

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 13—January, 1893.

I.

ST. PAUL AND INSPIRATION.*

WHEN looking at the New Testament collection, we find ourselves confronted by one personality in particular who, next to Christ Himself, is impressed most largely and weightily both upon the New Testament and upon historic Christianity. I refer, of course, to the apostle of the Gentiles. Of him the student of the New Testament must take particular account. He is the author certainly of thirteen, and perhaps of fourteen, of the twenty-seven books. His epistles constitute that part of the New Testament which gives to it articulated theological structure. He was the man who opened the door by which the world entered into the fold of Christ. His mission made the gospel of Jesus a universal religion. And yet he is one whose right to the place traditionally assigned him has, in various ways in different ages, been hotly contested. His own epistles show that in his lifetime itself his apostleship was denied and his mission violently opposed by many who claimed to be followers of Jesus. In the succeeding age we not only find the extreme section of Jewish Christians continuing to deny his apostleship; but we find the singular and significant fact that, while the orthodox Church acknowledged and honored him, used his epistles as Scripture and reaped the benefit of his mission to the Gentiles, yet it apparently did not grasp his real teaching, and, if its extant literature may be trusted as evidence, rejected some of his fundamental theological principles. Later on, his distinctive theological

* [This paper contains the substance of the address delivered by Dr. Purves at his inauguration as Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary.—EDITORS.]

ideas were for centuries rejected by the larger part of Christendom, even after they had been successfully defended by Augustine and formally acknowledged by the Church; while modern "liberalism" is as loud as the ancient Judaizers were in its rejection of Paul's interpretation of the gospel, and seeks to save itself from utter irreligion by endeavoring to prove that this apostle clothed the ethical teaching of Jesus in the sombre and alien garb of rabbinical theology. Considered, moreover, from the point of view of New Testament literature, the personality and career of Paul are confessedly singular and demand critical study. He appears on the field, suddenly intruding into the circle of original apostles, and mastering it by the success of his work and the force of his credentials. On any view of the origin of Christianity his influence appears gigantic. Baur called him the creator of historical Christianity. The very language of the Church was molded by his vigorous mind, for, as Reuss says,* "It was Paul who imprinted on the Hellenistic idiom its peculiarly Christian character, and he was thus in a manner the creator of the theological language of the Church." The student of the New Testament may feel Paul's influence in the third gospel and in the epistles of Peter, even as the student of the Christian origins finds in him a potent factor in the history. Altogether, he must be particularly investigated. The question of his authority as an apostle of Jesus Christ is a crucial one. Its reality, its extent, its inspired quality—these are matters which fundamentally affect our conception alike of early Christian history, and of present Christian doctrine, and of the Bible itself. It may be truly said that our apprehension of Christianity depends upon our apprehension of Paul. I have, of course, no intention of exalting him above the other apostles or of forgetting their part in the formation of the New Testament, of the Church, or of Christian doctrine. But his exceptional history, his peculiar work, his dominating influence, together with the particular distinctness of his teaching and its intimate relation to the fundamental ideas which we are to form of the religion of Christ, make the question of his authority and inspiration worthy of separate discussion.

I propose, therefore, to consider the testimony which Paul himself gave to his consciousness of apostolic office, his right to the place assigned him in our New Testament, and then to indicate the consequences which follow from this as concerns our conception of the New Testament itself.

I. First, then, as students of the New Testament, seeking simply to know what it actually contains, let us interrogate Paul himself with reference to his claims of authority and inspiration.

* *Hist. of Christ. Theol. in Apost. Age*, Vol. ii, p. 9.

Rationalistic critics are, of course, under the necessity of reducing the consciousness of St. Paul to a natural growth. They cannot admit the supernatural, in any real, objective sense, to have entered into his experience. His teaching and his activity must be explained as in some way the product of more or less rational processes. He must, in short, be represented as at once the victim of hallucination about himself and the herald of world-changing truth. It is a striking fact that, according to the rationalistic explanation of sacred history, the greatest spiritual gains to humanity have always been the outgrowth of illusion and mistake. For the New Testament student is confronted, first of all, by Paul's unequivocal testimony to his infallible authority as a teacher of faith and duty, and to his special inspiration by God. This testimony, moreover, is particularly borne in those great doctrinal epistles, written during the middle part of his missionary activity, the genuineness of which even inveterate doubters do not deny—for the recent denials of their genuineness by a few eccentric scholars chiefly of the Dutch school, are based on too exclusively *a priori* reasoning to be worthy of serious consideration. It will, therefore, not be necessary for me to discuss the genuineness of his later epistles; since no essential point of his self-testimony is involved in them.

Permit me rapidly to summarize his statements upon this subject.

1. We have from him in the first place repeated and positive testimony that the objectively supernatural played a large part and the decisive part in his Christian experience. He explicitly attributes, not only his personal salvation to the mighty power and wondrous grace of God, but his cardinal religious ideas to revelations directly made to him. The pivotal fact of his career was, he tells us, the glorious appearance of Christ to him when on the way to Damascus, and there can be no question that he regarded that appearance as objectively real. In connection with that event he claimed to have received explicit directions for his work and apostolic authority in it. He was "an apostle not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father" (Gal. i. 1). Hence he describes himself as "called to be an apostle" (Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1); "an apostle by the will of God" (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1); an apostle "by the commandment of God" (1 Tim. i. 1), "separated unto the gospel of God" (Rom. i. 1). But this pivotal fact was by no means the only supernatural experience to which he laid claim. Not to mention the miraculous gifts which he possessed in common with other Christians of the apostolic age (1 Cor. xiv. 18), he asserts that his religious doctrines had been immediately revealed to him. "The gospel which was preached by me is not after man.

For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it; but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12. So cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 33, xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 3). Visions, he tells us, were granted unto him (2 Cor. xi. 16, xii. 1-4), and future events had in some particulars been disclosed (1 Thess. iv. 15; 2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 51). All this culminates in the general declaration "that by revelation was made known unto me . . . the mystery of Christ; which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now made known unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph. iii. 3, 5). Thus a special "grace" had been bestowed upon him, the grace of apostleship with all the endowments, spiritual and supernatural, necessary to fit him for the office (Gal. ii. 9; Rom. i. 5, xv. 15; Eph. iii. 3, 7; 2 Cor. iii. 5); and on the basis of this immediate divine gift he emphatically declares his independence, so far as the ground of his right to be obeyed was concerned, of any man, even though it were one of the original apostles (Gal. i. 6, 11). With them he claimed to stand on terms of entire equality (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii, 11), both they and he having been directly invested with authority by the same Lord (1 Cor. ix. 1).

It is manifest that Paul was very far from regarding either the change in his personal attitude to Jesus or his new religious ideas as the result of rational processes of his own mind. Not indeed that his intellectual activity was in abeyance. Far from it. On the truth once revealed he keenly and intensely thought, though, as we shall see, believing himself even in that thought not to be unaided from on high. But his testimony to objective revelations, actually and frequently received, is unequivocal. It is noteworthy also that these consisted not of visions of the other world, of which he has given no description; and very little of hitherto unrevealed future events; but supremely and constantly of those religious truths which men now call theological, but which he called summarily "his gospel." This, he said, was what had been "entrusted to him" (1 Thess. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 1; ix, 17; 2 Cor. v. 18; Rom. i. 14; Col. i. 25; 1 Tim. i. 11; 2 Tim. i. 11). To use one of his own expressive phrases, "the word of reconciliation had been placed in him" (2 Cor. v. 19). This is not the usual way of mystics or enthusiasts, and it remains for those who deny Paul's self-testimony on this point to explain the psychological enigma which their denial creates.

2. But, still further, Paul claimed not only objective revelation, but a special subjective illumination of his mind by the divine Spirit, so that he was enabled correctly to teach the Word of God. True, he recognizes that all Christians are "taught of God to love one

another" (1 Thess. iv. 9), and we find him, with beautiful wisdom and courtesy, seeking rather to urge his readers to a full understanding by themselves of what was involved in the truth they had received, than, as he himself puts it, "to lord it over their faith" (2 Cor. i. 24), for he adds, "by faith ye stand." But he plainly claims for the apostles, and in particular for himself as one of them, a special divine illumination, different both from the objective revelations they had received and from the Spirit's teaching granted to all believers, on the ground of which the apostle's instructions were to be received as final because divine. He does this most explicitly in his epistles to the Corinthians. Speaking of the "hidden mystery"—by which he meant the things of our salvation—he says emphatically, "Unto us God revealed them by His Spirit" (1 Cor. ii. 10). The context shows that by "us" he meant himself and other apostles; and the subsequent verses show that this revelation included more than the objective communication of truth. For he continues: "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, *that we might know* the things that are freely given to us of God." That is, the apostolic teacher was enabled by the Holy Spirit rightly to apprehend the revelation given to him. Hence he could say without audacity, "We have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. ii. 16). Hence also in the second epistle, speaking of his apostolic authority and defending himself against detractors, he could write, "We preach Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake—seeing it is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6). Though these words may be properly applied to all believers, the reader cannot fail to see that Paul applied them in a special sense to himself as a divinely enlightened teacher, as one in whose mind the Almighty Creator of all light had shined for the express purpose of making the knowledge of His glory in the face of Christ known to other men; and this was to such an extent true that he could also write, "If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things that I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. xiv. 35).

Moreover we find him, in 1 Cor. vii, where he deals with the subject of marriage, carefully distinguishing between the known command of Christ about divorce, his own command on the subject which he makes as obligatory as the Lord's, and his advice to certain of them in view of "the present distress." Even his advice

was inspired, for, after giving it, he adds with a touch of irony, "I think that I also have the Spirit of God." Nevertheless it was advice, not command: and the ability to discriminate thus between what was obligatory and what was advisable indicates a perfectly clear perception of what, apart from specific revelations, he was authorized by God to require of them and what not.

So far, then, as his own testimony goes, Paul asserted not only a divine commission and divine revelations, but such an illumination by the Holy Spirit that he could say, "God doth beseech you by us" (2 Cor. v. 20), and "Christ speaketh in me" (2 Cor. xiii. 3).

3. It is little to observe after this that the apostle claimed authority over the faith and conduct of Christians. Though he associates other brethren with him in his epistles, he always puts himself above them (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1). Though both Apollos and he were ministers of Christ, he and not Apollos was a founder of the Church; and his language conveys the idea that not merely because he was in Corinth before Apollos, but because he held a different office, was he the founder of that Church (1 Cor. iii. 10-14). He habitually speaks of "his gospel" in terms applicable to nothing less than the full manifestation of divine, saving truth (1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4; Rom. ii. 16, xv. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8). In fact, he identifies it with "the word of the Lord" (1 Thess. i. 8, ii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 1), declaring in one place (1 Thess. ii. 13), "We thank God that when ye received from us the word of the message, even the word of God, ye accepted it, not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God, which also worketh in you that believe." He warns against any who taught contrary to what they had received from him, yea, though the teacher were an angel from heaven or the apostle himself (2 Thess. ii. 2; Gal. i. 8, 9). Alike in matters of faith and conduct does he speak in an unflinching tone of absolute command.

4. It is more important to observe that he attached the same authority to his letters as to his oral teaching, and to the verbal form in which his teaching was expressed no less than to the truth itself. Besides directing the reading and circulation of his epistles (1 Thess. iv. 27; Col. iv. 16, 17), he says expressly (2 Thess. ii. 15), "Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught, whether by word or by epistle of ours." As to the verbal form of his teaching, his language is likewise unmistakable (1 Cor. ii. 13): "Which things also"—*i. e.*, the knowledge given to the apostles by the Spirit—"we speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual." That this statement is to be interpreted in any such

way as to make the apostle represent himself as a mechanical, unthinking agent of the Spirit is both disproved by all the phenomena of his writings, and is positively forbidden by the phrase itself, "words which the Spirit *teacheth*," for a machine cannot be taught, it can be only used. But it is equally plain that Paul felt even the verbal forms, in which, with the full use of his own intellect and heart, and often in most characteristic and peculiar style, he uttered the message that God had given him, to have been also determined for him by the Spirit. He represented his whole communication to men as "pneumatic"—as the Spirit's work throughout; and therefore in all its elements the communication to men not of Paul's thought—that was only the medium—but the communication of the mind and will of God. As certainly as the phrase, "words which man's wisdom *teacheth*," describes the rhetorical dress and mode of argument and literary style which Hellenic culture would have suggested, so certainly does he mean, in the corresponding phrase, "words which the Spirit *teacheth*," to say that the rhetoric and the argument and the style which he did employ were, in some way which he does not explain, suggested, indicated, brought to his mind by the Holy Spirit.

5. At the same time, be it noted, there never was a more living writer than Paul, and his testimony is equally clear that, with all the authority and divine guidance which he claimed, he was always himself. His self-consciousness, in fact, is very marked, since he regarded himself as a typical example of grace, and since he was compelled to defend his character and his claims. His personality was intense. The "I, Paul, say unto you," is very frequent. He testifies to nothing mechanical in the operations of divine power within his mind, but quite to the contrary. His writings themselves bear sufficient witness to his intellectual activity, his strong and sensitive emotions, his quickness to discern the practical relations of his teaching. His testimony to the living reality of his experience under grace and while the subject of revealing and inspiring power, is as clear as is his testimony to that power itself. And to this should be added the remark that he recognized the limitations of his knowledge. The Spirit did not always quicken his memory, for he writes of his life in Corinth: "I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other" (1 Cor. i. 16). Neither did he claim perfect comprehension of the truth, for he could say, "Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (1 Cor. xiii. 11). But this confession of limits to knowledge only makes the more significant his assertions of clear and authoritative knowledge as to what had been given him to affirm and teach. It indicates a calm

and sober appreciation of just what God authorized him to say and what He did not, which is at the farthest possible remove from either a machine or an enthusiast. "This treasure," he says, speaking of the divine light which God had made to shine within his mind, "we have in earthen vessels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God and not of us" (2 Cor. iv. 7). By the "earthen vessel" he did not mean, as he has sometimes been interpreted, the human element in his writings, their words and arguments. These, as we have seen, he regarded as part of the treasure itself. But, as the context shows, he meant by "the earthen vessel" the external trials and the personal misfortunes of his life—for he was "always," he added, "bearing about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." To the Jews a renegade, to the Athenians a babbler, "the offscouring of the earth" in the eyes of the busy, fighting, cultured, careless Roman world—Paul claimed that he possessed a gift from Almighty God which made him a true prophet of Israel, an unerring teacher of the wise, and an authoritative expounder of the only way of salvation for mankind.

Such I believe to be a fair statement of Paul's apostolic consciousness as exegesis gives it to us. Thus he appears on the field of New Testament literature. This is the only Paul of which we know. It may be conceivable that he was an utterly mistaken man, but he cannot be treated as pretending to be different from what we have described.

II. Can, then, these claims be justified to us so that, as students of New Testament literature, we may accept Paul's epistles as a constituent part of the sacred Scriptures, and Paul himself as the authorized exponent of genuine Christianity which he claimed to be?

We do not hesitate to say that the objections brought by avowed naturalism are to be immediately set aside. We come to the examination of New Testament literature believing in the possibility of miracles, and even, under certain circumstances, in their probability. Above all, we come as convinced believers in an historical incarnation and resurrection. Our belief in this may be defended quite independently of Paul's claims to authority and inspiration. He may be regarded as mistaken in these and yet may constitute one of the many witnesses to the original belief of the primitive Church, and, as such, one of many facts which only an actual incarnation and resurrection can explain. Fairness does not require us, therefore, to profess want of conviction upon these points. For belief in the incarnation and resurrection does not necessarily carry with it the admission of Paul's specific claims, while unbelief does carry with it the denial of them.

In the hands of naturalism, moreover, not only must Paul appear a singularly deluded man and his conversion remain an unexplained enigma, but he can scarcely be made to justify the place he has occupied among the leaders of mankind. When Prof. Pfleiderer concludes that "the specially Christian and permanent element of Paulinism" was the fact "that it was an influence bringing freedom and inward depth to the religious life, delivering men from all externalities and uniting them directly with God ;* when Mr. Arnold, trying to show why Protestantism should still uphold the honor of its favorite apostle, makes Paul's essential merit to have been that he was possessed with a zeal for righteousness ;† we instinctively ask why, of all the advocates of religious liberty and righteousness, this man should occupy a unique position in history. Manifestly such praise is but the cloak which conceals the hand of the assassin. Not by these qualities alone has Paul actually exerted his decisive influence on mankind.

The New Testament student, therefore, is not to approach the subject without faith in an historical revelation of God through Jesus Christ. He is rather to inquire whether, assuming the fact of a supernatural revelation, the extraordinary and specific claims of this intruder into the original circle of disciples ought to be acknowledged.

Without attempting to do more than give an outline of the argument, the following reasons appear to us conclusive.

The particular credentials by which Paul himself appealed to his own converts are either beyond our power of testing or are not sufficiently explicit for our present purpose. They consisted in the miraculous powers with which he was endowed, and, above all, in the Holy Spirit accompanying his ministry and sealing his words to the hearts of God's elect (1 Cor. xii. 12 ; 1 Thess. i. 5 ; 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5). The former we cannot directly verify. The witness of the Spirit to his teaching we must certainly, if Christian men, feel. It has been largely because the experience of Christian life bears so much testimony to the essential truth of his doctrine that the Church, even when willing, has not been able to deny it. Nevertheless, the Spirit's testimony is only explicit with reference to Paul's fundamental doctrines. On the basis of that we might indeed infer the validity of all his claims. But as a matter of fact, the form in which he couched his teaching has been impugned even by those who profess to acknowledge the latter, and the dimness of the Christian consciousness is such that it is easy even for Christian men to question the full validity and reality of all that Paul asserts about himself. But the student of New Testament literature may,

* *Hibbert Lectures*, 1885, p. 287.

† *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *passim*.

we think, conclusively furnish two other lines of proof: first, the fact of Paul's recognition as an apostle by the original Church; and secondly, the internal relation which his teaching bears to the rest of Scripture.

1. His recognition by the original Church is a fact of first value because it affords conclusive evidence that his claims were admitted by the other apostles, and thus that the first founders of the Church confessed the validity of his credentials.

On this point, as you are aware, the modern critical assault has been directed; and rightly so, if the supernatural character of Christianity is to be disproved. Baur thrust his knife into the vital part of the system when he undertook to prove the original antagonism of Paul and "the twelve," and to explain Catholic Christianity as the reconciliation, 150 years later, of the originally hostile elements. But this ingenious reconstruction of the history has fallen before the attack of historical investigation itself, and the later followers of Tübingen criticism have been forced to recede from so many essential positions and to minimize the alleged division of the apostolic body in so many particulars that the theory ought to have little weight with students of the New Testament and of post-apostolic literature. For the unity of the apostolic body, and the consequent recognition of Paul, we appeal not only to the New Testament itself, when fairly interpreted, but to the earliest extra-canonical writers—*e. g.*, to Clement of Rome, writing about the same time with the apostle John,* who appeals expressly to Peter and Paul not only as examples of righteousness, but as reproving that very spirit of rivalry with which modern criticism charges them, and mingles their words together as the commandments of one mind; to Ignatius, writing perhaps only a decade later, who uses this language: "I do not enjoin you as Peter and Paul; they were apostles: I am but a condemned man" (Rom. iv); to Polycarp, whose imitative pen betrays his reverent use of the writings of all the representative apostles; and, passing by many other witnesses, to the extensive statements of Irenæus of Lyons. To be sure these ancient authors were not writing for the express purpose of refuting beforehand modern naturalistic criticism, and occasional difficulties occur in the evidence which have been made the most of. The most recent contention is that the Epistles of Paul were not considered as technically "Scripture" by the Church until the false position in which Marcion and others placed him required his orthodoxy to be vindicated.† But before Marcion wrote, the Epistles of Paul were used in precisely the

* *Ad Cor.* 5, 44, 47, 49.

† See Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, i, 304; Werner's *Der Paulismus des Irenæus*.

same manner as other books of the New Testament and must stand or fall with them; while the idea that Marcion was the first to announce the fact that God had given to the Christian Church a written rule of faith in addition to the Old Testament, attributes far too much originality to that famous heretic. We admit, indeed, that the Church of the second and third centuries did not appropriate the doctrines of grace which Paul taught with anything like his consistency. But that has been no unusual phenomenon in Christian history. None the less is the evidence ample that, while Paul derived his authority from no man, and while his course was opposed by many Jewish Christians, yet, after the first suspicions were overcome, as the Book of Acts relates, the Church recognized his credentials, and that means that the other apostles recognized them, even as he himself declares. If so, then whatever authority on other grounds we attach to the original apostles becomes a corresponding attestation of Paul. Were they merely trustworthy witnesses? They witness to the sufficiency of those of his credentials which we cannot examine. Were they the acknowledged founders of the Church? They acknowledged the apostle of the Gentiles to be a founder too. Were they endowed with the Spirit to be the authoritative teachers as well as founders of the Church? Then they admit also Paul's claim to be the same and his epistles to be part of the Church's abiding rule.

2. The other argument, drawn from the internal relation which Paul's teaching bears to the rest of Scripture, depends on the results of exegesis.

(a) It may be shown that his teaching is a legitimate unfolding of ideas already announced in the teachings of Jesus. In Christ's declaration of the righteousness which must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, of the necessity of His death as a ransom for sin, of the wholly lost condition of mankind, of the necessity of regeneration and of the Father's "drawing," of His peculiarly intimate and vital relation to His people based on the Father's gift of them to Him from eternity, of the immediateness and completeness of the reconciliation of God and the sinner through Him, and of the necessity of the sinner's dependence upon Him for salvation, it is easy to see the elements of Paul's doctrine waiting for some one to arrange them in the light of the full significance of Calvary, and of the person of the risen Lord.

(b) It may be shown further that his doctrine stands in such relation of that of the other apostolic writers as to be an integral and necessary part of the apostolic teaching as a whole; forming the required complement to James, one of the presuppositions of Peter and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and with these laying

the foundation on which John stood, with his personal remembrance also of the Lord's discourses, to set forth the true revelation of God and of life with God which the divine Word had effected and in the disclosure of which the written Word was to find its goal. The more closely the doctrines of the several apostolic writers are examined the more manifest becomes the one, identical truth which, with rich diversities of view, all express; and in this complex organism of living truth the teaching of Paul appears as the vertebrate column on which the structure of the whole depends.

(c) And then it may be shown, finally, that Pauline doctrine, as the apostle himself claimed, is a legitimate unfolding of the teachings of the Old Testament; a return to Moses and the prophets as against the Scribes and Pharisees; that he built, not on rabbinical theology, but on the principles imbedded in the Old Testament, and that, strange as his position seemed to the Jews of his day, he did but bring to complete expression the central truths of Israel.

It is not my purpose to do more than indicate these points of internal relationship. Their full working out belongs to Biblical Theology. But the result will, I believe, be substantially what I have indicated. It is so in its general features to every careful reader of the Bible. If so, Paul's epistles authenticate themselves as an integral part of that unified and yet diversified collection of literature which we call "the Bible." But that in turn authenticates him as one of its intended writers.

On these two lines of attestation, the one external and the other internal, must the New Testament student, who admits the fact of a supernatural revelation through Jesus Christ, and who is willing to accept the plain historical statements of the original witnesses as to what Jesus did and taught, admit also Paul's claims to apostleship and his epistles to a place among the authoritative apostolic teaching. Then the particular witness, which, in these epistles, Paul bore to his apostolic consciousness, must be our guide in determining what the New Testament, and back of that the whole Bible, really is.

III. The question then arises, What was Paul's doctrine about the Scripture? Did he attach the same conception of authority and inspiration to it that we have found him to attach to his own teaching, whether oral or written?

1. To answer this, we must first examine his descriptions and use of the Old Testament. His use of it is abundant. He quotes from it formally. He introduces its phrases. His language is saturated with its expressions and figures of speech. He assumes it to be well known to his readers and an authority recognized by them. There is no question that he possessed it in the form in

which we now have it in the Hebrew and substantially in the Greek. The names, also, which he applies to it indicate in general his acceptance of it, in unison with the Jewish Church, as the divinely given rule of belief and conduct. It is "the Scripture," called so by preëminence, "the Holy Scriptures," "the prophetic Scriptures," "the law and the prophets" (Rom. iii. 21), "the sacred writings" (2 Tim. iii. 15). He called the whole collection also "the law," quoting under that title from Isaiah (1 Cor. xiv. 21; see Rom. iii. 19); and in another place, "the oracles of God" (*τὰ λόγια* Rom. iii. 2), a phrase which must not be limited to the direct utterances of God, but must be understood to describe the Scriptures as a whole. These titles indicate his general attitude towards the Old Testament. Strongly as he revolted from the Judaism of his day, he recognized its Bible as God's gift to the Church of all time, and applied to it the terms of strictest faith and devoutest reverence used by those who acknowledged its authority (Rom. iv. 4).

But not to dwell on these obvious facts, it is important for our purpose to observe the descriptions which Paul gives of the object of the Old Testament and how it came to fulfill that object. He held that the Scripture was expressly written for the purpose of teaching the Church, both Jewish and Christian, the gospel of Jesus Christ; and this, of course, involved the assumption that it had been composed under the special direction of God. He affirms this, be it noted, of the Scripture as a book. It was not written in the interest of a legal way of salvation, though it contained the law; but it was written in order that the principles of the gospel might be learned by those who read it rightly. Not only did Moses and the prophets speak from God, but the sacred Scriptures themselves were in some way composed under divine control. He not only affirms with Peter that, "moved by the Holy Ghost *men* spake from God," but that "*the Scriptures themselves* are inspired by God." Paul plainly recognizes the human authorship of the books, and quotes Moses and David and Isaiah as speaking therein. But not only *through them*, but *in these books* of theirs did God also speak. Many readers notice the first part of Paul's statement, but not the second. God spake "through the prophets *in the Holy Scriptures*" (Rom. i. 2).

Hence we read statements like these. After speaking of the sins and sorrows of Israel in the wilderness, he declares: "Now these things happened unto them by way of example (typically), and they *were written* for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (1 Cor. x. 11). Here he represents both the facts of Israel's history and the *record* of them as having been ex-

pressly designed for our spiritual profit. So again, "For whatsoever things were *written* aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope" (Rom. xv. 4). And this pertains, according to Paul, to the use of special phrases; for (Rom. iv. 23) he declared that the particular statement of Genesis that "Abraham *believed* God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness," was *not written* for his sake alone, but for our sake also. The record, that is, of the great typical justification, was expressly made and in this precise form for our enlightenment. Even the directions of the Mosaic law were *written* for our sakes (1 Cor. ix. 10); not as if they had had no other immediate reference when originally enacted, but that the recording of them in Scripture was for the purpose of instructing us in the doctrines or duties of a godly life. Therefore the Scriptures are, so to speak, personified by him—as when he writes that "the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham" (Gal. iii. 8), as well as in the common formula, "Scripture saith." Of course these affirmations could only have been made on the supposition that he who secured the production of such a record, and who therefore speaks in its language, was none less than God. So Paul explicitly affirms, "The gospel of *God*, which *he* promised afore by his prophets *in the Holy Scriptures*" (Rom. i. 1, 2). He thus clearly distinguished between the historical revelations made from time to time, which, like the law, had a temporary purpose, and the composition of the Scriptures. These, indeed, contained the record of those revelations, but, besides that, were *so written* that they might teach for all time the principles of faith and duty. It was on the basis of this view that he could write to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 6), that they "must not go beyond the things that are written;" by which remark he meant to remind them that the Scriptures were the rule of practice as well as of faith to every Christian. So, too, he could write to Timothy of the Scriptures (2 Tim. ii. 15): "They are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." His declarations then culminate in the statement: "Every Scripture," that is, the whole collection to which he had just referred as the "sacred writings," and all their parts, "being inspired by God, is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17). Of this last passage I will speak presently. I desire now only to point out that Paul represents not only the Hebrew economy as designed by God to serve a temporary purpose in the education of His people, and Moses and

the prophets as having spoken from God, but the Hebrew Scriptures themselves also as a divinely made book or collection of books intended to teach the gospel, and an abiding rule of faith and conduct to the Christian. He affirms not only that the authors of the Old Testament were media of revelation, but that the literary product itself, and as such, was, in some way, divinely made and given to the Church.

2. What light then is thrown upon these formal statements by Paul's actual use of Scripture?

(a) He habitually employs it, in accordance, as I have already remarked, with his idea of its purpose, to show that it taught "his gospel." He does this, not by catching at plausible phrases, or by gleaning here and there from the Old Testament expressions which imply his doctrines, but by showing that the gospel was the very substance of the Scripture. Christ, as revealed to the apostles, was the key to the Old Testament. The unbelieving Jews read the Old Covenant with a veil upon their hearts (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15), but he—"the veil having been done away in Christ"—grasped the real meaning of the prophetic writings. The more closely we study Paul's use of Scripture the more should we be filled with admiration at the clearness and penetration with which he apprehended the essential religious teaching of the passages he cites. Take the great passages, which I need not quote, in which he uncovers in God's recorded transactions with Abraham the doctrine of gracious justification through faith; or the way in which (Rom. iii) he presents the Scriptural indictment of man as a sinner by a series of citations from the Psalms and Isaiah, so arranged as to set forth in sacred phrase the fact, the practice, the source of human wickedness; or the magnificent argument (Rom ix-xi) wherein he justifies on Scriptural grounds the loss by the Jews of their peculiar privileges. I do not see how any one can examine Paul's use of Scripture in these classical instances without being convinced that the apostle, so far from juggling with words, penetrated to the very marrow of the law and the prophets. There are instances, I know, where at first sight he seems to deal with words rather than with thoughts, and to be guilty of fanciful interpretation. These instances are few in number, but they have been made the most of. His use (Gal. iv. 21-31) of the story of Sarah and Hagar with their sons; his interpretation (1 Cor. ix. 9, 10; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18) of the Mosaic command, "Thou shalt not muzzle the oxen treading out the corn;" his citation of Isaiah xxviii. 11, "By men of strange tongues will I speak unto this people" (1 Cor. xiv. 21), as bearing on the use by the Church of the miraculous gift of tongues—are examples to which as many more might be added (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15, "When

it shall turn unto the Lord, the veil is taken away;" 2 Cor. viii. 15, "As it is written, he that gathereth much," etc., Rom. x. 6-9). But certainly it is only fair to judge of these instances by the apostle's prevailing habit, and to ask if further examination will not show that below the apparently verbal interpretation there was the perception by him of a principle in each case of which the Old Testament passage was one expression and his application of it another. I believe that this can be shown in every case, not excepting even the mis-called "allegory" of Hagar and Sarah, and the much misunderstood remark about the unmuzzled ox. It should, moreover, not be forgotten that these interpretations, which are offensive to some, proceed conspicuously on the supposition that the Scripture, as a writing, was a divine work. But many more examples might be adduced in which Paul's use of Scripture must have been to his first readers like the breaking of sunlight into darkened chambers. Sometimes by merely a single word he illuminates prophetic language, and again, by a group of passages, he lays bare at one stroke the golden ore which the older revelation contained.

(b) But further, he treats the Biblical narrative as true. This will be denied by none; but it is important to observe how vital the truthfulness of the narrative was to Paul's theological position. For he conceived of the gospel as the climax in a series of economies which were particularly ordered by God with a view to the announcement and understanding of it. He begins commonly with the period of the promise, and then explains the reason of the later introduction of the law. In his analysis of sin, however, he goes back to the first man and distinctly bases his doctrine of justification on the unity of the race in Adam. It thus appears that the truthfulness of the Old Testament's narrative—so far at least as its leading features are concerned—was fundamental to Paul's view of God's government of the world and of the method of man's salvation. And so, when alluding to the facts stated in the narrative, he always treats them as real. This is to be particularly noted for the reason that his view of Scripture, which I have described, as written for the spiritual instruction of the later Church, might have led him, as it has led others, to undervalue the historical nature of the facts. It might have transformed Scripture into an allegory, as it did in less accurate hands. But even when drawing his spiritual lesson from Hagar and Sarah, he manifestly regards the facts related of them as true. So he speaks of the life of Israel in the desert, "These things *happened* unto them typically (or, by way of example)." He did not look upon the narrative as an allegory, but as a relation of actual facts, some of which were of vital importance for a right conception of God's dealings with mankind,

and so narrated as to set forth, when properly understood, what God intended us to learn. So organic was the relation in his view between the dispensation of the gospel and the previous history of Israel as set forth in the Scriptures, that only in the light of the latter could it be said, "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son" (Gal. iv. 4).

(c) Still again, he is careful at times to support his argument by an appeal to the precise words used by the sacred writers. Did he teach that "Christ has been made a curse for us?" He appeals, in justification of his language, to the language of Deuteronomy, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. iii. 10). He confirms his doctrine of the spiritual Israel by the language of the promise to Abraham, "and to thy seed," "as of one, even Christ" (Gal. iii. 16). So in the Epistle to the Romans, his appeal frequently lies to the language of Scripture as well as to its real significance. He points out that the Scripture declares that "the just shall live by faith" (i. 17); that "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness" (iv. 3); that circumcision was given to him "as a sign" (iv. 11); that he was intended to be the spiritual ancestor of believing gentiles because called "the father of many nations" (iv. 17); that his spiritual seed should not be identified with his fleshly descendants because it was written, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called" (ix. 7); that the Scripture itself applies the word "hardening" to God's rejection of the reprobate (ix. 18). These examples are sufficient to prove that in Paul's mind the very phraseology of the Scripture was valid for religious argument, and expressed divine thought.

What then is to be said of certain features of his quotations which appear to many inconsistent with such belief in the value of Scripture language? It is a fact that he often makes his quotations loosely, and occasionally does no more than give their substance. Sometimes, also, he evidently changed the phraseology on purpose. In a number of instances he differs from the Septuagint, and sometimes follows the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew, and occasionally differs from both. Many regard these facts as wholly inconsistent with any high valuation of the words of Scripture. But, aside from the fact that the latter view would make Paul contradict his own express statements, the following additional facts deserve consideration.

It is wholly unreasonable to require that even an inspired man, who believed that the words of Scripture were written under God's direction, should always quote Scripture with textual exactness. This would be to insist on his becoming a pedant, as if God could not inspire a man to write rhetorically, or poetically, as well

as, when the occasion required, with simple prosaic accuracy. We have only a right to require of Paul, on his own theory of the inspiration both of Scripture and himself, that when he declares Scripture to have said a thing, it shall be true that Scripture did say it; and that, when he does argue from the words of Scripture, the words shall be there and his argument from them be in accordance with Scriptural principles. To insist that Paul's doctrine of Scripture, as we have presented it, ought to have precluded him from ever citing the sense rather than the language of the Old Testament, or from ever combining passages together, or from ever failing to correct any bad translation of the Septuagint when the existing translation did not invalidate the force of his appeal, or from changing the language intentionally, when by so doing he could bring out the meaning more strongly for the purpose in hand, is to insist that his epistles, because inspired, should have none of those rhetorical qualities which were the natural manifestation of the apostle's own mental processes.

In reality, however, Paul is remarkably exact, in the great majority of instances, when formally quoting from the Old Testament. The wonder is that his memory served him so well; for of course he could seldom have had the means, if he so desired, of verifying his citations. When he does quote loosely, his argument never depends on the verbal accuracy of his quotation, and he always correctly represents the teaching of Scripture when he professes to do so. His mind, however, was so saturated with Scripture that he seems often to be rather speaking himself in its words than to be citing it, and he continually strives in citing to explain and apply it. Thus in Galatians we find eleven clear quotations. Of these, five (iii. 6, 11, 16, iv. 27, v. 14) are verbally exact, and three (iii. 8, 12, 13) practically so—(*i. e.*, the differences, chiefly in tense or person or verbal form, are too slight to invalidate the accuracy of the quotation),—while the variations in the other three (ii. 16, iii. 10, iv. 30) can be accounted for by the apostle's desire to state the Old Testament teaching in phraseology which would make its real significance clearer to his readers. In 1 Corinthians, out of twenty-seven instances of reference to Old Testament language, only eleven are again formal quotations. Of these, seven are exact or practically so, and three (iii. 19, xiv. 21, xv. 54) indicate either acquaintance with the Hebrew and an intentional correction of the LXX., or else the possession by Paul of a better Greek version than we have. The remaining quotation (ii. 9) is very free, so that some suppose it to have been taken from a lost apocryphal book. But that is a violent hypothesis, opposed to Paul's invariable custom elsewhere; and since the citation expresses Scriptural

teaching in Scriptural figures of speech, and since there is a passage in Isaiah (liv. 4) which obviously forms its starting-point, we can only look upon this case as one in which the apostle modified consciously the prophetic declaration in order to apply its principle more forcibly to the matter of which he was writing.

In the Romans there are about seventy-three quotations and allusions of all kinds. Of these, twenty-seven are exact citations and twenty practically so. Only eight could be called loose, eight are mere allusions, two are centos of scattered passages grouped for a purpose. In four cases we may observe apparently intentional changes of verbiage to make the bearing of the truth more evident. Seven times (i. 17, ix. 1, 7, 32, x. 15, xi. 4, 34, xii. 19) he differs from the Septuagint, and corresponds more closely to Hebrew. In six instances (iii. 4, 14, ix. 32, x. 11, xii. 19, xv. 12) he follows the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew, but in none of these cases does the sense of Scripture suffer. Once (xi. 26) he differs in a single word from both Hebrew and Septuagint, saying, "*Out of Sion shall come the deliverer,*" instead of "*To or for Sion;*" but here he apparently mingled a reminiscence of one of the Psalms with the language of Isaiah.

It would be tedious for me to give more details. I believe these to be fair specimens of the proportion of exact and inexact quotations in Paul's epistles as well as of his methods. The key to whatever difficulty remains is found in the fact, which should never be forgotten, that Paul combined and meant to combine in his use of Scripture the functions of both an appellant and an interpreter. He is ever bent on letting the light of the gospel on the Scripture, as well as on supporting the gospel by the Scripture. He never pretended that he had derived his doctrine from the Scripture. He always claimed that he had derived it by revelation from Jesus Christ. Then, however, he saw the meaning of Scripture, and could both appeal to it and explain it. His exegetical method therefore was determined by his practical purpose. He had no need, as we have, first to state the "grammatico-historical" sense of the passage quoted, and then elaborately to show the principle on which it could be applied to the case in hand. When quoting, he often is interpreting. Hence some of his striking combinations of passages. Hence his change of its phraseology when occasion required. Hence his attitude now of reverence for its letter, and now of apparent disregard of its letter and attention solely to its essential meaning. When all these facts are duly considered, there appears nothing in Paul's actual use of Scripture which can be fairly made to contradict his expressed doctrine.

And now in the light of this study we may grasp the meaning

which he himself must have meant to convey by the word which in his last epistle he applied to Scripture—*θεόπνευστος*. It is his own word. It means "breathed into by God." He affirms it not of the writers, but of the sacred writings. These writings are "God in-breathed." The apostle must be his own interpreter, and by the aid of what I have shown, the idea which he embodied in this now classic word is to be obtained. By their inspiration he evidently meant that, as writings, they were so composed under God's particular direction that both in substance and in form they were the special utterance of His mind and will. Their words like the apostle's were "pneumatic." The divine Spirit dwelt in them and breathed through them. And this in no vague, mystic, intangible sense, but in the same sense in which he had said of himself and his fellow-apostles, "We speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," and with the same result that the writings were veritably the Word of God. *How* the divine Spirit operated in either case Paul does not say. The fact and its consequences he unmistakably affirms.

I have purposely omitted any appeal to the Epistle to the Hebrews because its authorship is disputed even by evangelical scholars. If, however, it was not written by Paul, it is certainly the utterance of Pauline ideas. When, then, we find in it the Psalmist's words quoted, "To-day if ye will hear his voice," with this formula, "as the Holy Ghost saith"—and when we observe further that the writer's argument turns in great part on the use in the psalm of the word "to-day"—we are made doubly sure that our interpretation of Paul's doctrine of Scripture is correct, and that he held it in common with the other Christian teachers of the apostolic age.

Such is the account which to the exegetical student Paul renders of his own inspiration and of that of the Old Testament. That the same is equally true of the other writings of the New Testament will hardly be denied by any who accept Paul's representations. He recognized the authority of the other apostles as of the same nature with his own, and the books which they wrote or gave to the Church must stand on the same level with his or the whole Pauline doctrine of inspiration be given up. He nowhere affirms, be it noted, that inspiration was confined to the apostles, and his recognition of Christian prophets—as when he declares the Church to be built "on the foundation of apostles and prophets"—would seem to imply the contrary. But he does make the apostles infallible teachers and the authorized founders of the Church. Those writings therefore which, though not written by apostles, were accepted by the Church from the beginning as part of Scripture, must

be regarded as sealed with their authority and therefore also inspired; and the fact is that in the following century apostolic authority—direct or indirect—was the express ground on which the books of the New Testament were received by the Church. That even in the apostolic age itself the conception of a New Testament Scripture had formed, to which the same qualities were attributed which were held to belong to the Old Testament, appears incidentally when Paul cites (1 Tim. v. 18) the saying of our Lord, "The laborer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7) as a saying of Scripture, and when Peter in his second epistle refers to Paul's epistles under the same title. Those who, partly because of these expressions, would deny the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles and of Second Peter must surely fail to realize what Paul's teaching on the subject of inspired Scripture really was.

IV. Now it is not my place to condense these exegetical results into a dogmatic formula, though I think it obvious what that formula should be. I desire to state in conclusion what, I apprehend, should be the effect of these claims of the Bible on the mind of the Christian scholar as he approaches its study. I say "Christian scholar" because with such alone we are concerned. It is not likely that many of us would devote our lives to the study of the Bible, were it not for our settled convictions that its teaching is of supreme value to mankind. But when, in addition to this general conviction, we find it to make such pretensions as I have endeavored to describe, these cannot but impose special requirements upon the student.

Certainly he must approach it with peculiar reverence. It is not like other books. It is not inspired in the sense in which works of genius or spiritual insight are. In its production God was immediately and peculiarly concerned. As our Lord is the Son of God in a sense in which His people are not, though they also in their way are sons of God, so is the Bible His Word in a sense which cannot be affirmed even of those other literary products (of which there are many), which contain the truth and manifest the divine Spirit. Such is the Bible's own account of itself, and if we may not accept its account of itself, why should we care to ascertain its account of other things?

So it is hardly possible for one who realizes this to go to the study of it in the same mental attitude in which he would approach other literature. He is dealing with a body which is, he has reason to believe, in all its parts quick with divine thought and life; and he cannot use his lens and scalpel on it with ordinary emotions.

He would, however, utterly misapprehend its character and claims, if his reverence were blind or unintelligent. The inspired

Word pretends to be in every sense a living thing, and to enter into its secrets the student must himself be alive, both intellectually and morally. He is very far from dealing with a mechanical product. In its doctrines and its words, in its substance and its form, in its historical genesis and in its proclamation of eternal truths the Bible is an organism—with its roots running down into the history, the language, the social, mental and religious activity both of the Hebrews and of the greater world about them—while yet its molding, forming principle is derived from above. As I have said, Paul nowhere describes the *method by* which the divine Spirit operated in himself or in the prophets to produce the Scripture. It is only the fact and the consequences to which he bears his testimony. The method we must judge, so far as may be possible, from the phenomena. These point to a complex process, wherein many subordinate agents were made to coöperate with the immediate exercise of divine power. Out of the matrix of a divinely guided history was this divine-human book born, and our very faith in its complete divine vitality should make us eager to apprehend every human element which entered into its being. Through the form alone can we reach the substance; through the words the thought; through the historical the doctrinal; through the human the divine. Every element of this complex literary product acquires new interest when we believe that through them all we are brought into contact with the process in and by which God has revealed Himself and His will to men.

At the same time his reverence for the finished product will keep the student cautious and humble in his judgments. He will not expect to understand everything about the construction of the Bible. He will not be staggered if he finds in it statements which he cannot yet comprehend, or phenomena which he cannot yet explain. He will assuredly trust its statements when they are clearly ascertained. If his reverence be intelligent and his examination be critical, as they certainly ought to be, both his intelligence and his criticism will recognize that the character of the subject examined sets obvious limitations upon their exercise.

1. But to be more specific, the Bible's account of itself will impress upon the student the great importance of ascertaining by valid processes the original text. We know enough of the history of the New Testament text to perceive that in all that is required for the correct ascertainment of Christian doctrine and duty, God has "by singular care and providence kept it pure through all ages." Nevertheless, the student will want to secure as nearly as possible an absolute reproduction of the original, that he may apprehend the precise thought of the inspired penman even in its smallest

details. The Bible's account of itself would seem to provide the strongest incentive to the study of textual criticism.

2. The same reason also will stimulate to the most exact and painstaking exegesis. To one who accepts the Bible's account of itself, no question, even of grammatical structure, will appear without importance. The usage of words, their origin and their receptiveness of Scriptural thought, the laws governing literary composition of this and of that kind, will be investigated by him with new zeal. Everything will be valued which will enable him to grasp the precise shade of thought in the section before him. It would be an immense mistake for him to become a careless exegete, or to fancy that, because its verbal forms are inspired, he is not to strive to grasp the very thought which is in them—or to suppose that because in all its parts it is inspired, he is not carefully to observe from it the proportion of truth and to grasp its teaching as a whole—or to allow his spiritual fancy to interpret Scripture as the exigencies of the pulpit may seem to require. This was the fault of much of exegesis in the ancient Church; and though it was based on a correct doctrine of Scripture, and was meant to do honor to the inspired Word, it wrought for ages injury to the truth, and hid, while it pretended to unfold, the Word of God. We should rather conclude from the inspiration of Scripture, that every statement of it is to be apprehended with precise accuracy—is to be seen to be just what it exactly is, if the divine thought in it and the relation of its thought to others, and so the complex thought of the whole, are to be really learned. They who accept and teach a wholly inspired Bible ought to count no labor too great to ascertain, by the use of every critical instrument as well as by devout sympathy with both the human and the divine authors, the exact meaning of the book.

3. And then, building on precise exegesis, interpreting according to the natural rules of the various kinds of literary composition, the student will move through the Bible from its beginning to its close—feeling his way, as it were, from fibre to fibre, from part to part of this living organism—until he approaches to an apprehension of it as a whole, perceives its structural unfolding and its vital principle, and is thus enabled to enter into the fullness of its content. Such a student should not be surprised, if he discover that elements, historical or verbal or doctrinal, which enter into the structure of the Bible, had a previous existence of their own. There is an economy observable in all God's operations whereby He uses existing materials for new purposes rather than creates similar ones, and the entirely unmechanical view of inspiration which we have gleaned from the Bible makes it even probable that in some cases (for

example in the Synoptic gospels) a valid literary criticism may discern preëxisting materials. But the student who accepts the Bible account of itself must admit that only as incorporated in the Scripture can such materials be affirmed to be inspired; and while such investigations may interest and instruct him, he will feel it to be his chief duty to apprehend aright the teaching of the Bible itself. He will feel that only by entering into its thought, as that is progressively unfolded in the Bible, will he be able to use the book for the supreme purposes for which it claims to have been given.

PRINCETON.

GEORGE T. PURVES.