

EXPOSITORY PREACHING

by LESLIE C. ALLEN

Assembly folk are often commended by their 'separated brethren' with the tribute 'They know their Bibles'. Many a non-conformist minister looks back in gratitude to an assembly as his training ground in knowledge of the Scriptures. Those of us who from time to time occupy the pulpits of the Free Churches have learned to appreciate the open Bible upon every lap back in the assembly and the ready reception of a Bible-based message without need of apology or justification. Of course, these very boons carry with them drawbacks, of which more anon, but boons they remain.

You are invited to speak at such and such a place. Down goes the date in your diary. As it draws nearer, some text or some passage comes knocking at the door of your mind, demanding admittance in God's name. Alternatively, it may be some broad theme or a current problem, destined to range over a variety of different passages, but, if so, this article is not primarily for you. Expository preaching means interpreting a single text or a continuous passage of Scripture in such a way that the full impact of God's Word flows through the speaker to the congregation.

EXEGESIS

Obviously the first question to ask of the text or passage is: what does it mean? Less obviously, the question must be framed in the form, not what does it mean to me here and now, nor what should it mean to the congregation, but what does it mean in its original setting? The would-be preacher must be prepared to travel back in mind to the first century A.D. or the seventh century B.C. and reconstruct the circumstances in which the human writer and the first readers or hearers lived and thought, if he takes seriously the fact that revelation is grounded in human history. The spadework of disinterring the background of ancient customs and concepts may seem an unnecessary chore for a twenty-five minute talk, but there is no shorter way. Exegesis must precede exposition. The preacher must first retire into the past and stand alongside the Biblical writer before he can bring the message up to date and stand with his audience. Exegesis draws out of the scriptural material what God has put there. Its deadly foe is *eisegesis*; reading into the text what has never been there. Pay heed to the warning couplet:

'Wonderful things in the Bible I see,
Some put there by you and some put there by me.'

C. S. Lewis was aware of this danger: 'What we see when we are looking into the depths of Scripture may sometimes be only the reflection of our own silly faces'.¹

Sit quietly with your Bibles—note the plural—around you, and hear what the text has to say. Let the words seep into your mind by repeated reading and meditation. As a general rule, the Revised Standard Version

will be the best basis for study, but other versions will also throw light on the text. The aim is to get as near as possible to the meaning of the Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek words originally used in the passage. This aim demands a version as close as possible to the text and meaning of the original, or in other words a version based on the best possible readings of ancient manuscripts and incorporating up-to-date knowledge of the Biblical languages. Strange though it may seem, much more is now known about the Biblical languages than ever was known a century ago. Moreover, discovery of early manuscripts and study of ancient versions have clarified the exact wording of the original text. It is galling to discover after much labour that your masterpiece of a message rests upon the flimsy foundation of a mistranslation or an inferior reading. It is even more galling for people in the congregation to realize it—and your ignorance of the fact.

Of course, the optimum is to read the Bible in the original languages, but comparatively few of us have both time and talent for this task. The man who is not good at languages or who does not feel impelled to pore over grammars will be best advised to rely upon secondary helps. If you must learn a Biblical language, learn it well and do not just dabble: 'a little knowledge . . .' Obviously one must know any foreign language very well in order to get more out of reading the original than out of a translation. For the non-specialist, knowledge of the Biblical languages will not so much shed immediate light on the Word as lead him to an intelligent use of lexicons, academic commentaries and such books as C. F. D. Moule's *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. For the rest of us, not given to language work, the time will be better spent on other aids. We must read our versions and paraphrases diligently. The meaning will gradually come glimmering through the welter of words. Welter, not just because the same verse or verses are being read in different translations, but because the context is being allowed to colour the passage.

KEEPING IN CONTEXT

The maxim is old but unfortunately not out of date: a text out of context becomes a pretext. The danger is always lurking close at hand, to to misquote Lewis Carroll, that 'when I use a text it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less'. The context acts as a brake on such subjectivity. Bible study involves a vicious circle that can only gradually be broken, but the effort must continually be made. One cannot know the meaning of a part before one knows the meaning of the whole; one cannot understand the whole until one has grasped the sense of the component parts. Ultimately a particular passage yields its full meaning only in the context of a whole book and the larger context of the whole Bible.

Study of the immediate context will save from many pitfalls of eisegesis. For example, the context shows that Philippians 4:19 is not a blank cheque for any Christian to drawn upon. The preceding verse has filled in who the recipients are to be: God helps those who help others. Always ask yourself: why is this verse next to that one? Try to grasp the logical

connection between the two. Sometimes the link is not obvious and one has carefully to read between the lines to perceive it. Sometimes the writer jumps back to an earlier point.

Verse divisions are an indispensable boon for quick reference, but such a bind upon exegesis. We must learn to think in terms of paragraphs, of literary units dictated by the sense rather than by any mechanical system. The juxtaposition of different incidents or themes can cast light upon the intent of the writer. Look at the way that Luke follows the parable of the Good Samaritan with the story of Martha and Mary, 'the former teaching that religion which does not express itself in practical attempts to alleviate the sufferings of humanity is religiosity, and the latter proclaiming the complementary truth that the philanthropic service rendered by the Marthas of the world tends to become fussiness, unless there lies behind it something of the contemplative and devotional attitude of Mary'.²

Once this truth about Luke 10 has been pointed out, it is immediately obvious and makes one wonder why one did not think of it oneself. The answer is partly that we have not learned to read consecutively; partly too that there is a limit to what one individual can grasp in the unaided reading of Scripture. But before turning to the question of aids in the form of commentaries and allied material, the need to link scripture with scripture should be further stressed. A Bible without references at the bottom or in the margin is of little use in the study. Look them up; see what parallel or related passages have to say. Romans and Galatians will often provide a helpful commentary upon each other in Paul's own words. Add your own cross-references as you light upon them from time to time, for instance comparing Ps. 130 and Eph. 1:7, Mal. 3:16-18 and Heb. 10:23-25, or contrasting Gen. 3:6 and Mt. 26:26, Mal. 3:17 and Rom. 8:32. A concordance will augment the marginal references and show the range of meaning of key-words. But one must be careful not to lose sight of the passage, not to confuse throwing light on a passage with submerging it among a mass of other scriptures which have other things to say.

EXTRACTING THE IMPLICIT

By this time material has been building up. One can jot down in one's own words what the text means and trace the development of the argument or the sequence of ideas. Recurrence of a word or of a refrain has been duly noted as a natural guideline. Implicit truths may be brought out by setting to work Rudyard Kipling's 'six honest serving-men':

'Their names are What and Why and When
And How and Where and Who.'

They will usually be of more value in the preparation of a message than in the presentation. Stating a positive truth in a negative form will help to uncover latent implications. Scripture sometimes does this explicitly, for example, 'Take heart . . . do not fear', 'not to please men, but to please God', 'you are living in idleness, . . . not doing any work'. Paul

does the very thing here recommended in the exposition of Rom. 4, which surely originated in a synagogue sermon or series of sermons. He is there expounding Gen. 15:6: 'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness'. He makes four points, alluding to his text each time. The first three are: (i) faith justifies, not works; (ii) faith justifies, not circumcision; (iii) faith justifies, not the Law. By these contrasts he brings out the character and importance of faith, and incidentally gives an object-lesson to his preaching brethren.

LITERARY AIDS

Eventually one reaches the limit of one's ability to understand a passage. But questions still remain unanswered, or one is not sure whether the right questions have been asked of the text. Oh for a Philip to come alongside and say, 'Do you understand what you are reading?!' Every Bible student has fellow-feeling with the Ethiopian's counter-question: 'How can I, unless someone guides me?' Brethren tend to be do-it-yourselfers and there is often much to be commended in this attitude. But one must beware of taking it too far and of misapplying it. It is tragically possible to confuse reliance on the Spirit with self-reliance and laziness. Was not Spurgeon speaking partly of our movement when he said, 'It seems odd that certain men who talk so much of what the Holy Spirit reveals to themselves should think so little of what He has revealed to others'? At least the cap has often fitted some of our number—including us at times. What do you think of this sentiment, also from that prince of preachers? 'No, my dear friends, you may take it as a rule that the Spirit of God does not usually do for us what we can do for ourselves, and that if religious knowledge is printed in a book, and we can read it, there is no necessity for the Holy Ghost to make a fresh revelation of it to us in order to screen our laziness.'

The simple truth of the matter is that God has set teachers in the Church, and some of them have committed their teaching to writing. One might feel competent to do as well or better, if one had the time at one's disposal. *Perhaps* one could, but there's the rub: if . . . Why spend our limited time re-doing what a specialist has toiled for months or even years to produce? There is, of course, a danger of turning into a 'secondhand Rose', but heeding the advice given earlier will ensure that literary helps are accessories and stimulants to one's own thinking, and not substitutes.

What of 'unsound' books, books marked with or without an asterisk in certain lists? Here 'I speak as to wise men; judge for yourselves what I say'. It is hoped that a man conscious of a gift for teaching, evangelizing or exhorting will become sufficiently mature to 'test the spirits to see whether they be of God'. At the tender age of seventeen the present writer borrowed from the school library C. H. Dodd's *The Epistle to the Romans* and, reading it with reservations, received insight into the vast significance and broad sweep of the letter. It kindled a love for Romans which has never waned, and a longing to learn more. Two points may profitably

be made. First, it is a paradoxical truism that the Bible is not only a divine book but also a human one. As a work of literature, it may be understood to a considerable extent by applying the canons of literary criticism, in the best sense of the term. Secondly, we are sometimes too ready to think in terms of black and white. The mentality that thinks exclusively in blanket terms of 'sound' or 'unsound' authors is often paralysed by nervous fear. 'Test everything; hold fast what is good, abstain from every form of evil': this is surely a valid principle here. Some fellow-Christians who have come to appreciate the spiritual warmth and vigour of the expositions of a certain contemporary scholar might rush to burn them if they discovered that he does not accept the virgin birth. One hopes for their own sakes that they do not make the discovery. Of course, a caveat must again be entered. The lazy and the immature will be tempted to jump from 'That author is very helpful on this point' to 'He is so good here that I am prepared to accept all that he says'. Gullibility and growth in knowledge rightly so called are poles apart.

Build up a good range of exegetical aids; keep in touch with a well-stocked library to supply the deficiencies of your own shelves. Mention of individual books is an invidious task, for 'time would fail me to tell of' all that have proved personally helpful. The New Bible Dictionary is a must, and so is the New Bible Commentary in the forthcoming revised edition which will repair the patchiness of the old. A N.T. Commentary shortly to be published by P. & I. and written by brethren from the Assemblies should prove to be a valuable tool. But these are no substitute for commentaries on individual books. Both the New London commentaries and the smaller Tynedale commentaries will yield much exegetical fruit. Complete sets should not be bought, for they are never all of uniform value. F. J. Leenhardt on Romans, Robert Law on the first letter of John (*The Tests of Life*), A. B. Rhodes' little paperback on the Psalms: these commentaries spring to mind as real treasure chests. Oscar Cullman, *The Christology of the N.T.*; H. L. Ellison, *Men Spoke From God*; A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel*; Fleming James, *Personalities of the O.T.*; L. H. Marshall, *The Challenge of N.T. Ethics*; T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of O.T. Theology*—these can bring theological balance to one's exposition of many a passage. *The Book of the Acts of God* by G. E. Wright and R. H. Fuller gives an overall survey of the theological intent of the Biblical writers. Such aids as these, used with discrimination, will widen and deepen the preacher's knowledge and appreciation of the Scriptures.

MAIN ROAD PREACHING

It is advisable to keep on the main roads of basic Biblical teaching rather than risk getting lost in the byways of obscure texts and the alleys of controverted passages. Test your bright ideas against the standards of customary interpretation among the pundits, and be grateful if you discover that you are on the wrong track. In Bible study humility must go hand in hand with truth. Confronted with a congregation that knows its Bible well, one may be tempted to resort to novelty. Spurgeon was fully

aware how addicted assembly speakers were to this fault in his day, and his caustic words can still find contemporary application, sad to say: 'Plymouth Brethren delight to fish up some hitherto undiscovered tadpole of interpretation and cry it round the town as a rare dainty; let us be content with more ordinary and more wholesome fishery.' The same warning has been sounded from within our ranks. 'Keep among the great themes of the Bible,' J. B. Watson once said. 'Don't become a trifler with pretty little texts, with dainty little morals, or a clever weaver of wordy nothings hung on obscure phrases in the Minor Prophets. Suburban preaching is a plague. Get to the Citadel and from its noble towers cry aloud the things that matter.' No church can thrive on a dilettante diet.

SIFTING AND SORTING

So far, to borrow James Black's gardening metaphors, we have used not only the spade, to dig with and get down to the basic meaning of the passage, but also the rake, to gather about us everything that may be useful; now we must use the riddle to sift and sort things out. One will never make use of all the material one collects. But the labour of research will not be wasted. It will colour one's thinking and give the right orientation. And store all those notes and jottings: they will come in handy for another day.

Meditation and study provide the raw materials for preaching. The iron ore diligently dug out needs to be smelted into serviceable metal. Do not throw indigestible lumps of Scripture or doctrine at the heads of the poor people. Sometimes one hears a legitimate complaint laid at the door of speakers who have undergone some degree of intellectual training, that they take too much for granted and assume that ground familiar to themselves need not be traversed again. This assumption imposes too great a strain on the average congregation. What is obvious to the speaker, fresh from study, will be hazy to them. If he is commendable to them on other scores they will call him 'deep', but if not, they will accuse him of talking over their heads. In either case they will go away little the wiser for his erudition. The considerate preacher 'brings out of his treasure things new and old'.

Hefty quotations, and still more hefty tomes brought on to the platform, will betray inadequate use of the sieve. Imagine reading out the quotation cited earlier from Tasker about the contrasting pericopes of the Good Samaritan and Martha and Mary! It is styled in a literary form, which in the book may be read slowly and perhaps re-read; but as an oral quotation it will not make immediate impact and will be wasted breath. Resist the temptation to ramble on for an hour repeating a bit of Bruce, a bit of you, a bit of Cullmann, and so on. One can pick up treasures in second-hand shops with long browsing, but in the realm of preaching it is too wearying a task to be inflicted upon the congregation. The speaker must impose his own unity, pattern and purpose upon his diverse material. If you do not have time to think through the material and make it your own,

you must have made a mistake in accepting the invitation to speak in the first place. A hasty picking of other people's brains, a shoddy re-hash, run counter to the ideal of 'a workman who has no need to be ashamed, rightly handling the word of truth'.

BE YOURSELF

Seventy years ago Phillips Brooks aptly defined preaching as 'truth through personality': 'Every preacher should utter the truth in his own way and according to his own nature.' He does not merely repeat Scripture. He is no mechanical loudspeaker. He does not hide behind the Word in such a way as to lose his distinctive God-given individuality. Paul never ceased to be Paul, easily distinguishable from Peter. The God who made him what he was, providentially ruling and overruling in his life, did not suddenly turn him into a robot for the purposes of inspiration. Likewise the Christian preacher is called as a whole man to testify to his knowledge of the God revealed in the Scriptures. His words will dovetail with his own experience. 'We speak that we do know' will be his watchword, and congregations will be quick to detect counterfeit claims. His preaching will reflect his background, his training, his thinking. He will aim to be not a Spurgeon, a Lloyd Jones, a Howley, a Harpur, but himself. This is not to say that he may not study the preaching methods of others to profit, but he will not model himself upon someone else. Equally, this is not to say that preaching is simply self-expression: it is the impact of the divine Word upon mind, heart and conscience of a dedicated Christian.

APPLICATION

'Keep close to life and remain close to the text' is Karl Barth's advice to the preacher. The first half is as important as the second. There is a temptation to neglect it in facing a congregation used to a Biblical message. An assembly can develop into an antiquarian society delving into well-worn Bibles and mulling over a remote past full of molten calves and miracles with never a thought for the world hurrying by or for their own tangled lives. Bible study can degenerate into a mere substitute for the television addiction of other evenings, taking one's mind off reality and giving oneself a rest from the harshness of life. There are other churches where the preacher has to justify an exegetical message and plead hard for its relevance to modern life. There the Bible cannot be used as a means of escapism, nor will repetition of its texts call forth sympathetic nods from minds soothed by the *old, old* story. To which of the two types of congregation is it easier to preach? Ah, but to which congregation is the Biblical preacher being more faithful? The preacher to be praised is the one who builds a bridge from 700 BC or AD 35 to the present day, from the first hearers to the present ones.

The Bible itself envisages a grim situation when 'the word preached did not profit them that heard it'. Scripture stresses its own profitableness—'profitable for preaching, for reproof, for correction and for training in

righteousness'. In other words, its self-avowed purpose is to present what to believe and how to behave, both negatively and positively. Does this expository message of ours for next Sunday or next Wednesday reflect this purpose? Will it be a monologue recited to parade one's Biblical knowledge? Or will it come home to the hearers as God's word to them personally, applied to their own deepest needs, drawing out the desire to

'In purer lives Thy service find,
In deeper reverence praise'?

What dross so much of one's past ministry seems in the light of these high ideals! It is so easy to keep one's Bible and one's sermons in a polythene bag, insulated from life, and so, insulated from effectiveness. At every point the preacher must ask of his text a reverent 'so what?' Before every address he must ask concerning his congregation: who are they? What will help *them*, not some hypothetical congregation of my own inventing?

SIMPLICITY

We who so stress simplicity in church order often need to learn true simplicity in our preaching. Not the simplicity that loses all the fullness of the Word and reduces waters to swim in to a dull little pint pot measure, but a simplicity that breaks down the complex into its component parts, that presents the unknown by means of the known, and that imaginatively fits the exposition to the experience of the hearers. 'I sometimes wonder,' writes J. B. Phillips, 'what hours of prayer and thought lay behind the apparently simple and spontaneous parables of the Gospels.'³ Occasionally one hears an address which says precisely the same thing as the text in more complicated language. The preacher in his own study has obviously learned a lot from his text, but he has not managed to communicate it, either because his mental vocabulary is too highbrow for his audience or because he puts on an affected style to impress them that he is more clever than he really is. Whatever the cause, the congregation is not edified. The preacher who claims to have heard God speaking His word to his soul must in turn cultivate a tape-recorder ear for the way that people speak, if he is to impart that word. Writing out the address or making extensive notes—so valuable an exercise for clarifying thought—can encourage a literary style instead of an oral one. The ear and the eye tend to have different standards. If the preacher does write beforehand, he must hear the words ringing in his ears as he writes them.

Edward Harwood's eighteenth century paraphrase of the parable of the Prodigal Son is worth citing as a warning to the twentieth century interpreter. 'A gentleman of a splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons. One day the younger approached his father, and begged him in the most importunate and soothing terms to make a partition of his effects betwixt himself and his elder brother. The indulgent father, overcome by his blandishments . . .' One cannot continue: the story is so longwinded. Gone is the simplicity, and with it the sparkle.

Eradicate polysyllabic circumlocutions of Latin and Greek derivation! 'Pelt the devil with Anglo-Saxon,' said Spurgeon to his students, 'and he

will soon shift his quarters.' Sentences of simple structure and short words well within the hearers' range—these are the everyday tools of the preacher's craft. As he reads, listens and observes life, he will be constantly on the look-out for good definitions, for apt illustrations, for ideas put over with a punch. What impresses him will be transferred to quotation books, to be read over periodically to train his own powers of expression and to be cited, where relevant, to enrich the congregation's understanding of the Bible.

Adjectives like 'eschatological' and 'Christological' will be commonplace to the preacher in his study, but they will rarely, if ever, cross his lips on the platform. He will avoid such statements as 'in the original Greek', 'the Hebrew means', let alone quoting the original words. It would be resented as a pretentious parade of learning, even though the speaker's motives may be of the purest. Instead he may safely wrap up the truth in a more subjective guise as 'I like the rendering . . . it gets to the heart of the meaning' or say, 'What Paul meant, what Paul's actual word means . . .' But those words 'Greek', 'Hebrew', not to say 'Aramaic', can be red rags antagonizing the audience.

As to which version to preach from, the preacher must weigh up his congregation. If most of his listeners are emotionally wedded to the King James' Version he may only arouse hostility if he uses another. There are those to whom only that version can really be the Bible: they heard it from their mother's knee and through it have come to know God and His salvation. The matter is worth enquiring about before going onto the platform. Obviously the preacher should not expect to address only those who are enlightened like himself. His divine commission is not merely to preach to those who dot his i's and cross his t's. He will be wise to respect certain deep-seated foibles rather than attempt rigorous re-education, only succeeding in getting himself crossed off the list of speakers. One can pay lip-service to the AV in the reading and incorporate other, truer renderings in the address. But beware of continually disparaging the old version with 'This is inaccurate', 'We must omit this and that', or else you may tie up your listeners in emotional knots so that they can no longer regard you as the channel of God's word to them.

PATTERN IN PRESENTATION

The preacher must get a pattern into his exposition and arrange it in an orderly fashion. He should not potter through the passage like a tape-recording of a conversational Bible reading. The congregation expects and deserves a different method from the solo expositor. He may well have to refrain from imparting all he knows about the passage, lest the message be jerky and chock-a-block. If too much is thrown at the audience, they will catch little. The expository material should be logically arranged under several heads, and all matter extraneous to this scheme rigorously

excluded. A bewildering array of mixed material will soon leave behind the hearers, day-dreaming and clock-watching.

The scope of each section of the address can be underscored by headings, so useful as signposts for the listener to prevent him losing his way. 'Alliteration's artful aid' can be a hindrance. If you are reduced to scouring the pages of *Roget's Thesaurus*, then alliteration is probably not for you, in this address at any rate. On the other hand, if it comes naturally and easily out of the passage, then it will help to drive the message home. A case in point is John's triad of life, light and love, although it is purely an accident of English since the Greek lacks the alliteration. Eschew long words as headings, alliterative or not. The point of the heading is to fix the subject matter more clearly in the congregation's minds, but if it is lengthy and abstract it will defeat its purpose, even if it does begin with a p. The stock example of what not to do is the following quartet of headings for Psalm 55:6: prudent celerity—innocent simplicity—devout sublimity—permanent security. What a travesty of exposition of 'Oh that I had wings like a dove . . .' But at least that bad example does illustrate a trick of parallelism that can be put to better use. Repetitive parallelism can yield headings that stick yet do not require hectic thumbing through a dictionary. Henry Drummond's famous exposition of I Corinthians 13, 'The Greatest Thing in the World' had these headings: love contrasted, love analysed, love defended. The common factors in these labels are love + passive participle, and the difference lies in the verb used in each case. Occasionally one may be inspired to more ambitious repetitive parallelism, such as the following headings for an expository talk on Romans 5: 1-11: grace that does not let us fall, hope that will not let us down, love that will not let us go. Obviously the third was the first one to spring to mind, then the second and the first followed in due course.

George Matheson's hymn gave the initial inspiration. That hymn could well be used in the service, and reference to it would help to bind together the worship and the word into an integrated whole. If the hymn to which reference is made is well known to the audience, quoting from it will evoke a desirable emotional response; it will provide a helpful link between a well loved hymn and a perhaps less appreciated text.

IMAGINATIVE PREACHING

Perhaps the preacher's greatest asset in the preparation of an expository message is imagination. In the role of fancifulness it is a bad master, but under proper control it serves the preacher well. He will develop an imaginative approach to the text or passage. If it is set in narrative, he will make a mental film of the scene after researching into the background. If it is set in a prophetic or epistolary context, he will visualize the issues at stake and the people involved. The preacher must not only read the text but see it. In Amos 1 he will conjure up the scene of a market-day crowd applauding a soap-box orator—a farmer like themselves—as he denounces foreign war crimes: 'Down with Damascus, down with Gaza . . .'—until his accusing finger falls from distant horizons to point at his jingoistic

audience. In Luke 19 he will read the mind of our Lord and think back to the politics of thirty years before when King Herod's will had been read out in the amphitheatre at Jericho—the very town Jesus and the disciples were just leaving. Prince Archelaus, nominated partial heir, had to go off to Rome to get his father's bequest ratified by the Emperor and returned to massacre the leading reactionaries. The commentaries will help to supply the bare bones of these things but the preacher must conjure them up into a living scene which he may set before his hearer's eyes.

The expositor needs, too, a sympathetic imagination. The writer to the Hebrews knew about this when he counselled: 'Remember those who are in prison, as though in prison with them'; so did Paul with his injunction to 'rejoice with those that rejoice, weep with those who weep'. The power to enter sympathetically into the thoughts and feelings of those to whom one ministers is a precious possession not easily acquired. The interpreter needs a twofold skill, an understanding of two cultures, two languages, two worlds; so, too, the Biblical interpreter stands between the Word and the world around, between God and the needy individual. According to the measure in which he is at home in both realms, the inspired Word will become flesh and come to dwell in the hearts of his hearers, full of God's grace and truth.

LESLIE C. ALLEN

NOTES

1. *Reflections on the Psalms*, Fontana edition, p. 102.
2. R. V. G. Tasker, *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels*, p. 58.
3. *Making Men Whole*, Fontana edition, p. 76.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- G. R. Beasley Murray, *Preaching the Gospel From the Gospels*.
James Black, *The Mystery of Preaching*.
A. W. Blackwood, *The Preparation of Sermons*.
J. A. Broadus, *On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*.
E. P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology*.
J. R. Hill, *Preaching the Word*.
W. E. Sangster, *The Craft of the Sermon*.
C. H. Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*.
C. H. Spurgeon, *Commenting and Commentaries*.
A. M. Stibbs, *Understanding God's Word*.
A. M. Stibbs, *Expounding God's Word*.
R. A. Ward, *Royal Sacrament*.
John Wood, *The Preacher's Workshop*.