any national Church of later days.* I have said that Scripture knows of no pure Church; I might have said

September 14, 1898.

up in some confusion, he escaped and no-

rance it is a wonder, died on his bed, yet not until after his Thirty years later, Prague were sent to Romanists could not former, alive, seeing to his Maker, it was uld be taken up and into the River Swift. by the Swift to the to the sea. "These Fuller, "are emblem- ich, he adds, "is now world."

INTING.

-the most important d in this or in any he invention of print-

To William Caxton roduction of the art an English boy, but y acquiring a know- en letters. The in- earlier in Germany. own as the Mazarine it request that a copy nearly £3,000. The in number in this years 350 printing in England. With ledge naturally arose, ch instrumental in schools and colleges. nes that the Church nement of learning, without foundation; ey of London we read the Church in the year 1140. At the y, William of Wyke- founded Winchester location of his scho- ollege, Oxford, was ent patron. Others o we find that Eton ry VI. Long before y of the City of Lon- nt for permission to heir parishes. The to show that the ucational movement.

s. Tudors, though the agers and difficulties, aty. The Pope's and for ever, the f its lawful property, olated, the King's t of the proceeds— y former benefac- remained—as it still England.

The elder, Arthur, herine of Arragon, t. The second son, II., was then only a o secure the worldly ed him in marriage ge was irregular, and Pope was necessary children were born save one, and that

#### HILD AT HOME."

unkind indeed who conferred upon him istinate that he does of your offer! If on, be equally firm other minister who ftly; are you aware

ible bears the arms d at Mentz, in 1462. 166, two copies are Library at Leipsic.