

appeals, as does our Church in her sixth article, with absolute submission, to the supreme authority of the Scriptures alone?

Lastly, as to types. Six instances out of thirty-three are all I can discover in which our Lord makes distinct use of types as media for His teaching—*i.e.*, (1) His reference to the living water in the desert, and (2) to the manna; (3) to Jonah's three days and nights in the fish's belly; (4) to the salt of the sacrifices; (5) to the serpent in the wilderness; (6) to the flood as typical of the end of this age. Sufficient, perhaps, to allow this growing method of interpretation to be used with moderation and care, not sufficient to give full play to the fancies of Origen and his followers in our day. But had there been no truth in this method of handling the word of God, as is sometimes alleged, we might have expected He would denounce its prevalence, and, at least, that He would not have adopted it, even to this limited degree.

I do not pretend to have solved the old-standing problems which have gathered round some of these quotations, or to be satisfied with the solutions of them I have met with elsewhere; but He who lays stones in Zion to catch the foot of pride has said, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

Let me add, after careful, and I hope impartial, examination of these quotations, my undoubted conviction that our Lord entirely believed in the historical veracity of the Old Testament—that is, in the actual occurrence of the events, and in the actual existence of the persons to whom He referred. It seems impossible to suppose He ever gave any sanction to pious fraud, or pretended a book was written by one man when He knew it was written by another, the very thought of which is like blasphemy against Him who was at once the *Verax*, the *Verus*, and the *Veritas*.

FRANCIS GELL.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETIES.

WHAT would most amaze an English monk of the fifteenth century, could he come from Hades and see his native land at the present day? He would, of course, be bewildered by a whole world of new things, which have come into our national life since he and his brother monks walked their old cloisters and repeated their daily offices. He would be confused by the foreignness of it all. There would be little or nothing in our public or private ways as English people to

recall his own experiences when he was a dweller and a worker upon earth. Like a young child taken to see the engine-room of a ship, he might be impressed, but he would not understand.

In Church matters our visitor would be more at home. He would recognise the facts of prayer and worship and spiritual service, in spite of the altered forms in which they now exist and operate. He would catch dim resemblances of the old orders of clergy. He would detect familiar features in the cathedrals and ancient parish churches. And the Book of Common Prayer—would not that appeal to him? But when he came to inquire into the methods of work in the English Church, how much there would be in these to startle and make afraid!

To take only one instance—the Church's use of Societies. This would surely take away the breath of a man who had been trained in the ideas of the Church of the fifteenth century, and sent back from Hades to see the English Church of the twentieth century. What a miracle of dangerous liberty for the rank and file of ordinary humanity it would seem to him; what a strange devolution of authority from the dignitaries of the Church to unofficial members of the Church; and what an extraordinary lack of ceremonial our visitor would feel in it all! Truly, the place of Societies in the life of the English Church, and the work they do, and the power they wield, and the liturgical bareness of their methods, would be the most astonishing phenomenon to eyes and to a mind accustomed to fifteenth-century Church ways.

And yet, if the man had some of the spirit of a Gregory or of a Cyprian, we may believe that he would, after due reflection, come to see that the Church had not lost but rather gained by the expression of her life, and the operating of her ministries through the agencies of manifold Societies.

It is true that in some form or other Societies have always existed in the Church. Even in our Lord's day there was the little company of holy women who made it their business to minister to the Lord of their substance. And since then there has been a never-ceasing succession of distinct bodies of men or of women within the borders of the Church, who have organized themselves on definite lines and for special religious purposes. We do not forget all this, and yet we venture to think that none of these ancient associations of Christian men or women were more than distant relations of what we now know as "Societies," with their modern spirit, and their modern machinery of committees and secretaries, and annual subscriptions, and sermons, and meetings, and reports.

As living and working parts of the Church there is undoubtedly a connection between the old and the new. But

the new has taken to it such fresh elements, and has won such unprecedented liberty and power, that it seems more like a creation of modern times than an evolution from what has been existing and operating through centuries before.

When it is asked, Whence are these Societies? how came they to begin their career? and what gave them the peculiar features which mark them? we find that in their forms and methods they are very largely the product of the practical spirit which has worked in the English race during the last three centuries. What the English nation has been in its commercial and industrial development, the English Church has been to a large extent in the organization and conduct of its business affairs. The latter has learnt from the former. The Church has shared in the marvellous quickening and expansion which came to the nation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Renaissance was followed by the Reformation. And out of both—the quickening of intellect and the quickening of soul—our nation and our Church gained the modern qualities which work in them at the present time.

The immediate cause which made Societies take shape and begin their action within the Church was a recoil on the part of a few righteous souls from the fashionable and powerful immorality which the Restoration brought with it, and a resolve to make an organized protest against it. For this high purpose private religious associations or guilds were formed about 1685 under the leadership of Drs. Horneck and Beveridge and Mr. Smithies. "These guilds met frequently for devotional exercises, and their members systematically undertook certain good works. They were instrumental in bringing about more frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion, the holding of daily services, and the establishment of schools and ministrations to prisoners and the sick" (Dr. Woodward's "History of the Religious Societies," London, 1701).

In all this we look in vain for that corporate action on the part of the Church, which is sometimes held up as being the only legitimate form of Church activity in missionary and philanthropic effort for Churchpeople to sympathize with and support. It is individualism pure and simple. And had the earnest Churchmen of the seventeenth century, whose bold action resulted in the birth of the modern Society, waited for the Church authorities of their day to move and give them a lead in their holy crusade against the world and the deadness of the Church herself, the great work which their individual daring accomplished would never have been done at all.

From efforts of a private kind and for ends of a personal nature the founders of the first of our modern religious Societies proceeded to larger and more public ventures. In

1692 they launched on the troubled sea of English public life what were called "Societies for Reformation of Manners." These were undenominational organizations. Their purpose was for enforcing the law against profanity and vice, for inspecting disorderly houses, and for summoning guilty parties before the judges.

The Societies had a mixed reception from Churchpeople. Some approved and others strongly disapproved, the objectors urging that the aim of the Societies might be more satisfactorily accomplished by means of the ordinary Church services than by playing the part of "common informer" against criminals (Hore's "History of the Church of England," p. 403).

No success seems to have attended the experiment. The first attempt to found a modern Church Society was therefore a failure. Its motive was good, but its method was faulty. Hence its speedy dissolution.

The next attempt to produce a modern Church Society was more successful. It lives and flourishes to-day as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Five men have the undying honour of being the human originators of this grand work. Their names are Lord Guilford, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Justice Hook, Colonel Colchester, and Dr. Bray. These are the fathers of the wonderful system of Societies by which the English Church does more than half her administrative and missionary work at the present day. The time will come when the Church will realize her debt to these men, and do them proper honour. Their object in founding the Church's first Society on modern lines was to provide gratuitous instruction to the poor, to supply Bibles and religious books at a cheap rate, and, further, to attempt missionary work abroad. The year of this epoch-making effort was 1698.

Three years later it formed a branch for missionary work in the American Colonies. This obtained a Charter in 1701 under the name of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, a name which has been borne by three Societies. Under Cromwell's auspices the House of Commons established a Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. The Restoration put an end to this scheme, but Robert Boyle revived it, and formed a second S.P.G., which exists to this day under the name of the New England Company (*vide* "One Hundred Years of the C.M.S.," by Mr. E. Stock, p. 3).

For a time it seemed as though the Church would welcome the rise of Societies as a legitimate and valuable development

of her missionary life. The Primate, Archbishop Tenison, went so far as to issue a circular letter in April, 1699, in which it was urged that the clergy of every neighbourhood should institute local Societies for the reformation of men's lives and manners; and it was further directed that the laity should be asked to co-operate in the effort (Perry's "English Church History," p. 562).

It was not long, however, before a great jealousy sprang up in many Churchpeople against the new institutions. The undenominational constitution of some of the new Societies was distrusted. The presence of Dissenters was said to weaken and overthrow Church principles. The new Societies were further charged with being a cloak for Jacobinism. Thus began that guerilla warfare against Societies which is still active in some quarters at the present moment. Alas! the ill-feeling of suspicious Churchpeople at the beginning of the eighteenth century against the proposed increase of Societies prevailed. Nearly one hundred years had to pass before the real springtime for the growth of Societies as parts of the best life of the Church came. And what a dreary, barren period the long interval was! In 1747 Bishop Butler refused the Primacy because he thought it was too late to save a falling Church.

The clergy were "courtiers, politicians, merchants, usurers, civil magistrates, sportsmen, musicians, stewards of country squires, tools of men in power" (Archdeacon Blackburne's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury).

Some Bishops visited their dioceses but once in three years; some never visited them at all. Meanwhile, infidelity was rampant. Coarseness and profanity were common among all classes.

The bright spot in the darkness was the beginning of the revival of religious life in 1729, under Wesley and Whitefield.

At the end of the eighteenth century there came to the Church the great Evangelical movement, led by Cecil in London, Venn at Huddersfield, Milner at Hull, and Simeon at Cambridge.

The Evangelical movement inaugurated by these and others likeminded with them at the close of the eighteenth century is the principal seed-plot out of which the Church's modern Societies have sprung. From this time onward Societies have risen as willows by the watercourses. As a High Church historian puts it: "How great that reaction has been, the extraordinary development of the Church of England which the nineteenth century has exhibited, abundantly testifies" (Perry's "English Church History," p. 593). Sufficient has been said to show the genuineness of the connection of

Church Societies with the Church herself as natural and proper issues of the growing life of the Church. They are in no sense mere accretions which have gathered upon the Church. They are indisputably the fruit of the Holy Spirit, and as such they are the living organs of the Body of Christ. To question this is to question the whole history of the Church during the last two centuries.

While all this is generally accepted, however, it is not so largely realized that the Societies of the Church have been, and still are, the "safety valves" of the Church. Were it not for these vehicles and outlets of her spiritual energy, the Church of England would be a more labouring and groaning and mutually conflicting body than she is. Party spirit would be more malignant, party feuds more reckless, party cries more unreasoning. The very narrowness of her bounds, were Societies to be taken away from her, together with the choking restriction which would then of necessity mark her life and work, would be for the confusion and degeneration of the Church, and not for her order and progress. God, however, who governs His Church as well as His world, has so ordered that in these "last times" the new forces which have come to His people's feelings and thoughts should find outlets for their working and instruments for their power. Hence the rise of Societies, with all their manifold serving and striving.

There remains the subject of the relation of the individual Churchman or Churchwoman to his or her particular Societies. Societies being frankly partizan, the question arises, How far do Societies help to develop the Christian manhood or womanhood of their supporters? There can be but little doubt that one's special "pet" Societies do stimulate Christian zeal and call out self-denying effort. This can be easily tested by a reference to what the C.M.S. or the S.P.G. does in these directions to their most earnest supporters. There is a widening of outlook, to say the least; for what intelligent and earnest member of a missionary Society can fail to see more and feel more of God's working for the race, and of the race's need of God, as a result of the interest which he takes in the Society's doings? And does not membership in a missionary Society bring some increased sense of the Church's destiny as the Divine instrument for sowing the world with righteousness? It ought and will do so, if the Society and the supporters of it are ready to do the will of God. Then, too, there is the clarifying of party principles, and the consecrating of party enthusiasm which the support of party Societies by members of the different schools in the Church usually brings. Many an Evangelical Churchman

has not clearly seen the principles for which the word Evangelical stands, until he asks himself why he should support a Society belonging to his own school of thought rather than another Society which is connected with a different school. The need for some justification of his preference compels him to sort his ideas and set in order his convictions.

And what shall be said of Societies as means for consecrating and employing party enthusiasm for the highest ends? When we take the case of the laborious efforts of the Committee of "King Edward's Hospital Fund," aided by the powerful leadership of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and supported by England's nobility and merchant princes and the press, to raise an income of £100,000 a year, and then take the case of a Society like the C.M.S., which raises close upon £400,000 a year without the aid of royalty or the leaders of the money-world, and in spite of the indifference of the secular press, we see what party enthusiasm can do when the Holy Spirit of God is in it, and when real missionary feeling is at the back of it.

The difference is indeed great. But does the Church realize it? Is she conscious of what she owes to Societies? Does she ever make an articulate acknowledgment of the fact that half of her practical work is done by these Societies? We do not think so. Occasionally an empty canonry or prebendaryship is spared for the chief secretary of a missionary Society. Sometimes a Bishop will preside at the anniversary meeting, or allow his name to be set down as one of the vice-presidents of a Society. Beyond these, very little recognition is made by the Church of the enormous debt which the Church owes to the institutions which, begun two centuries ago in the face of much ecclesiastical opposition, are now more actually and powerfully in touch with the real life of mankind than the Episcopate itself.

HENRY LEWIS.

SACRIFICE: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

IT would need a treatise of very considerable bulk to trace out, even in an approximately adequate manner, the evolution of man's conceptions regarding sacrifice. For sacrifice presupposes the existence of a god, or superior power, of some kind; therefore man's conceptions of sacrifice will vary according to his different ideas regarding this higher power. For an adequate treatment, therefore, of this subject it would be necessary to deal with four great stages of religious evolution—namely, Animism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Chris-