

count of what had happened, either by cable or mail, a notable event in the history of the Anglican Communion would not have passed so little chronicled, that even now it is unknown to the great majority of Church people. The Roman Catholics and the Dissenters are wiser in this respect. The former flash the remarks of this Cardinal or that Archbishop on the most trifling affairs all over the world, and the latter also take good care to use the press as a means of keeping themselves before the public. Self-glorification and self-advertising we heartily deprecate; but there is a difference between these and simply making known through the medium of the secular press great events in the Church's history and important crises through which she passes.

How, it has been asked, has the consolidation of the Church in Canada affected its position with regard to the Church at home? The answer to such a question is, only so far as was necessary to secure greater power for the extension of the Church in Canada and to obtain unanimity of action. So far as this, and only so far, has there been any change in its relations to the mother Church. In its solemn declaration the Synod said, "We declare this Church to be, and desire it shall continue, in full communion with the Church of England throughout the world." No principles, no forms, no creeds, no articles of faith have been touched by what has been done.

Our readers who know how long and earnestly we have ever promoted the idea of reunion, will be interested at hearing that the first General Synod of the Canadian Church formally adopted the four Home Reunion Lambeth Conference articles of 1888 as a basis on which approach might be made towards that end. It is peculiarly gratifying to find the Synod among its very earliest actions thus recognising the immense importance of the question of Home Reunion and taking a definite step to advance it.

Some prominent Church people are inquiring whether the Church in other parts abroad is likely to follow the example which has been set by Canada in raising her Metropolitans to the rank of Archbishop. If they were all to do so, we might have, in addition to the two Archbishops in Canada, an Archbishop in the West Indies (Jamaica), Australia (Sydney), South Africa (Capetown), India (Calcutta), and New Zealand (Auckland). If the ancient Archbishopric of St. Andrews were also revived, as some have suggested, the Anglican Communion would then have, with the two English and the two Irish Archbishops, no fewer than twelve Archbishops. This is, however, not at all likely at present. Australia and the West Indies are probably the places which will be the first to follow in the steps of Canada. As for ourselves, we should regard it as a very good thing if the South African and Australian Churches were immediately to take some definite steps in that direction. In Australia the matter has already been discussed, but nothing practical has yet been done. Otherwise, the island continent might have had the honour in this respect also of justifying its title of "Advance, Australia." It may still be second, if it does not delay.

The men of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew are very dear to me. They are a centre of unity, a bond of strength, a source of enthusiasm, a depot of supply for help, a trolley-line of distribution of the supply, a power for awakening good in young men's hearts and a power for conserving it awakened. I love and thank them all.—*Bishop Tuttle, Missouri.*

## POLYCHURCHISM.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH HAMMOND.

*From the Church Times.*

[CONTINUED].

I now come to the last link in the chain, and with it to the end of my seemingly ungracious, but really charitable and necessary task. I affirm in the last place that—

VI. *Holy Scripture teaches us, and in the most emphatic and decisive way, that, whatever may be the corruptions of the Church, we must on no account separate from it.* I submit to you that the Book of God instructs us to put notorious and impenitent sinners out of communion; to teach us to separate from the errors and abuses of the Church (by protesting against them, by resisting them, by striving to reform them), but it nowhere teaches that we ourselves are to leave it; on the contrary, it requires us to remain in it. It does this, first, by the example of our sacred Lord who voluntarily—when there was no inherent necessity that He should do so—became a member of the Jewish Church, gangrened as it was with hypocrisy and formalism and greed; Who remained a member—just as the prophets had done before—and a conspicuously conforming member, for He religiously attended both temple and synagogue, and Who lived and died in its communion. Secondly, by the precepts of our Lord, Who, among other things, charged His disciples to observe and do "all things whatsoever" the Scribes and the Pharisees bade them to do—those same Scribes and Pharisees whose deeds in the next breath, He denounced in such scathing words. Thirdly, by our Lord's language and attitude towards the "seven Churches of Asia," one of which "was dead," and in another of which His servants, the Church members, were taught to commit fornication and to join in idolatries, and yet He addresses these Churches as His, and never says one word about secession. He does threaten to remove the candlestick out of its place (as indeed He has done); He even threatens to "spew them out of His mouth," but He never counsels separation—not even as a last resort, if every other means should fail. It is now allowed by some Dissenters that secession can only become a duty as a last resort—"after all means have been tried and after it is clear that a majority of the Church have ceased to keep Christ's word and have denied his name." But our Lord says nothing about secession "after all means have been tried," as He must have done, if secession is ever a duty or a remedy. Fourthly, by the attitude of the Apostles, who, as their Epistles plainly show, had to do with frightfully corrupt Churches, yet never spoke of secession. "Neither St. Paul," says Wesley, "nor any other of the inspired writers ever advised holy men to separate from the Church because the ministers were unholy," nor, we may add, for any other reason whatsoever. And not only so, but they denounce all divisions within the Church; how much more, therefore, separation from it? For, if factions and strife which do not lead to an open rupture are condemned, how much more would the Apostles have reprobated the open rupture itself, had it occurred to them that men could or would separate from Christ's Church, God's Church? But separation is also condemned, fifthly, by the principles of the Apostles, for St. Paul clearly held the principle of the "one body" to be as fundamental as that of the "one Lord," or "one Spirit," or "one God and Father of all;" he also held this body to be the household or family of God. But if this is so—and it cannot be denied—then it follows that whatever the diseases of the body, men must not leave it so long as the Head remains; but whatever the

errors or misdeeds of some members of God's family, the others must not desert them—their misguided brothers—and set up a new family. "It is only," says Wesley, "when our love grows cold that we can think of separating from our brethren." He might with equal truth have added that it is only when we forget the example of Christ, the teaching of Christ, the prayer of Christ, and at the same time forget the example, the principles, and the precepts of the Apostles that we can think of separation at all, I therefore submit to you that you are not entitled to say that though there was no Dissent in the Apostolic age, and no Church other than the Church of the city or country, yet the creation of separatist "Churches" has been necessitated and is justified by the errors and abuses, which have since arisen in Christendom. I say that you cannot take this ground, because those errors and abuses, in England at least—and it is with England that we are concerned—have not been greater than those of the Jewish Church, which our Saviour nevertheless did not leave; not greater than those of the Church of Sardis, which He neither required nor permitted men to leave: or than those of the Church of Corinth, which the Apostle: neither left nor counselled others to leave.

And there are, of course, arguments which I might use, had I not limited myself in this paper to an appeal to Holy Scripture. I might ask, for example, whether secession can ever be a remedy for the corruptions of the Church? Whether that remedy, as Irenaeus pointed out long ago, is not worse than the disease? I might ask whether "union is strength," or division? I might show that "our unhappy divisions" have silenced the voice of the Church, have weakened her witness, have impaired her force, have exasperated her members, have brought her into profound contempt. But this would be to travel out of my proper province, which is the teaching of Scripture on the subject of *polychurchism*. I therefore proceed to sum up my argument, which I shall put before you in the shape of questions, to which I earnestly and respectfully solicit an answer. And I suggest to you that, lying as they do at the very root of the matter, they should be answered one way or another before I am required to deal with objections. It is in the interests of truth and of reunion that I press for an answer.

1. Is the word "Churches" ever used in Holy Writ as it is used in the Prospectus and proceedings of this Conference, and as it is constantly used in newspapers, in pulpits, and on platforms to designate bodies which have separated from the parent stock? Is it ever given to congregations of Christians other than the congregation of the city or country? If so, Where?

2. Is there any Scripture precedent for calling voluntary associations of Christians professing a particular form of Christianity—such, for example, as Baptist principles, or Wesleyan principles, or teetotal views (as we have had a "teetotal Church")—is there any precedent for calling sectional bodies "Churches?" If so, in what Epistle is it found?

3. Is there any mention of any dissenting Church, or indeed of separatists at all, in the pages of the New Testament; or any mention except to condemn them? If there is, where is that page to be found?

4. Is it or is it not the fact that the Apostles forbid divisions within the Church? And if divisions within are sinful, can divisions which led to separation, to an open rupture, be sinless? If so, on what grounds?

5. Is it or is it not the case that the Church is described as "one body?" But if so, how can it be composed of two hundred separate and independent "bodies?"

6. If the name of "Churches" is never given to separatist bodies, and if indeed no such bodies existed—notwithstanding the errors and abuses of the Apostolic age—then on what grounds can