

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Church Congress met this year at Stoke. It was not so well attended as last year's Congress, which met in Cambridge. For last year was the jubilee year of the Congress, and Cambridge is better than Stoke for those who delight in Congresses. Yet it was at Stoke and not at Cambridge that the most revolutionary word ever heard at a Congress was spoken. When all the rest are forgotten, the Congress at Stoke is likely to be remembered.

It was in a sermon that this word was spoken, in a sermon by the Bishop of London. When the Congress met at Stoke, in the heart of the Potteries, the conviction seems to have been borne in upon the mind of the Bishop of London, that the place was suitable and the time opportune for inviting the Church of England to a departure in policy that can scarcely be carried out without a revolution.

For the doctrine of the Church of England has hitherto been, that for those who are unhappy here a heaven of happiness is waiting beyond the grave. Its practice has been to leave them therefore in their unhappiness. But the Bishop of London sees clearly now that those who are unhappy here decline the offer of a future heaven of happiness. They demand that they shall at least have the chance of being happy here. This

demand, in the language of his text, the Bishop calls 'new wine.' And he asks his fellow-Churchmen at the Church Congress, Do they intend to let this 'new wine' burst the 'old bottles' of Church doctrine and practice, or are they ready to provide new bottles for it?

'There is a strong new wine working in the hearts and brains of thousands to-day. Thousands believe to-day that there is a possibility of equality of opportunity for all. Thousands believe that this grinding poverty which some of us have seen in great cities before our eyes is unnecessary, and should come to an end. Thousands look forward with hope to a day when each child shall have a chance, and no one shall be—to use a terrible phrase—"damned into the world." Thousands believe that literally a Kingdom of God is "at hand." They are tired of hearing of a heaven in another world; they believe they were promised a heaven on earth. They complain, with Clough, of Christian people that—

They mark off so much sky
And call it Heaven;
Place bliss and glory there,
Plant perfect homes in the unsubstantial sky,
And say what is not will be by and by.'

The Bishop of London does not invite the Church of England to deny the existence of

heaven. He even invites his fellow-Churchmen to think more of heaven, less of earth—for themselves; but he entreats them to think more of earth and less of heaven for others. For he says that thousands of men and women are set upon seeing at least the beginning of a heaven upon earth. He says it is a modest heaven. 'It is not large mansions or princely incomes. It is more time to think and greater leisure from toil, a living wage and a help towards being independent in old age instead of going to the work-house, co-operation the ruling motive of life and work instead of cut-throat competition, and peace among nations instead of war.'

Now all this is no doubt evident enough and enough platitudinous. And if the Bishop of London had said no more than this, he would have received the applause and probably the heartfelt thanks of the Church Congress. But when he proceeded to say, 'This is the beautiful dream which is at the bottom of the Labour movement in this country, and which I found animating Labour Day last summer in Canada, and which, though mixed up with many unsatisfactory elements, is, I expect, the inspiration of what is called "Socialism" abroad, and the cause of the tremendous strides which it has made'; and when he asked, 'What Christian can deny that the dream is a beautiful and a Christian dream, and that the wine in itself, undiluted, might have been created at Cana of Galilee?'—then the men and women who were present knew for what purpose God's hand had been heavy on them to bring them to Stoke.

There are two important facts about the Labour movement in this country which force themselves upon the attention of the Bishop of London. The first is, that it is a religious movement. The second is, that it is outside the Church.

It is a religious movement. 'The Labour movement in this country,' says Dr. WINNINGTON

INGRAM, 'is avowedly and definitely religious.' And he recommends any one who doubts the statement to send to the Warden of Browning Hall, Walworth, for a pamphlet entitled *Christ and Labour*, which contains addresses delivered in Labour Week of the present year by eleven Labour Members of Parliament. He makes quotations from these addresses. This quotation from the address of Mr. PARKER, M.P. for Halifax, is a fair example. His topic is the Power of Vision. He says: 'It is our business to keep the Vision in front of us—that we have to work for the other fellow, to give to the whole of the people a life worthy of the living. So only can we accomplish the purpose of the Divine Master, whom we all, I am sure, in our heart of hearts desire to follow.'

But while it is a religious movement, it is outside organized Christianity, it is outside the Church. 'Why,' asks the Bishop of London, 'do scarcely any of these men belong to the Church of England? Why in the recent strike had the Church so little influence? Why do they not turn, as you would naturally suppose they would, to the Church which was founded two thousand years ago to preach and teach these very ideas, and to hold up just this ideal to the world? Why are these men not looking more than they are to the historic Church of Jesus Christ for sympathy, guidance, and advice?' He answers his own questions.

The first answer he gives is that Church people are influenced by class prejudice. It was a difficult thing to say. The Church people who heard him were 'probably the kindest-hearted people in the world,' 'clergy and clergy's wives and daughters, men and women who toil day and night for the good of their parishioners, who would give, and perhaps have given, the coat off their backs for the poor committed to their charge.' Quoting the layman who writes *Across the Bridges*, 'The black guard,' said the Bishop of London, 'never fails.'

And yet: 'We clergy are largely drawn from one class. The lay people who have leisure to attend such a Congress as this are wholly drawn from that class. We are apt to like the poor so long as they keep in their proper place. We read our class newspapers, and hear our class conversation over the tea-table or after dinner, and in all we do and say class feeling insensibly makes itself felt.'

And what is the effect of this class feeling? It makes it simply impossible for man or woman of the one class to show sympathy for man or woman of the other. Real sympathy requires that heart be put to heart and mind to mind. 'Unless we realize,' says Dr. INGRAM, 'that that young workman is as proud and sensitive as our own young brother who has come home from the university or from Sandhurst; unless we realize that he does not really want charity or pity or being preached at any more than the other; that he wants to stand on his own feet and look the whole world in the face, and have a man's life with some leisure in it and time to read and think, and an honourable opportunity to court his girl and a home to take her to, and that nothing else that we can give him will do instead, nothing else but the treatment of a man—until we realize that, we have not given him the sympathy which we so desire to give.'

And what the young men need, the girls and women need also. Not clubs and mothers' meetings only. Not good advice only. That girl must have shorter hours. She ought never to hear what she has to hear where she works. 'Her soul,' says the Bishop of London, 'is the soul of a queen. She is a daughter of God. She should be able to carry her head, as your girl does, with the proud consciousness of perfect innocence, and be able, though she works in a pottery, to lay her crown of flawless purity at the feet of her Saviour when she meets Him at the last.'

'That young mother should not work in a factory at all. She should be the keeper of the home. She should have rest before the

child is born and rest after, if the children of the nation are to be its joy. It is not enough to give her a little good advice at the Mothers' Meeting about not taking stimulants or drugs; she should have a life in which she will not feel the need of either—a life in which she can play her true part as wife and mother, while the man has a wage which will keep the whole family from want.'

What is it that has kept the Church of England from accomplishing this? Is it class prejudice alone? There is another reason.

'It happened,' says the Bishop of London, 'that at the same time this summer that I was studying the addresses given in Labour Week, I was also reading the last two volumes of the singularly interesting *History of the Church of England*, edited by the late Dean of Winchester. These last two volumes are by the Vice-Provost of Eton, and bring the history of the Church down to the present time. The first volume consists of 350 pages, and the second of 450. They give a perfectly frank and true account of what the Church of England has been really interested in during the last hundred years, of the subjects which have crowded its meetings, excited its debates, and sometimes almost torn it to pieces. Of these 800 pages about 400 are devoted to the Ritual question. Are vestments to be worn or not? Is incense to be burnt or not? Is a stole legal? Now I should be the last to deny the importance of some of these controversies, but it is hard to realize how trivial, how petty, many of them must have seemed to the toiling millions of our fellow-countrymen. There they were, fighting and struggling for daily bread; here were we convulsed with the question of the legality of a stole.'

'Revive thy work, O Lord.' The prayer proceeds uninterruptedly. It is the prayer of thousands; it is a prayer of faith. Yet no revival comes. Is it possible that such a revival as we pray for would not be good for us?

Professor T. B. KILPATRICK, of Toronto, has written a book on *New Testament Evangelism* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). He does not confound evangelism with revivalism. 'It ought to be stated, clearly and emphatically,' he says, 'that to make evangelism a synonym of revivalism is to be untrue to the teaching of the New Testament.' Evangelism is the work of man, revivalism is the work of God. To evangelize is to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation through Christ. A revival may be the result of the proclamation, and it may not. But if it is—and this is the point—the character of the evangelism will determine the quality of the revival.

It is necessary, then, that we should not only pray for a revival, but also work for the right kind of revival. Of what character ought the evangelism to be that the fruit of it may be a revival that will be good for us?

First, the message delivered must be complete. A revival of a kind, says Dr. KILPATRICK, may be and has been given on an inadequate gospel. But it may be that at the present time God is waiting until the gospel is proclaimed in its fulness. Let us enlarge it to the depth of human need and to the scope of divine revelation. And let us attend to the balance of parts, not emphasizing one element in its discovery of God or its appeal to man, to the exclusion of others, but recognizing the manifoldness of the grace of God.

After the message the evangelist. For Dr. KILPATRICK has nothing but contempt for the miserable quibble that separates the man from the messenger. 'The power of God to save does not operate magically, whether through a rite or a book or an uttered phrase. It operates normally, upon men, through men. It must therefore manifest itself in those who preach the gospel as a regenerative and sanctifying energy before it can be proclaimed to others as capable of achieving like results in their experience. *An un-Christlike evangelist is a moral horror.*'

Can Dr. KILPATRICK tell us, then, what is the right kind of revival to expect and pray for? It is a revival, he says, that has depth, extension, and permanence.

It has depth. To preach Christ truly is to break up the deeps of the human spirit, to lead to great repentance and a mighty decision, and to inaugurate revolutionary changes in life and character.

It has extension. To preach Christ truly is to proclaim Him Lord of all. It is to include within His sovereignty the whole of life. A revival which makes a speciality of 'holiness,' while neglecting the plain virtues of truthfulness and integrity, is a scandalous misrepresentation of the demands of the gospel and the claims of Christ.

And it has permanence. To preach Christ truly is to preach Him as the abiding source of redemptive power, to summon men to a continual activity of trust and obedience, and to keep them in solemn remembrance of the final estimate of life at which the Saviour shall preside as Judge.

When the historian of the reign of David had completed his history, he found that there were mighty men whose deeds he had left unrecorded. And he gathered them all together, men and deeds, and placed them one after another in the 23rd chapter of the Second Book of Samuel. Of these men, the mightiest in the opinion of after ages, though they are not placed first by the historian, are three who broke through the Philistine garrison, and fetched David the water that he longed for from the well of Bethlehem.

The historian's purpose is to describe the three warriors and their mighty deed. But in doing so he describes David. It was at the hottest time of the wars with the Philistines. David had the worst of it, and had taken refuge in the cave of

Adullam, while the garrison of the Philistines was in possession of Bethlehem. David's mind returned to the scenes of his early youth. Every spot desecrated by the presence of the Philistine host was familiar to him. There was nothing he would not have dared in order to drive the Philistine garrison out of Bethlehem. Suddenly his desire and his powerlessness met together. The thought of one particular well of water came overwhelmingly upon him, its refreshing coolness, its utter inaccessibility. The cry escaped him: 'Oh that one would give me water to drink of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!' The three men heard it. They brake through the host of the Philistines and drew water from the well of Bethlehem, which was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David. But he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord. And he said, 'Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: Shall I drink the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?'

Not many of the mighty deeds which history has recorded move us more than this. There is not a flaw in it or in the record of it. The David who longed for the water of the well of Bethlehem is the David who has won the heart of humanity. The David who would not drink of the water, but poured it out unto the Lord, is the David who has moved the souls of the most religious among men.

Now, there are two discoveries which men have to make in life, and that day David made them both. The first discovery is the value of water, and the second is the value of blood.

David that day discovered the value of water. It is one of the necessaries of life; in the East it is the greatest of all. Is not the earliest song on record the Song of the Well? There was no way in which the ruler of a nation could more beneficially occupy himself than in the digging of wells. There was no way by which an invading army

could more speedily bring the people to submission than by stopping up the wells of water.

It is one of the necessaries of life. And like all the necessaries of life it is a gift of God. But it has to be toiled for. To be sent to be hewers of wood and drawers of water—it was almost the degradation of toil and barely removed from slavery. See how the worn stone at the mouth of the well speaks of the times that women have 'come hither to draw,' and the gladness with which they would have welcomed any promise of relief from the drudgery.

David had often drunk of the water of the well of Bethlehem in the careless spring morning of his youth. Now he knew the value of it. He had come through much toil, he had suffered many disappointments, since he drank so carelessly of the water of the well of Bethlehem that is by the gate. Life had proved harder than he expected, harder, it may be, than he thought he had a right to expect. He no longer fancied that the earth was an easy place to live in. He had come to take life seriously. But it was not till that sudden longing came upon him for the water of the well of Bethlehem that he realized how difficult life is. It was not until the three men returned with the water that he understood how much it costs to provide life even with its necessaries.

This, then, is the first great discovery that we have to make. We have to discover the value of water. To some it comes early. And sometimes it is very pitiful to see the careful face above the half-developed body. Yet these are not the most to be pitied. More to be pitied are they who above the broad chest of manhood carry a face that has no lines of care in it.

The other great discovery is the value of blood. David made it at the same time. It was when the men returned with the water that he discovered the value of water, and it was when they returned with the water that he discovered the value of

blood. For the blood is the life. These men had gone in jeopardy of their lives to bring the water. And when they brought it, he would not drink of it. He said, It is the blood of the men. And he poured it out unto the Lord.

What does the world say? It says David was a fool for his pains, a sentimental fool. For the world, which has taken him home to its heart because he was so human and longed for the water of the well of Bethlehem, sees no sense in the pouring out of the water when he got it. Of course, the men went in jeopardy of their lives. That is what men are for. And if we are to consider the cost of all the necessaries of life, the cost to other people, when should we have time for life's enjoyments?

'The ground of a certain rich man brought

forth plentifully: and he reasoned within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns and build greater; and there will I bestow all my corn and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool.'

Thou fool? What had he done? He had learned the value of water. Life was no plaything to him. He had toiled in youth and he had toiled in manhood. If he had prospered, he knew what it had cost him. 'I will pull down my barns and build greater.' Why should he not? But God said unto him, Thou fool. He had learned the value of water. But he had not learned the value of blood.

The Missionary Idea in the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. GEORGE JACKSON, B.A., VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA.

FROM two different quarters the call comes to us to-day for a re-examination of the charter of missionary enterprise. On the one hand, the revival of missionary interest and effort, which received such unexampled expression in the Edinburgh Conference of last year, is leading men to investigate anew the whole ground of the missionary appeal. On the other hand, modern New Testament criticism, in its attempt to get behind the reporters of Jesus to Jesus Himself, sometimes questions our right to use—or at least to use in the old way—some of the texts which have long done duty in the missionary cause. The moment, therefore, seems opportune for considering afresh the nature and strength of the missionary argument as it is to be found in the Gospels. When we send our missionaries to press the Christian faith on the peoples of other lands, is our action in line with Christ's own purpose? Can the appeal to the Churches at home plead His sovereign sanction and authority? St. Paul, we know, was a missionary; his eager spirit broke the

bonds of Jewish exclusiveness and drove him forth on the world's highways to make known unto all men the gospel of the grace of God; but Jesus lived and died within the narrow limits of the Holy Land. Then is it to Paul rather than to Jesus that we must look as the founder of missions? Here, shall we say, is another example of the way in which the strong and masterful personality of the Apostle has dominated the whole Christian Church; or, may we see behind St. Paul the figure of Another who said once, and who says still, to all who believe in Him, 'Go ye into all the world'? Such is our question. In seeking to answer it I shall, for well understood reasons, limit myself mainly to the first three Gospels.

I.

And at once it has to be admitted that our missionary 'texts' are neither so numerous nor so conclusive as perhaps we have been led to expect. There is, of course, the Great Commis-