

25, 1891

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 17.—JULY, 1891.

I. AUTHORITY IN REVELATION AND MORALS.

FIVE FALLACIES AND ONE FIASCO CONVERGENT.

CURRENT literature, popular addresses and constantly recurring conversations in social intercourse, discover six convergent influences actively at work in society. Four are newer; two older. The aim of each is to shift the basis of authority in moral and religious life. The six forces differ widely in nature and in the character of those who direct the propagation and transmission of them through society. But, without collusion and moving along different, and sometimes antagonistic, lines, they tend to the same result, the annihilation of finality and authority in ethics and revelation. The convergence implies the superintendence of the same evil personality, shrewdly intruding himself into these different spheres of life and giving a common direction to their movements.

1. Blatant last century infidelity holds that miracles cannot be proven by testimony, and that, therefore, the claims of Christianity cannot be established because resting on them. It denies the relevancy or pertinency of what are called the evidences of Christianity, and in regard to Scripture would say: granted that a revelation has been made, it cannot be authenticated. It scoffs at religion as a superstition, and sneers at authoritative morals as the silly scruples of childhood and inexperience—greenness. Its ethics are utilitarian only. The best that it can say is, moral principles must be obeyed, because it is for the good of society. The evil of such a system was shown long ago in the famous passage about balances when held in the hands of self.—*David Hume, his confrères and followers.*

II. INSPIRATION.

The inspiration of the Bible is one of the living questions of the day. Many regard it as a vital question to Christianity. Some of our late apologists, however, do not so consider it. Fisher, in his *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, takes the position that the inspiration of the Scriptures, though a fact, is not essential to our faith in Christ; that the Bible may be regarded as a purely human book, and yet the proof of Christianity remain substantially unimpaired; that all the evidence we need from the Scriptures we may get, if we regard them as the production of reliable men. These statements naturally shock us at their first presentation. Reflection, however, will probably lead us to conclude that Fisher may be right; that our religion is divinely pure and perfect, and its evidences unassailable, even though the record of it had been the work of merely good though uninspired men.

Within the limits of Christendom there are few intelligent men who deny the inspiration of the Bible. This is true of heterodox as well as of orthodox thinkers and writers. The question is as to the nature, not as to the reality, of inspiration. Baur, Strauss and Renan, as well as Calovius, Buxtorf and Quenstedt, believe that the Scriptures are inspired; but they are poles apart in their understanding of what inspiration is.

It will help to a simpler and clearer discussion if we consider this question under two main heads, the manner, or nature, and the extent of inspiration.

NATURE OF INSPIRATION.

There are two radical views held as to the manner of inspiration:

I. That it is ordinary, natural, human. There are several forms of this belief. Schleiermacher, Coleridge and Morell regard inspiration as a kind of genius, a natural, or a naturally-acquired, power of intuition. Just as all men are able to perceive first truths and primary ideas, such as space, time, cause and the axioms of math-

ematics; and as some men are naturally gifted as musicians, painters, sculptors, poets, orators, to see the beautiful and the sublime, so there have been men who had the power of religious intuition—some to a larger, some to a less degree. This view is not necessarily inconsistent with the higher or supernatural theory; surely not, as presented by Morell, for he holds that this power of religious intuition possessed by the writers of the Bible was a “state of mind consequent upon special and Divine arrangements—a state in which there is involved an extraordinary and miraculous elevation of the religious consciousness of certain chosen individuals, for the express illumination of humanity at large.” It is credible that God might have endowed the sacred penmen with this extraordinary power from their birth, or might have conferred it upon them in their maturity. Even as so held, however, the theory seems liable to the objection, that it regards the inspired as remarkable men in themselves, so far as religious truths are concerned, as having a general power of religious intuition; whereas many of them were quite ordinary men, and were used only as passive instruments in the communication of the divine will. This theory is thoroughly naturalistic, when inspiration is held to be mere genius turned to religious truths, and like all human genius, more or less imperfect and erroneous.

There is a modification of this view, according to which the inspired were extraordinary men, not by nature but by cultivation; purer, more intelligent and spiritual than others. That they were superior was due to their faithful and efficient use of the means of grace and illumination possessed by them in common with all believers. Inspiration is, therefore, the common gift of the Spirit.

Evolution has been pressed into the service of Christianity in more ways than one. It has been applied to inspiration; its advocates contending that the Biblical writers were the natural products of their race and age, “simply more fully developed men.” This theory needs to account for the fact, that this natural process has not produced a succession of inspired men with increasing powers of divination.

Several objections appear to all naturalistic interpretations of inspiration. 1. They all leave us in doubt as to the reliability of

the revelation, as they make the Bible virtually a human book. This objection might be met by the assertion, that God chose these men because they were naturally fitted for the work. But this would satisfy those only, who are prepared to believe that the Bible is not distinctively God's book ; that it is essentially human and partakes of the imperfections incident to its authorship. If the Bible is a perfect book, or contains superhuman truth, it could not have come from the fallible mind of man.

2. These theories are inconsistent with the fact, that ignorant and wicked men were the subjects of inspiration. As stated under the first objection, this fact would be fatal, even if the writers were the most superior men, mentally, morally, spiritually, that the race has known ; that is, on the presumption that the Bible is infallible ; for "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ?" The point of the difficulty here, however, is that some of the inspired men of the Bible were not the best men, not superior to others ; a few not equal to their uninspired contemporaries : "Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness ;" Solomon, who "loved many strange women," "had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines," "went after Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites," and "did evil in the sight of the Lord ;" David, the adulterer and murderer, who was not allowed to build the temple, because he had "shed much blood upon the earth ;" the disobedient prophet slain by a lion ; Jonah, who thought he could escape the Omniscient and Omnipotent in his wilful refusal to obey God's command, and who was angry because God was merciful ; Amos, a mere "herdman and gatherer of sycamore fruit ;" Peter, whom Jesus rebuked as Satan, who denied his Lord, and dissembled with Paul ; John, who was ambitious for preëminence among the apostles ; and Caiaphas, the judicial murderer of Jesus, 1 Cor. xiii. 2 seeming to imply that one might be gifted with prophecy and yet be without charity ; and in 1 Cor. i. 26-28, we are told that God chooses, not the wise, but the foolish, the weak, the base, the despised, "that no flesh should glory before God."

3. This human or naturalistic hypothesis is contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures, that the inspiration came to the writers

from without and not from within themselves. John xvi. 13-15: "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth. He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you." 1 Peter i. 11: "Searching what time, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." 2 Peter i. 21: "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. ii. 13: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." All of these statements show that it was not the writer's intuition, nor his superior wisdom and spirituality, nor his developed personality, that inspired him; but the Spirit of God, a distinct mind and person, dwelling in him, informing him and speaking through him.

II. The opposite view is, that inspiration is extraordinary, supernatural, superhuman, divine; a special bestowment by the Spirit of God upon the minds of those chosen to write the Bible, by which they were qualified to make known infallibly God's will. Here a discrimination must be made between those parts of the Bible naturally known to the writers and those not known. One of God's economical laws is that of parsimony; he does not act for his creatures where they can act for themselves.

1. A very large number of facts and truths recorded in the Scriptures were known to the writers independent of any inspiration they might possess. Moses was an eyewitness of the events of the exodus; Samuel, of those of his own time; Matthew and John were daily attendants upon Christ's ministry; Luke was not only Paul's companion in his later travels, but tells us that he had learned the facts of the gospel history from those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning. David was probably a natural poet. Solomon had wisdom to make many proverbs. So of the truths set forth, the precepts laid down, the warnings uttered, the consolations given in the Bible; many of them are manifestly within the compass of human ability. It is doubtless true that much more than one-half of the entire Scriptures is a statement of facts and truths naturally known to the writers. What has inspiration to do with this part of the book? Manifestly the Spirit did not enable

the penmen to see these things, for they already saw them. Was inspiration, therefore, unnecessary? By no means. Here is a radical mistake of Morell, who contends that inspiration is limited to the intuition, as distinct from the rational intellect. Suppose the composite theory of the Pentateuch is true, was no unerring, heavenly guidance necessary in the selection of the material thus brought together? Or, to take a better example, did Matthew or John write all he knew of Christ's acts and words? John, if he wrote the last chapter of his Gospel, tells us plainly that he did not. Did Luke record all that was told him? In all this part of the Bible, inspiration effected two objects: 1, It guided the writers in the selection of facts and truths already known; and 2, It controlled them in the arrangement and expression of the truths and events. Both of these are necessary, if the Bible is God's book, and we may rely implicitly upon its declarations.

2. The more important, though it be the smaller, portion of the Scriptures presents truths and facts not known naturally by the writers. A distinction may here be drawn between those things which the sacred penmen did not know and those which no human mind could know. Prophecy, in a sense, represents both of these, and particularly the former. The seer in his day could not naturally know the future event, while the generation living at the fulfilment would witness it. Creation is a fact which no human eye observed. The Trinity of the Godhead, the two-fold nature in the one person of Christ, are truths which the reason of man could not have discovered. With reference to this entire class, the sacred writers were of themselves alike hopelessly ignorant. The central truth of the Bible, the redemption of the world by the mediation of Christ, belongs to this category.

The office of inspiration with regard to this class is also two-fold: 1, To reveal to the writers the unknown facts and truths; and 2, To guide them in the infallible expression of them. Inspiration is thus seen to be complex, composed of three elements—1, Selection; 2, Revelation; 3, Expression. It is essentially a divine power; it is, indeed, exclusively so. But it is a divine influence exerted upon the human mind, and shows itself in the effects produced in the inspired mind. The divine inspiring Spirit in-

spires the human mind. The sacred penmen, however, were not always wholly passive under this influence; when the Spirit was discharging the function of revelation, they were passively receptive; but in the processes of selection and expression, they were active, and the inspiring influence simply controlled and guided their activity.

This introduces the psychology of inspiration. As already said, Morell is mistaken in limiting the inspiring influence to the intuition. It is rather probable that there was no faculty of the mind which was not on some occasion, as might be needed, energized and directed by it. In all visions, the perceptive powers were quickened, as when Saul met Jesus near Damascus, he saw and heard him, though he was not seen by Saul's companions. It is specially promised that the Spirit should stimulate the memory of the apostles (John xiv. 26). In the selection of what they should record, and in the presentation of the relations of truths to one another, the judgment and the reasoning faculty must be guided. In the setting forth of the glorious wonders of the apocalypse, the conceptive imagination was inspired. The affections and desires were also doubtless controlled, and through them the will. Balaam had a strong natural wish to curse Israel and thus obtain the reward of Balak; but his desire was restrained, and he was compelled to bless. The power of expression was helped and directed to a clear, forcible, accurate utterance.

A word may be said about the modes of inspiration. These concern mainly, if not exclusively, the element of revelation. They were numerous, and may be classified as immediate and mediate. The immediate was the direct influence of the Spirit upon the mind of the writer, upon his perception, his memory, his judgment, or his will, as the truth revealed might require. The most important truths, and probably the majority were made known in this way. The mediate modes were, dreams by night, visions by day, the Shechinah, Urin and Thummim, angels, inscription on the two tables of stone, writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace, a voice, possibly the Bath-Kol, etc. The theophanies may be regarded as one mode of direct or immediate revelation.

THE EXTENT OF INSPIRATION.

This is perhaps the more interesting question of the two. In orthodox circles, there is a much greater diversity of views with regard to it:

I. There are those who limit inspiration to the thoughts and exclude it from the expression of the thoughts. According to this view, the truths are divine, and the language human. These may be sub-divided into two classes: 1, Those who hold that the Spirit confined himself to matters connected with redemption, to religious truths and facts. 2, Those who extend his influence to the selection and revelation of all the truths found in the Bible. They agree in believing that the writers were left to their own unaided powers of expression. The thought, therefore, is divine and perfect, while the language is human and fallible.

II. The opposing view holds to verbal inspiration; that the words as well as thoughts were directed by the Spirit. These however, do not thoroughly agree. They divide upon two principles: 1, As before, some hold that inspiration is limited to the religious element of the Bible; while others contend that it is universal, extending to history, science, etc. 2, Again, some exclude human agency altogether, except as a passive instrument in the hands of the Spirit; like Swedenborg, contending that the writers were like a lyre played upon by the divine hand. Others object that the human mind is not matter, and is not, therefore, subject to mechanical laws; and affirm that the Spirit so controlled the sacred penmen that his thoughts were their thoughts, and his words were their words. To use a modern illustration, the former view makes the writers servile amanuenses, taking the words dictated to them by the Spirit, and exercising no more free power than the phonograph. The latter makes these same amanuenses take the idea from the Spirit, express it freely, naturally, according to their peculiarities of style, and at the same time, in such a way that the Spirit is willing to adopt the expression, as well as the idea, as his own. According to the former, the influence of the Spirit, in both thought and language, is positive, directive, suggestive. According to the latter, his influence as to the

thought is positive, but as to the language is negative, corrective, restraining from inaccuracy and error. The divine is at the maximum in both by the former view; it is at the maximum in the thought, and the human is at the maximum in the language, by the latter. According to both, the Spirit makes himself responsible for thought and expression, so that the Bible is both the mind of God and the word of God.

Is verbal inspiration essential to the divine authenticity of the Bible?

1. Dr. Charles Hodge and others contend that it is involved in the inspiration of the thought; that the thought could not have been suggested to the writers except as clothed in language, and in particular language. This does not seem to be true in every mode of revelation; surely not in dreams and visions, in all symbolic revelations. Thought is not the Siamese twin of language. Thought can exist and does exist without language; in brutes, infants, mutes. Even those possessed of speech are conscious of the existence of the thought prior to and independent of its embodiment and expression in words. But it may be urged, that while there may be thought without language, there can be no communication of thought without it. Is this true? Not only the speechless, but those endowed with articulation often converse without it. Moreover, if the finite should be so limited, is it equally true of the Infinite? Is not the Omniscient Spirit free to work with means above them, or without them? Still, again, granting that the Spirit suggested everything to the inspired by means of words, is it necessary to suppose that it was a definite and complete expression in words? May it not have been abbreviated?

2. The admitted varieties of style in the several books of the Bible are of importance in answering this question, when we observe that these variations regularly occur with a change of human authorship. It is conceded that each of the four gospels is written in independent forms of speech; that the Acts have the style of Luke; that the epistles of Paul bear marks in expression which show a different hand from the others. Does not this indicate that the language is human and personal to the individual writers?

3. The quotations of Christ and the apostles from the Old Testament in language different from that found in the original passages would seem to show that they regarded the language as unessential. The same thing is true of some of the most marked portions of the Scriptures. Take two examples. There is no passage in the Old Testament more important than the ten commandments. We are told that God wrote them with his own finger on the tables of stone. They are recorded twice, (Exodus xx. 2-17 and Deut. vi. 6-21). On comparison it is seen that there are variations in the second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth commandments. In the New Testament nothing is more interesting than the Lord's Prayer. It is also recorded twice. Matthew, who possibly heard Jesus speak it, though he was not called to the apostleship till afterwards, gives it as a part of the Sermon on the Mount, (Matt. vi. 9-13). Luke, whose knowledge was gathered from others, records it, (xi. 2-4). Place the two side by side and several important variations are manifest. The same thing is true of the entire Sermon on the Mount.

4. The fact that God has allowed the original autographs to perish, so that they are no longer in the possession of men, and that from the apographs it is practically impossible in some cases to recover with certainty the exact wording of the original, tends to show that the Lord does not regard the *ipsissima verba* as essential.

In connection with this, it should be borne in mind that all except a very few have the Scriptures and can read them only in translations, whose wording, of course, is entirely different from that of the Hebrew and Greek. Practically the world to-day has the Bible in uninspired language.

5. Literalism is too mechanical and mathematical to consist with all the rest of God's dealings with man on moral and spiritual questions. The law of probability pervades the entire sphere of moral truth. Mathematical exactness, compelling belief, is not found there. "The letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life." Room is left for human judgment, in the exercise of which lies our responsibility.

That verbal inspiration is essential, and that verbal inspiration

is a fact, are two distinct propositions. While it may not be necessary that the very words should have been inspired, yet as a fact they may have been so. That there is verbal inspiration in the Bible is undoubtedly true. We are told repeatedly, "The Holy Ghost saith;" Paul says (1 Cor. ii. 13), "which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth."

The verbal theory was not held by such men as Augustine, Luther, Melanethon, Calvin, Zwingle, Baxter, Doddridge, Tholuck, Alford and Farrar. The Helvetian *Consensus*, on the other hand, goes so far as to declare the Old Testament "θεόπνευστος," equally as regards the consonants, the vowels, and the vowel-points, or at least their force."

Is it necessary to the inspiration of the Scriptures that the scientific facts and historical events found in them shall be divinely vouched for? There are three opinions on this question held by orthodox writers. (1). That every statement in the Bible on any topic whatever is inspired; if scientific, it is perfect; if historic, it is absolutely accurate. Not many writers hold this view, but it prevails probably among the loyal and loving readers of the Bible. (2). That the religious portions alone are inspired; and that all other parts are human, and as such subject to imperfection and error. Baxter, Tillotson, Doddridge, Warburton, Paley, Whately, Heber, Scott, Pye Smith, Alford and others have taken this position. Luther thought that the epistle of James was "strawy," and that Paul's argument in Gal. iv. was insufficient. Calvin believed there were inaccuracies, as, for example, the quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9, where Jeremiah is cited as author of a passage found only in Zechariah. (3). A middle view is held by many, who limit inspiration to the religious element, but think that even on other questions no mistakes are made, while there may not be scientific precision. Such was the position of Howe, Burnet, Lowth, Barrow, Conybeare, Hinds, Bloomfield and others.

The necessity for the universal inspiration of the Bible should be settled, *pro* or *con*, by a recurrence to the purpose of the revelation. Whatever is necessary to the perfect fulfilment of that

purpose is essential, and *vice versa*. The design of the Bible is manifestly to reveal and record God's purpose and plan for the redemption of man. Are the scientific facts and historical events a part of that purpose and plan necessary to its fulfilment, or to its revelation; then they must be a portion of the inspired volume. On the other hand, are they merely incidental, but the frame of the picture or the scaffold of the building; then they may be inspired, but need not be.

Facts seem to show that a part of the truths and of the words of the Bible need not be inspired, and possibly are not so; that all religious facts and truths are fully inspired, both as to thought and expression, so that there is no statement upon which the salvation of the soul may turn which is not altogether of the Spirit and infallibly true.

Is there such a thing as passive inspiration? This kind of inspiration is sometimes stigmatized as mantic, and sometimes as mechanic, and its existence is totally denied. Others maintain that there was no other kind. The truth lies between these two. Much the greater part of inspiration was probably dynamic, and consisted in an energizing of the inspired mind, so that with its own faculties it intelligently saw and made known the truth. On the other hand, in some instances, the writer was wholly passive, purely receptive, and in other instances, he did not understand the revelation which he himself made. These are cases of plenary, verbal, mechanic, *ipsissima verba* inspiration in the fullest sense. For example, take the vision recorded in the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Daniel, and read what the inspired prophet himself says at the conclusion (xii. 8), "And I heard, but I understood not." He passively received the revelation, and mechanically, as a phonograph, repeated it. Such, too, was doubtless John's condition when, on Patmos, he witnessed the apocalyptic visions, and such was Paul's, when he was "caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words." In all these instances, the inspired seem to have been subjects of what Plato would have called the divine *μανία*.

The differences of opinion among sincere students and lovers of the Bible are largely cases of looking on different sides of the same shield. There is a basis, more or less ample, for every theory held by the orthodox. They are all more or less true; but they are all more or less partial. A wise, unprejudiced eclecticism, rigidly determined to consider and coördinate all the facts, is doubtless the true position on the vexed points of this question. This is the main idea contained in this paper. It has appeared to the writer in his reading and study upon the question that theologians become the victims of their theory, and seek to convince themselves that, because some of the language is human, it must all be; because sometimes the writers were rapt and passively received and ignorantly gave forth the revelation, such must have always been the case. The facts would seem to show that no exclusive theory is correct and that all have in them a modicum of truth.

It is a serious question, whether the attempt to reconcile all the trivial discrepancies to be found in the Bible, on the assumption that every word on every subject must have been directly dictated by the Spirit, or even so controlled by him as that he made himself responsible for it, does not cost more than it comes to. It is believed that a stronger, more masculine and assured faith looks upon these things as the merest trivialities, as the imperfect human setting of the precious jewel of inspired truth.

We need not wonder that the divine and the human come thus so close together and are so intimately intermingled. So did they combine in the one person of Jesus; weeping as man, raising Lazarus as God. So did they meet in many of the miracles: the brother, raised by divine power, must be unbound by human ministry; the restored daughter of Jairus must be nourished by parental care. So do they meet in every case of regeneration and sanctification; God's perfect work blending with the imperfect exercises of the human soul.

But, it is said, this confounds the divine and the human, and no one can separate and distinguish the elements. Can this be so? Is it true that there is not a marked difference between the finite and the infinite, the imperfect and the perfect, the human and the divine? Can we not unerringly trace the golden thread of divine

truth, interwoven with the texture of the earthly? Must we not dive into the ocean to find the pearls, and dig into the earth for the diamond? Do we fail to recognize them when we see them?

Was inspiration limited in those who were the subjects of it?

I. With regard to quantity, there seems little, if any, ground for variant opinions. It is reasonably certain that, outside of what they were directed to communicate as a part of the divine revelation, the Scripture writers were fallible as other men; they were not inerrant in thought or life. It is doubtless true that some were inspired to speak alone, as Elijah and Elisha; some to write alone, as Luke perhaps; and many to both write and speak, as the apostles. But in every case, there were definite bounds to their inspiration. Not everything that Paul said and wrote was inspired. If so, then God has allowed the inspired epistle to the Laodiceans to perish. Paul and Barnabas had a sharp contention as to Mark. Both could not have been, and doubtless neither was, moved by the Spirit, in thought or expression, in this quarrel. Paul withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed. Here manifestly, Peter, at least, was without divine direction. Moses was not moved by the Spirit to smite the rock and exclaim as he did. David, in the matter of Uriah, was clearly under the instigation of the devil; as was Solomon in his worship of idols. Balaam and Caiaphas were inspired to a very limited extent, both as to time and matter.

II. As to limitations of quality, or degree, the Christian world is not at one. The prevailing orthodox opinion is probably a denial of degrees of inspiration. The argument seems a short one; all inspiration is perfect, and, therefore, cannot be graduated. It is strange that we deceive ourselves with such paralogisms. The circle of the ring on the tapering finger of a belle is perfect, but is much smaller than the circumference of the earth. God's knowledge is infinitely perfect, but the amount of it which he may see fit to bestow upon his inspired agents may be quite small. That there is progress in the revelations of the Bible from the beginning to the end can hardly be questioned by the intelligent student. Take its central truth, redemption by Christ; there is no reason-

able doubt that the New Testament is to the Old Testament as the mid-day to the earliest dawn. The same is true of immortality, the resurrection, the Holy Spirit, the church; indeed, of almost every important doctrine. Yet, without question, the Old Testament was as really inspired as the New Testament.

It is interesting to study prophetic inspiration with reference to this point. Did the prophets always see with perfect clearness the events which they were directed to predict? When David wrote the 22d Psalm, did he know its bearing on the Messiah? Is it true that the foretold facts were all seen with equal clearness, distinctness and adequacy? Did not the same prophet have some future events revealed to himself more fully than others were? Is it not apparent that to their contemporaries, some of their predictions were more lucid than others? Did John fully comprehend the revelations of Patmos? Are not some of these visions more readily apprehended than others? Any foreseeing of the future is beyond the unaided power of man. He may conjecture, but he cannot see the future, not even one moment ahead. Prophetic vision may be illustrated by the experience of an aeronaut. While on the surface of the earth, his horizon is the same as that of other men. As he rises, however, it is gradually enlarged; but while the prospect widens, he does not see all objects with equal distinctness. So the prophet is lifted above his fellows, above his own natural condition, so that he beholds the distant future; but, in the prospect, some things stand out in bold relief, while others are but dimly seen. All of these acts of prevision disclose unmistakably the effect of divine inspiration; the dim no less really than the clear.

Not only did revelation gradually unfold its disclosures of truth; not only did the same prophet vary in his degrees of inspiration; but it is also manifest that inspired contemporaries were not on the same level. Hosea and Isaiah lived and wrote during the same period of thirty-five years; did they stand upon the same grade of inspiration? How does Paul rank in the scale of inspiration in comparison with his fellow-apostles?

So it will be seen that inspiration is not an elevated table land, whose surface is like a sea level; it is rather a mountain range,

every height of which is far above the contiguous valleys, while some of them are but foot-hills in comparison with others that rise like Mont Blanc.

It may be worth while to remark that, printed with our common English Bibles, are many things which are human and uninspired additions. Without the text, are the names, superscriptions and subscriptions of the several books; the headings of the chapters, the verses and chapters, the dates, marginal references and readings, title pages and tables. In a sense, the marginal readings are a part of the text, as they are alternative translations to the corresponding passages within the text.

Within the text itself are to be found uninspired additions. Some of these are indicated by an ill-chosen mechanical device, the printing of them in italics. In all other books, italics are used to denote the emphatic portions; it was, therefore, quite inconsiderate that they were used for those portions of the English Bible for which there are no corresponding words in the original. Parentheses would have been better in most cases, and the entire omission in the rest.

There are other added words in our ordinary version of the English Bible which are not indicated by any marks. This is due to the fact that our translators thought that they were part of the inspired volume. We know now, however, that they are the interpolations of scribes. The most noted of these passages are the additions to the Lord's Prayer, and the reference to the Trinity, in 1 John v. 7. It is one of the greatest among the marked superior excellences of our revised version, that a loyal, loving criticism has eliminated these additions, so far as they have been assuredly ascertained.

It must also be remembered that the entire English Bible is, in a sense, human and uninspired, because it is a fallible translation from the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek into English; a tongue quite different from the first two, and bearing but a remote affinity to the last. This translation is one of the very best made of any book, and like Luther's, reads more like an original than a version.

Nevertheless it is a translation, made by uninspired men; and, like all man's work, has its mistakes and imperfections.

A final point of discrimination must be made between the divine and the human elements in the Bible; and these as found in its original tongues. The Koran professes to be a word by word direct revelation from God to Mahommed. Mahommed never speaks in it in the first person. It is throughout written upon the presumption that Mahommed has taken it immediately and given it *verbatim* as it came from the mouth of God. The Bible is not so, except as to a comparatively small portion of it. It contains a great deal besides what is the direct utterance of God to the inspired writers.

Simple and manifest as this fact is, it is often overlooked and, indeed, but seldom noticed. It is an interesting and important matter to distinguish and separate this human element from the divine, with which it is often mingled.

1. It is easy to note the sentiments, words and acts of uninspired men and devils, which are quoted or recorded in the sacred volume. From the very beginning and all the way through, we find more or less of these. The sayings and doings of Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, the devil, are given, but surely none of them are to be regarded as inspired. So in the New Testament, in the Gospels and Acts, ordinary men, women, children and the demons are brought before us in their words and deeds. It is manifest that no such passages should be quoted in the settlement of any matter of truth and duty, as though they were the divine rule.

2. There are yet three other classes of expressions to be found in the Bible. The first is the language of the writer of each book, the human author. It is with regard to this that all differences of opinion and contentions as to inspiration arise. Are the words and opinions of the human author to be regarded as certainly and invariably inspired? This question will be answered by each, according to his general view of inspiration. Whatever limitations there may be, whether of language or of thought, to the fact of inspiration must be found here. If it is believed that this part of the Bible is not necessarily nor always inspired, are we to presume that it is so, unless the contrary is manifest; or is the opposite the-

correct rule? Whatever theoretical difficulty we may have in answering this question, there will be found little or none of a practical nature. As has been said, the pure ore of divine truth will be readily distinguished from the human dross with which it may be united. The presumption, doubtless, is in favor of the inspiration of all such expressions. Paul seems to recognize that some of his statements are inspired and others are not. In 1 Cor. vii, he says, "But this I say by way of permission, not of commandment;" "But to the rest, say I, not the Lord;" "Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord; but I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." The proper conclusion doubtless to be drawn from this is that, *prima facie*, the personal utterances of the inspired writer are to be regarded as divine declarations.

3. There can be no trouble as to the two remaining classes of expressions found in the Bible: The language of God and his acts recorded historically as of a third person; and the same addressed to the writer and ordered to be written and proclaimed by him. If any portion of the Scriptures is inspired, surely these are. As instances of the former class, in the first chapter of Genesis, note first a divine act, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" then a divine speech, "And God said, Let there be light." A single instance will be sufficient for the latter, (Exodus iii. 14), "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

All of these elements are found in the Book of Job: 1. The words and acts of Satan, Job, his wife, the three friends and Elihu, comprising probably three-fourths of the book, are manifestly un-inspired, and cannot be used to challenge faith or practice. 2. The expressions of the writer of the book in the historical introduction and conclusion, and in furnishing the connecting links of the main body of the discussion. All this is meagre and comparatively unimportant. No inspiration was needed for this. 3. The acts and words of God in the historical portions. 4. The direct appearance of the Lord himself for the authoritative settlement of the question in dispute, when he answered Job out of the whirl-

wind. These last two classes of passages are without doubt inspired, and are to be held as binding our consciences in their beliefs and acts.

The conclusion reached is, that no one extreme theory is exclusively true; that the Bible is the mind and word of God; that its inspiration is not natural but supernatural; that the Spirit of God selected or revealed its facts and truths, and guided the writers in their expression; that its inspiration is both verbal and plenary, as to every statement which can affect the salvation of the soul; that inspiration had its degrees, and was manifestly progressive; that, on occasions, it used the writer as a mere passive instrument for communication; that a large part of the Bible is a record of the acts and words of common men, which acts and words are neither inspired nor authoritative; that the extent of inspiration is best seen in the light of the purpose of revelation to make known God's design and plan of saving man; that it is the only divinely-inspired book which the world has; and that "we have the word of prophecy made more sure, whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts."

"All flesh is as grass,
And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass;
The grass withereth and the flower falleth,
But the word of the Lord abideth forever."

J. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.