

**Bible, ITS INSPIRATION AND AUTHENTICITY.**—On what ground do we believe that the Bible is inspired? Some will give the ready answer. "We believe that the Bible is inspired because the church says so." . . . Others there are who, when asked why they believe the Bible to be inspired, would reply, "It is because we have found it to be so practically; by reading it we found our way to God; by searching it the will of God has become clearer to us; by living according to its precepts we have proved that they are divine; and now its words move us as no other words do: other books delight us, instruct us, thrill us, but this book is a prophetic voice discoursing about eternity and the unseen in the same breath that it speaks with a demonstrable truthfulness concerning the temporal and the seen." . . . The people who answer in this way certainly seem to render a more solid reason than those who found their assertion about inspiration upon the tradition of an authoritative church.—"*Inspiration and the Bible*," Robert F. Horton, M. A., pp. 2, 4, 5. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891.

There are, it is well known, many theories of inspiration. But whatever view or theory of inspiration men may hold, plenary, verbal, dynamical, mechanical, superintendent, or governmental, they refer either to the inspiration of the men who wrote, or to the inspiration of what is written. In one word, they imply throughout the work of God the Holy Ghost, and are bound up with the concomitant ideas of authority, veracity, reliability, and truth divine.—Canon Dyson Hague, M. A., in "*The Fundamentals*," Vol. I, p. 105. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company.

The present Hebrew text is admitted by the most able scholars of the day to be substantially accurate, the great majority of the errors discovered being of a trivial description, such as the misspelling or transposing of words, the omission of insignificant particles or their insertion, and errors of the like description. The variations of the MSS. of the New Testament are very much more numerous than those which have been discovered in the Old, and yet we have the authority of two of the greatest textual critics of the New Testament (Drs. Westcott and Hort) for saying that the New Testament variations of any importance, if all put together, would not exceed one thousandth part of the whole text.—"*The Bible and Its Transmission*," Walter Arthur Copinger, pp. 4, 5. London: Henry Sotheran & Co., 1897.\*

Inspiration is not affected by minor differences in various narratives. While God used men as media of communication, they were not mere machines, but were left to use their faculties in individual freedom. Hence arose peculiarities, not only of style, but of treatment, according as the same utterances or occurrences might impress each observer or narrator. But this, instead of impairing, rather increases the trustworthiness of the record, as it proves that there could have been no prior agreement or conspiracy among the various writers.

Most so-called discrepancies or disagreements disappear when the various records are regarded as partial, rather than complete, as each of the four Gospel narratives may present some feature not found in the rest, but capable of being combined with the others in one full statement. For example, the complete inscription over the cross was, "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." Of this inscription of ten words, Matthew records eight, Mark five, Luke seven, and John eight, and not the same in any two cases; but the full inscription includes all the words found in any record. There is, therefore, no antagonism or contradiction.—"*Knowing the Scriptures*," Arthur T. Pierson, D. D., p. 18. New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910.

The revelations of prophecy are facts which exhibit the divine omniscience. So long as Babylon is in heaps; so long as Nineveh lies empty, void, and waste; so long as Egypt is the basest of kingdoms; so long as Tyre is a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea; so long as Israel is scattered among all nations; so long as Jerusalem is trodden underfoot of the Gentiles; so long as the great empires of the world march on in their predicted course,—so long we have proof that one Omniscient Mind dictated the predictions of that book, and "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man."—"Will the Old Book Stand?" H. L. Hastings, p. 19. Boston: H. L. Hastings & Sons, 1916.

Respecting the particular manner of divine inspiration, there are two opinions extant:

1. That the Spirit of God inspired the thoughts; but that the writers were left to express themselves in their own words and phrases, but they were so guided that they were kept from theological errors.
2. That every word was suggested to them by the Spirit of God, and that the writers did nothing but write. This is verbal inspiration. . . . Both views secure the Scriptures from all error.—"*Theological Compend*," Rev. Amos Binney, pp. 21, 22. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902.

**Bible, HISTORY IN, DIFFERS FROM OTHER HISTORIES.**—Niebuhr says that the Old Testament history is the only exception to ancient history, in that it is free from what he calls all "national patriotic falsehood." . . . In other histories we see the great tendency to hero worship. The historian has some favorite character. He wants to show what a grand man that was. The Bible never wants to show what a grand man anybody was. There is no hero worship in the Bible.—"*The Divine Unity of Scripture*," Rev. Adolph Saphir, D. D., pp. 213, 214. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909.

**Bible, CREDIBILITY OF.**—The main facts of the history they [books of the Pentateuch] contain have received strong confirmation from Egyptian and Eastern research.—"*The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*," William E. Gladstone, pp. 14, 15. London: Wm. Isbister, 1890.

It is of no use to say that Christ, as exhibited in the Gospels, is not historical—who among his disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee, as certainly not St. Paul.—"*Essays*," John Stuart Mill, p. 233; quoted in "*The Bible: Its Origin and Nature*," Marcus Dods, D. D., p. 208. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

**Bible, CREDIBILITY OF: ARCHEOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL CONFIRMATIONS.**—This is the century of romance,—romance in exploration, in discovery, in invention, in thought, and in life. . . . Through a series of marvelous discoveries and romantic events we have been let into the secrets of wonderful centuries of hitherto unknown peoples and events. . . . Now through the co-operation of explorer, archeologist, and linguist, we are the heirs of what was formerly regarded as prehistoric times. . . . These marvelous revelations from the archives of the nations of the past have painted for us a new background, in fact, our first background, of the Old Testament.—"*The Monuments and the Old Testament*," Ira Maurice Price, Ph. D., pp. 17, 18, 5th edition. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.