

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

Books about preaching are always interesting, at least to preachers. When Dr. Dale of Birmingham wrote *his* book about preaching, he told us that he read every book about preaching he could find. And some of us accepted the example at once; it seemed so good and so easily followed. But it must be confessed that the interest is out of proportion to the profit. For the essential elements in preaching are these two: the message, and our own personality; and books about preaching can give us neither.

Still they can do something, and they are always interesting, and we gladly welcome one more. The latest book about preaching is Dr. R. F. Horton's *Verbum Dei* (Fisher Unwin, publisher). It is the course of lectures delivered in 1893 before the Divinity School of Yale College, under the Lyman Beecher foundation. That lectureship has been held by the most distinguished preachers of America, and three times Englishmen have accepted it—Dr. Dale in 1878, Dr. Stalker in 1891, and Dr. Horton in 1893.

Dr. Horton tells us that when he was invited to deliver the Lyman Beecher lectures at Yale, he at once accepted the invitation, because he felt that there was something about preaching which none of his predecessors had expressed, and which urgently called for expression. He believed that preachers had forgotten when to deliver the

Word of God, forgotten how to obtain it, and even forgotten what it was. He felt that it lay upon him, therefore, to go to Yale and carry this burden with him—the Word of God, what it is, how we must receive it, and when we must give it forth. And so he calls his book *Verbum Dei*, the Word of God.

He went with a distinct message; and that there might be no misunderstanding or suspense, he stated it in a clear-cut proposition at the very beginning of his first lecture. It is this: "Every living preacher must receive his message in a communication direct from God, and the constant purpose of his life must be to receive it uncorrupted, and to deliver it without addition or subtraction."

That is a truism, Dr. Horton hears you say, and he hastens to say so himself. But he believes you will admit that it is a neglected truism. "It is a truism; but are we ready, in the face of what is involved, to grant that it is true? The message must be received from God in a direct communication! The preacher is indeed a Prophet. The full meaning of this dawns upon us as we look at the alternatives. He is a Prophet; that is, he is not merely a Reciter or Rhetorician; he is not merely a Lecturer or Philosopher; he is not, above all he is not, merely a Priest."

Well, if that is all that is involved in Dr. Horton's thesis, it *is* a truism, and we are not even prepared to admit that it is a neglected truism. Surely few things have been more persistently or more ruthlessly forced upon our attention of late. It is a truism that is so true and momentous that we welcome the vehement words in which Dr. Horton restates it here, though we wonder that he should claim to have rediscovered it. "All manner of sins may be forgiven a preacher—a harsh voice, a clumsy delivery, a bad pronunciation, an insufficient scholarship, a crude doctrine, an ignorance of men; but there is one defect which cannot be forgiven, for it is a kind of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; it cannot be forgiven him if he preaches when he has not received a message from God to deliver. Woe unto those prophets whom the Lord has not sent!"

How forcibly it is expressed! How willingly it is granted! But was it worth while going all the way to Yale to say it? For a time one is sorely puzzled. It is so unlikely that Dr. Horton of all men should be unaware that during these many years we have been driven on every side of him to assert this truism as the one great truth in the preaching of the gospel, the truth that makes it preaching—

First seek thy Saviour out, and dwell  
 Beneath the shadow of His roof,  
 Till thou have scanned His features well  
 And known Him for the Christ by proof;  
 Such proof as they are sure to find  
 Who spend with Him their happy days,  
 Clean hands and a self-ruling mind,  
 Ever in tune for love and praise.  
 Then, potent with the spell of Heaven,  
 Go, and thine erring brother gain,  
 Entice him home to be forgiven,  
 Till he, too, see his Saviour plain.

But before one is out of the first lecture one perceives that Dr. Horton's meaning is very different from that.

It all turns upon the meaning which Dr. Horton gives to the expression, "a communication direct

from God." There are two meanings which that expression may have, and they are very different from one another. As an example of the one meaning, take this passage out of the life of Balaam: "And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, go with them; but only the word which I speak unto thee that shalt thou do. . . . And God put a word in Balaam's mouth. . . . And he took up his parable, and said . . . How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? And how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied?" (Num. xxii. 20, xxiii. 5, 7, 8). Of the other meaning it is not so easy to find an example in Scripture, and be sure that you have it; but perhaps this will serve: "I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself" (Rom. xiv. 14).

Now in the first of these two examples the word comes manifestly from without the person who receives it. It comes independently of that person's knowledge or will. It comes, he knows not when, he knows not how, and he knows not what. He must simply wait for it, or pray for it, till it comes; and then act upon it, whatever it may be. In the other instance the word is as certainly a direct communication from God, but it comes in a different way. It is found within. It is a conviction. It is a persuasion. The will has consented. It is the person's own word as well as the word of God; for the person is in respect of it in the fullest harmony with God. It is a persuasion *in* the Lord Jesus, because the Lord Jesus is resident within.

The distinction is valid, whether the examples chosen are correct or not. The first, certainly, is so. Of the second, one cannot be sure; and the reason may be given in this way. In the third series of Robertson of Brighton's *Sermons*, there is one on "The Dispensation of the Spirit," and it opens with these words: "According to a view which contains in it a profound truth, the ages of the world are divisible into three dispensations,

presided over by the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. In the dispensation of the Father, God was known as a Creator; creation manifested His eternal power and Godhead, and the religion of mankind was the religion of Nature. In the dispensation of the Son, God manifested Himself to Humanity through man; the Eternal Word spoke, through the inspired and gifted of the human race, to those that were uninspired and ungifted. This was the dispensation of the prophets—its climax was the advent of the Redeemer; it was completed when *perfect* Humanity manifested God to man. The characteristic of this dispensation was, that God revealed Himself by an authoritative Voice, speaking from without, and the highest manifestation of God whereof man was capable was a Divine Humanity. The age in which we at present live is the dispensation of the Spirit, in which God has communicated Himself by the highest revelation, and in the most intimate communion, of which man is capable; no longer through Creation, no more as an authoritative Voice from without, but as a Law within—as a Spirit mingling with a spirit. This is the dispensation of which the prophet said of old, that the time should come when they should no longer teach every man his brother, and every man his neighbour, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’—that is, by a will revealed by external authority from other human minds,—‘for they shall all know Him, from the least of them to the greatest.’”

Now, the difficulty of finding in Scripture an example of the second meaning of the expression “a direct communication from God,” arises from the fact that the Old Testament belongs to the dispensation of the Son, in Robertson’s phraseology, and even the New Testament belongs to the transition between that and the dispensation of the Spirit. There is much in the life of St. Paul which clearly has to do with visions and dreams and the external prophetic, “Thus saith the Lord.” It is not so absolutely clear and certain that we have any passages wholly emancipated from that. But that does not affect the distinction. The dispensation of the Son did come to an end, and

we now, at least, are living under the dispensation of the Spirit.

But, to our great surprise, we find that when Dr. Horton speaks of “a direct communication from God,” he means such an external communication as Balaam received. Certainly he is not consistent about it. Very often he uses words and quotes examples that belong to the other meaning, and are useless for his purpose. But he leaves us in no doubt as to what his meaning really is, and why it seems to him a *neglected* truth that the preacher must not preach until the word of the Lord has come to him.

In the second lecture he quotes freely from the prophets of the Old Testament, to show us what *their* word was. We easily see that it is such a word as we have quoted from the history of Balaam. Whereupon he at once turns to certain modern biographies, and selects three passages. The passages he selects record experiences which seem to be exactly parallel to those of the Old Testament prophets. Dr. Horton believes that they *are* parallel, and selects them for that reason.

Here is one of the stories. Mr. Egerton Young records in his “deeply interesting book,” *By Canoe and Dog Train*, that he visited a band of pagan Indians, about sixty miles from Beaver Lake. He found them in a kind of lethargy, and nothing that he or the Christian Indians who went with him could say had any effect upon them. “They sat shrouded in their blankets, smoking in a sullen indifference, upright and motionless as mummies. Tired out in body and sad at heart, I threw myself upon the help of God, and breathed a prayer for guidance in this hour of sore perplexity. God heard me, and, springing up, I shouted, ‘I know where all your children are, all your dead children!’” At the word the Indians uncovered their faces and manifested intense interest. Then “a big stalwart man sprang up and rushed towards me. ‘Missionary, my heart is empty, and I mourn much, for none of my children are left among the

living; very lonely is my wigwam. I long to see them again, and to clasp them in my arms.' He sank at my feet in tears, and was quickly joined by others."

That is the story. And this is Dr. Horton's comment on it. "Was not that exclamation, 'I know where all your dead children are,' a veritable 'word of God'? Did ever any saint in Old Testament times receive a more direct or manifest message to deliver? It was the one point where the callousness of that congregation was penetrable. The missionary had no means of knowing where that one point was. And the word of the Lord came to him. He gave it, and with such result as might be expected."

But the question is not whether that ~~was~~ a veritable word from God or not. The question is whether every preacher of the gospel in the land must wait on every occasion for such a word as that before entering his pulpit; and whether he runs the risk, if he does not wait, of committing the unpardonable sin.

Travellers have their weaknesses; and to those who do not travel, one of the most marked and unaccountable of their weaknesses is the difficulty they seem to have in finding places which they have gone to see, and which are plainly set down in the maps. There is Mount Sinai, for example. Few places on the earth's surface are more fixed and certain to those who have never visited the Peninsula that lies between the Gulf of Akaba and the Gulf of Suez, but who possess "a good map." Yet travellers of sense and experience will go there for the very purpose of identifying Mount Sinai, and return home either to confess that they could not find it, or else (and that is even worse) to tell us that they have found it, each in a different spot. "You have seen Mount Sinai?" you ask of Burckhardt on his return; and he answers, "Yes; the Jebel Serbal is Mount Sinai." But you turn to Robinson, and he replies, "Ras-es-Sufsafeh is Mount Sinai." And he is not done speaking when

a chorus of travellers' voices breaks in: "Jebel Musa, the Mount of Moses, that is the historical Mount Sinai, as an unbroken tradition of sixteen centuries has maintained, and the rest are uninteresting pretenders."

Professor Sayce maintains that only they are right who cannot find it at all; for Mount Sinai never was in the Sinaitic Peninsula. "It may seem cruel," he says, in an article in the *Asiatic Quarterly* for July, "to disturb the convictions of the numerous travellers who have patiently supported the fatigue of a journey among the monotonous and inhospitable rocks of the so-called Sinaitic Peninsula, under the belief that they were treading in the steps of the children of Israel. But, in spite of the tradition of the last sixteen centuries, that belief is contrary to the combined evidence of the Old Testament and the Egyptian monuments. Where the mountain peak of Sinai actually was, we do not know; perhaps we never shall; but of one thing we may be certain, and that is, that it was not in the peninsula which is now called Sinaitic."

It was the Christian monks and cœnobites of the fourth century that gave the peninsula the name of "Sinaitic." In their anxiety to escape from the world, they fled into this desert and hid themselves in its cells and mountain-caves. Food and drink were both scarce enough and plentiful enough to meet an anchorite's necessities. They were not altogether delivered from the coveted fear of persecution, and yet they were not utterly at the mercy of the wandering Bedouin, being protected by a garrison of Roman soldiers. Now Moses and Elijah had fled like themselves into the wilderness, and had come to the Mount of God. What was easier than to imagine that *this* was the Mount of God which they had visited; and then find the special scene of the giving of the Law in one of its cliffs, black and lonely and awful? Before the Roman Empire had tottered to its fall, and the Roman garrison had been withdrawn, this belief had taken root. The

Mohammedans accepted it as well as the Christians; and even the nomad Bedouins were persuaded to see the footprint of the man of God among the barren rocks of the Jebel Musa or Hill of Moses.

But it is not in this "Sinaitic" Peninsula that the Old Testament invites us to look for Mount Sinai; and the monuments of Egypt absolutely forbid it. At the time of the Exodus, as well as long before, and long after it, the Sinaitic Peninsula was in the hands of the Egyptians. Its lucrative copper-mines were worked by Egyptian convicts; and in order to protect them from the wild and wandering Bedouin, the peninsula was strongly garrisoned with Egyptian troops. "For fugitives from Egypt, therefore, to have entered the peninsula would have been an act of insanity. A people who were not allowed to travel along 'the way of the land of the Philistines,' lest they might 'see woe' (Ex. xiii. 17), were not likely to venture into an Egyptian province guarded by trained veterans. The account of the flight of Moses after the murder of the Egyptian implies how carefully the peninsula would have been avoided by one who had escaped from Egypt. When Moses 'fled from the face of Pharaoh,' it was not to the so-called Sinaitic Peninsula that he made his way, but to the land of Midian. That was the nearest locality in which he could find himself in safety."

Where, then, is Mount Sinai? Josephus says it is in Arabia, and St. Paul agrees with him (Gal. iv. 25), and Professor Sayce holds that to a writer of the first century Arabia would denote Arabia Petræa, rather than a peninsula which in the age of the Ptolemies was still a province of Egypt. Wherefore Professor Sayce thinks we must look for the mountain that burned with fire in the borders of Midian and Edom, among the ranges of Mount Seir, and in the neighbourhood of the ancient sanctuary of Kadesh-Barnea, whose site has recently been discovered in the modern name of Ain Kadis.

Principal Brown has sent us the proof of a lecture which he delivered in Aberdeen on the Revised Version of the New Testament. That subject has been so recently discussed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and so fully, that we feel no call to take it up again. But as Dr. Brown confines his attention almost entirely to the Greek text which the Revisers adopted, a topic but slightly touched upon in our discussions, and as he makes some interesting contributions to that topic, in his own racy manner, it will be useful to refer to one or two points in his lecture.

Wisely enough, the meetings of the Revision Committee were marked "private and confidential." But it has long been an open secret that in questions respecting the Greek text to be adopted, there were two parties, somewhat sharply divided, so that Principal Brown is now at liberty to refer to that freely. The one party was led by Bishop Westcott and the late Professor Hort, the other by the late Dr. Scrivener. Textual criticism is so intricate and laborious a study that there were not a few of the members who felt that their opinion was of little independent value, and they were influenced for the most part by the arguments which were brought forward on either side by these leaders. "For myself," says Dr. Brown, "I had for thirty years before this made the textual criticism of the New Testament a subject of special study, and as I found myself getting more and more into line with Dr. Scrivener, when the various readings began to be discussed, I voted for the most part with him."

Principal Brown did not always vote with Dr. Scrivener, as we shall hear in a moment. But he voted most frequently with him; and he says that as the work went on he got uneasy. He perceived that there was a fundamental difference between the grounds on which Drs. Westcott and Hort judged of readings from his own, and he wanted to get at the bottom of it. He found that with them only five MSS. were of any value. When these

differed, two of them were chosen, Codex B and Codex  $\aleph$ ; and when these two disagreed, Codex B was followed alone, a proceeding which led the Dean of Rochester to say, since Codex B belongs to the Vatican Library at Rome, that it was time they had raised a cry of "No Popery!"

Of course Drs. Westcott and Hort gave reasons for their preference (and it may be well to state here parenthetically that these reasons have convinced by far the majority of scholars). But Dr. Brown holds that Dr. Scrivener in the third edition of his *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* has made a conclusive reply to these reasons. What convinced him at the time, however, that there must be a fallacy somewhere in their system, was "that it obliged them to defend impossible, and in some cases absurd, readings." And he gives two examples.

One of the examples is from the eleventh chapter of St. Mark. On approaching Jerusalem, Jesus sent two of His disciples to the village over against them, to find and fetch a colt which was tied there, and on which no man ever sat. "And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither." Now Codex  $\aleph$  and Codex B (together with some others) insert the word "back" (*πίσω, palin*) before "hither." Codex B, indeed, has no word "hither" at all, but simply reads, "and straightway he will send him back." And that is how Dr. Hort wanted the text to read, with "*hither or again*" in the margin, which "makes nonsense of the verse," says Dr. Brown; for "what our Lord wanted the man to do was to send the colt to Him, not to send it back again." But surely Dr. Hort meant that it was Jesus that was to send the colt back—back to the man again. You cannot distinguish by the Greek whether the "he" refers to the man or to Jesus Himself. And Dr. Hort must have meant to read the verse, "Say ye that the Lord hath need of it, and He will immediately send it back again."

The other example is more remarkable, and we shall give it in Dr. Brown's own words. "In the eleventh chapter of Acts we read that a prophet came to the Gentile Church at Antioch, telling them that a great dearth was about to come over the whole Roman world; and as this would reduce the poor Christians at Jerusalem to starvation, they determined to make a contribution for their support, and, says the historian, 'they sent it by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.' So we expect in the twelfth chapter to find some account of what they did with it. But it is only in the last verse that we read, 'And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem when they had fulfilled their ministration.' But what does the Westcott and Hort text read? It says they returned *to* Jerusalem. But as they were in Jerusalem, they could not return to it. 'Yes,' says Dr. Hort, 'but the text of the Acts sometimes inverts the order of the words, and the meaning no doubt is: When they had fulfilled their ministration to Jerusalem, they returned.' The reply to that was, that no Greek would so understand the sense. But so strongly did he urge his point that it was agreed to insert this margin: 'Many ancient authorities read *to Jerusalem*.'

Thus when the leaders differed, Dr. Brown for the most part went with Dr. Scrivener. But not always. There were times when that was impossible, for Dr. Scrivener sometimes clung to readings which he could by no means accept. He gives but one example, and it is so interesting and instructive that we shall close these notes on Dr. Brown's lecture by offering it as it stands. "Dr. Scrivener contended that the doxology in the Lord's Prayer was part of the original text as our Lord uttered it. No one, of course, supposed that any one, when using it as a prayer, would close it without some doxology, and there were plenty of doxologies ready at hand in the Jewish services. But the question was, Did our Lord, when He gave this prayer as a direction or model for our prayer, close it with this doxology? Two arguments were conclusive with me that it formed no part of the original text. In the year 382, Pope

Damasus asked Jerome, the only competent scholar of his day, to revise the Latin version of the Bible. At first he stoutly refused, saying it was the Christians' Bible; they lived upon it; and 'if I tampered with it, they would stone me.' But he had to yield; for the copies, being all written with the hand, differed so much from each other, that it was hard to say which was right. But he was determined to do it very cautiously. He would take the New Testament first, and begin with the Gospels; and he determined to change nothing except where the Greek text demanded it. Accordingly, the Lord's Prayer would be the last thing he would venture to touch; and if the doxology had been a part of it, would he have ventured to leave it out? Never. Yet it is not in the *Vulgate*, which is the revised version that Jerome made. But a better argument remains. Origen, a century before Jerome, and the first biblical scholar that the Church produced, wrote a Commentary on the Lord's Prayer (which will be found in the splendid Paris edition of his works in three volumes, folio). If you read it through, you will find every clause explained. But it stops at the clause preceding the doxology—not only without that doxology or any other, but without a word implying that it had or needed a doxology. Our learned friend sat silent, but not convinced."

---

On the 20th of August the Rev. William Ince, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford, preached a sermon at West Malvern on Election, and a verbatim report of it is found in the *Record* for August 25. It is a sermon that compels attention. Outside the University pulpit it is unusual to hear so purely theological a discourse. And at the present day it is become rare to hear a discourse on Election anywhere. But the ability of this sermon is the best excuse for its novelty.

---

Professor Ince thinks that the reason why we now so rarely hear the pulpit "resound with sermons on what used to be called the doctrines of grace, the five points of predestination, the extent

of Christ's redemption, freewill and human corruption, conversion by irresistible grace, and final perseverance," is that preachers have come to the conclusion that there is no outlet that way; that the mysteries handled in this whole controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism are really insoluble; and that, therefore, it is better to avoid imitating the example of Milton's angels, who

apart sat on a hill retired  
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high  
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,  
Fixed fate, freewill, foreknowledge absolute,  
And found no end in wandering mazes lost.

But it is not probable that the preachers of to-day have less faith in their skill to thread these wandering mazes than their fathers had. And the reason why we hear so little about election is, that it is felt that the subject has been exhausted for the present. Everything has been said about it that can be said. And we must leave it where it is, until some theological genius shall arise to open new pathways across it.

---

It was Dr. Fairbairn, was it not, who recently said that that theological genius is the greatest need of our day? Professor Ince cannot well be he, else Dr. Fairbairn, being on the outlook, had discovered him for us ere now. And certainly Professor Ince does not make the claim. Nevertheless, he says some new and striking things in this sermon, and that even on so old a subject as Election.

---

Some time ago attention was directed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to a remarkable paper by Mr. Gore, which appeared in the third volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica*. In that paper Mr. Gore maintained that the election of Scripture—or at any rate the election of St. Paul—was an election to special privileges; not the election of individuals to eternal salvation, but the election of a chosen body—first the Jewish race, and then the Christian Church—to a special position of honour and responsibility. Professor Ince does not mention Mr. Gore in his sermon. But if we



mistake not, he has them well in mind. For he says that Scripture does contain this election to special privilege; but it contains more than this. And as he argues for the further election of which the Bible speaks, he evidently has such an adversary as Mr. Gore in mind.

Professor Ince maintains, then, that the terms "election" and "elect" are used in the Bible in two different and distinct senses; and that the great controversies on the subject have mostly arisen because men have missed the distinction. Election means, first, "the selection by God's providence of nations or individuals to certain privileges, advantages, opportunities of improvement and service, by the possession of which they are distinguished above other nations or individuals." This was the election to which the nation of the Jews was called. And the passages that speak of it are very numerous, but these two will satisfy: "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are on the face of the earth;" "The Lord set His love upon you and chose you, not because ye were more in numbers than any people." This election of the Israelites was an election to the privileges of being the sacred people, the priests of God, the adopted children of God, the receivers of the Law of God, the occupants of the promised local territory.

But special privileges involve special responsibilities. And the children of Israel were always warned that if they proved unfaithful to their high calling their privileges would be taken from them. They did prove unfaithful. The climax of their unfaithfulness was the crucifixion of the Messiah. Whereupon the election visibly passed from them as a nation: it passed to the Church of Christ.

But the election was not a failure though Israel as a nation failed to appreciate it. From the first the election was on a principle. Not all the sons of Abraham were chosen, only Isaac; and again not both the sons of Isaac, only Jacob. So the

election is not of those who can count their descent by ordinary generation from Abraham; but as Abraham himself was chosen on account of his faith, so they are blessed with this election who are the children by faith of faithful Abraham.

This, then, is the election, says Professor Ince, of the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. It is not an election of individuals to eternal salvation, but an election of the members of the Christian Church, in respect of their faith, to the inheritance promised to the sons of Abraham. And the apostle's argument, that there is nothing unfair in such an election, is unanswerable. "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" Surely. For the honour carries its own grave responsibilities along with it. And if these responsibilities are not recognised, no blessing will flow from the election, but only the deeper curse.

But, besides this election to special privilege, "Scripture recognises an election of individuals to eternal salvation and final glory, founded upon a sovereign decree of God." So says Professor Ince. And he adds: "It is this election, of which I cannot but think St. Paul speaks in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, when describing the called according to God's purpose; 'For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.'" This election is an unfathomable mystery. It is connected with a divine decree secret to us. No man can be certain that he individually belongs to the number of those thus elect. No man can pronounce positively of others whether they are or are not thus elect. He who feels within him the working of the Spirit of God may humbly trust from this sign that he is among the elect, but he may not presume upon it.

But what of man's free will? That also is a doctrine of Scripture, and "the fact is that we must hold at the same time the two great truths of God's predestination and man's free will. They cannot be stated separately as complete intellectual propositions; they are mysteries which we cannot adequately conceive or express. In philosophy, as well as in religion, they are mysteries. We cannot conceive of God as absolute will; that makes Him the author of evil as well as of good; and denies His attribute of righteousness. We cannot conceive of man's absolute free will, for that is a denial of the obvious fact of the weakness of his moral nature, and of the almost overwhelming forces of habit and example."

Thus Professor Ince has not been able on this point to pass beyond the position so seemingly defenceless, yet so ably defended by the late Professor J. B. Mozley. But he very wisely says, as he concludes his sermon, that the doctrine of Election, as taught by St. Paul, is not taught in order to drive us to desperation, but for the very opposite end and purpose. St. Paul's doctrine of Election—the election of individuals to everlasting life—is a hopeful and courageous doctrine, and these are its most characteristic expressions: "Fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom." "My sheep shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my Father's hand."

## Studies in Tennyson's "In Memoriam."

BY MARY A. WOODS.

### I.

"Yet in these ears, till hearing dies,  
One set slow bell will seem to toll  
The passing of the sweetest soul  
That ever look'd with human eyes."

THERE is no poem of Alfred Tennyson's more frequently quoted and less really known than "In Memoriam." The two facts (inconsistent though they may appear) spring from the same causes. The poem is so long that, while it is seldom read through from beginning to end, it is impossible to overlook it altogether. Again, it is so thoughtful, so filled with matter of deep and perennial interest, that, while it is difficult really to grasp it, a knowledge of it has become one of the hall-marks of culture, and no one can afford to be wholly ignorant of it. And lastly, it is so diverse, both in tone and subject, that, while it has much in it that appeals only to the few, it cannot fail to have something that appeals to every one. Thus our knowledge of it is in danger of being (1) a mere matter of words and names; (2) a repertory of borrowed opinions; or (3), at best, a knowledge of detached fragments which, beautiful though they may be, lose half their value when severed from their context. And it is just this "little knowledge," superficial, borrowed, fragmentary,

which is "a dangerous thing," being apt to be mistaken by us for real knowledge, and to supersede the necessity, in our view, of more detailed study. We travel through the poem as we do through a foreign country, at railway speed, noting here and there a lovely peep of lake or mountain, but knowing nothing of the country as a whole, and leaving its more inaccessible parts unexplored and unvisited. In the following papers I propose to make a voyage of discovery through this country, not as a guide, but as an inquirer, in the hope that I may find a few fellow-travellers ignorant enough, and at the same time sufficiently interested, to care to go with me.

Let us begin by looking at the poem as a whole. That it *is* a whole, not a succession of unconnected poems, is obvious from the title. It is a commemoration; and as we look at the shorter poems of which it is composed, we find that the idea of commemoration runs through them all. There are few, in fact, that might not have been headed "In Memoriam A. H. H." The four-lined stanza with its alternation of outside and inside rimes, continued without intermission from end to end of the poem, is suggestive of this common likeness. It reminds us that we have not, as in "Maud," the