

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIX.—NO. 3.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXVIII.

---

## ARTICLE I.

*The Atonement.* By the Rev. ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE, D. D., Professor of Didactic, Historical, and Polemical Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 440 pp., 12mo.

“We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.”

“For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.”

What is the gospel but the doctrine of Christ crucified, the doctrine of the cross? This is its central truth, on which all others depend, around which they revolve, without which they are vanity and confusion. This doctrine founded the Church. The Church has always believed it, and preached it, and lived by it, and drawn from it the inspiration of all its hopes, the strength of all its energies, and the secret of its triumphs. Without it Christianity and the Church are a folly and a lie.

But precisely against this doctrine—and that of course—human reason and pride and depravity, with deadliest hostility, have ever waged an implacable warfare. It has scandalised the Jew,

VOL. XIX. NO. 3—1.

of the *dramatis personæ* about the state of affairs at the commencement of the play. In like manner, the many conflicting passions which he depicted in his works, occasionally entangled the plot so much that he found it impossible to bring everything to the desired conclusion without the use of violent means: he therefore introduced the "*deus ex machina*," who suddenly appearing in a chariot from the clouds, settled every difficulty to the satisfaction of all concerned. Such loose construction of the plot had of course also a very injurious effect on the nature of the chorus; it remained no longer the faithful and impartial exponent of the thoughts which the dramatic action suggested, but sided often from the commencement with one or the other of the parties, (as in *Hippolytus*), or even uttered lyric songs which had little or no connexion with the play itself. This habitual neglect of the office of the chorus produced also a laxity in the construction of the metrical systems, of which Æschylus and Sophokles had been, for the opposite reasons, entirely free.

---

### ARTICLE III.

## CANONICITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

- I. *The Bible True, and Infidelity Wicked.* By WM. S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. American Tract Society.
- II. *The Schools of Doubt, and the School of Faith.* By COUNT DE GASPARI, Translated by Robert S. Watson. Edinburgh: Thomas, Constable & Co.
- III. At the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Nashville, the Rev. Dr. B. M. Smith, of Union Theological Seminary, Va., offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"The Assembly would earnestly impress on the minds of all having in charge the government and instruction of our Theological Seminaries, the vital importance of training our future ministers, not only to be able and faithful ministers of the word, but also to be fully imbued with an implicit faith in the plenary and literal inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures."

In the discussion of this subject, the first and main question to be settled relates to the authority of the Bible, or upon what testimony, human or divine, it rests its claim to implicit belief. Assuming as we do, that the Bible, the whole Bible, and every part of the Bible, is the revealed word of God, we shall defer the direct proof of our position until we submit to a careful analysis a portion of the testimony which is usually regarded sufficient to establish it beyond a doubt. The triple foundation which an old divine, Gerhard, makes the basis of this authority, consists: 1. Of the inward testimony which the Holy Ghost gives to it in our souls. 2. Of the internal evidence of Scripture, or the immense superiority of the Bible to all human works. 3. Of the external evidence, or the attestation of contemporary or nearly contemporary writers to the authority of the sacred books.

Later authors have built, for the most part, upon the same foundation, varying more in terminology and arrangement than in matters of any essential importance. Hence we have, first, the *a priori* argument, or proof from necessity; secondly, the mystic argument, or proof from feeling; thirdly, the argument from miracles and prophecies and gifts of the Holy Ghost; fourthly, the argument from the acknowledged superiority of Scripture, and the correspondence and harmony between its varied parts; and lastly, the testimony of the Church, and of early Christian writers. Under the article "Christianity," in the British and New Edinburgh Encyclopædia, which is ascribed to Dr. Chalmers, we are told that "the external evidences of the authenticity and divine authority of the Scriptures have been divided into the *direct* and *collateral*. The direct evidences are such as arise from the nature, consistency, and probability of the facts, and from the simplicity, uniformity, competency, and fidelity of the testimonies by which they are supported. The collateral evidences are either the same occurrences supported by heathen testimony, or others which concur with and corroborate the history of Christianity. Its internal evidences are either from its exact conformity with the character of God, from its aptitude to the frame and constitution of man, or from those supernatural

convictions and assurances which are impressed on the mind by the immediate operation of the divine Spirit."

We do not mean to underrate the evidences of Christianity which are drawn from these and kindred sources. Indeed, many of its defenders are entitled to our admiration and gratitude for their skilful employment of the proofs thus indicated. And besides, they have done much good—confirmed the faith of many, and led many to renounce their infidel errors, and to receive with joyfulness the Scriptures as worthy of all acceptance.

But is any one of these proofs, or is a combination of them all, sufficient to silence all doubt as to the infallibility of the Canon, or as to "the plenary and literal inspired authority of the (entire) Sacred Scriptures." Take, for example, Gerhard's first foundation, viz., the proof of authority drawn from "the inward testimony which the Holy Ghost gives to it in our souls;" or what, in other words, Dr. Chalmers calls "those supernatural convictions and assurances which are impressed on the mind by the immediate operation of the divine Spirit"—and we venture to ask whether any one is conscious of having this inward testimony of the Holy Spirit to any thing more than a limited portion of the Sacred Scriptures? Is there any such testimony when he turns to the ceremonial law, or to the history of the extermination of the Canaanites, or to the presentation of Esther to Ahasuerus? Or can he discern the divine beauty and aptitude of the Scriptures in the imprecatory Psalms, or in every chapter of Chronicles or of Ezekiel? While there may be on the mind a general impression that all this is true, it seems not to afford a sufficient pledge that all the books of the Bible are canonical, and every text infallibly inspired. It meets not the objection that uncanonical books may have found their way into the Scriptures—that whole chapters and parts of chapters of very questionable authority, may have thus been interpolated; and that many of the texts fail to furnish from this inward testimony any proof that they were infallibly inspired.

This mystic proof, or proof from feeling, may be illustrated by an interview which the writer once had with a young Roman Catholic of irregular habits, but a rigid observer of all the cere-

monies and requirements of his Church. Knowing that he had recently been to the confessional, we asked him one day how he felt when his priest pronounced him absolved from all his sins? "I felt," said he, "like a new man—entirely freed, not only from the condemnation, but from the pollution of all my sins." And under the *opus operatum* principle of that communion, such an inward but deceptive attestation as this is common with its devotees, while they may be utter strangers to that "faith which purifies the heart." And so it is with the devotees of every form of error—they "*feel*." It is the inward testimony on which they depend; and no argument can convince them that such proof may be deceptive. They may not go the length of the mystic Platonists of Alexandria, or of Bridget, or of Catharine of Sienna. They may not have invented a reign of the Holy Ghost, in the place of the Father and of the Son, as did the Abbé Joachim, the prophet of the twelfth century; nor administered baptism, as did Baron Swedenborg, "into the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," thus confounding the persons of the Trinity. All have not blended themselves with the Holy Ghost, like some old nuns and monks, or sat down to contemplate the divinity in themselves, like the quietists of Mount Athos. All have not laid claim to direct inspiration, like Fox, the founder of the Quakers. All have not pretended to prophecies and miracles, like Munzer and the prophets of Zwickau, or like the Mormons of our own day. All have not spoken the language of pure love, like the Fratricelli and Molinos, and Labadie, and Poiret, and Mademoiselle Bourignon. All have not come to the absolute disinterestedness and loss of themselves in God, as did Madame Guyon. All have not been carried away like Arndt, to the blotting out of Christ for us, in order to substitute Christ in us. But all have placed a reliance upon *feeling*, or shades of feeling, just as diversified as are their respective systems of belief. And yet while error has its feeling accompanying it, so has pure religion. We cannot have faith or love without feeling, but it must be feeling founded on the knowledge of Christ Jesus as he is revealed in the gospel to make it of any value as evidence even to ourselves.

From what has been said, it must, we think, be apparent that the inward testimony, or the testimony from feeling, (called the testimony of the Spirit,) furnishes no certain or solid foundation on which to rest the authority of the Bible as a canonical book divinely inspired in all its parts. If we turn now to the testimony of the Church, we shall find it also defective in the main element which is needed to establish its divine authority. From the preface to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, we learn that faith in Revelation is that "knowledge by which we yield our unhesitating assent to whatever the authority of our holy mother the Church teaches us to have been revealed by Almighty God." This, at the very best, is but human testimony, and human testimony, we are sorry to say, not the most trustworthy. Chillingworth, whose motto was, "The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!" well said in the same connexion, "I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended; but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but only of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in." These are not random charges, but charges that can be substantiated on the clearest testimony. And shall we receive the Church as a witness to the canon and inspiration, when in other important matters her testimony is so discordant and contradictory?

Besides the general ground already indicated for regarding the testimony of the Church less trustworthy than the subject demands, we invite attention to other grounds more specific and bearing more directly upon the question before us—the question of authority. And

1. When the Church is asked for the evidence of her own assumed prerogatives, she at once appeals to the Scriptures as amply sustaining her claim. And then she gives her own testimony to

the Scriptures, vouching for their truth upon her assumed infallible authority. This sophistical mode of reasoning is what logicians call the *vicious circle*, and proves nothing. The claim of the Church is questionable—

2. Because she has never yet been able to decide where we are to look for the exercise of her infallible prerogative—whether to the Pope, to a general council, or to the Pope and council in concert. It has been claimed in turn for each, and it remains undecided still. And if she cannot tell where rests the seat of her infallibility, how can she bear infallible testimony to other matters of which she is a witness ?

3. We cannot regard the testimony of the Church as beyond a doubt, when we know that she has falsified the Bible by adding to the canon a dozen books (the Apocrypha) which have no right there; which neither the ancient nor modern Jews regard as canonical; which Josephus, though he speaks of them as having some title to credit, classes as of inferior authority to the sacred books, and which contain internal evidence that they were not written under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. For it contains apologies for the defects to be found in it: and to suppose that the Holy Spirit would thus apologize, is both impious and absurd. There may be a reason, however, why a “Holy Mother” has taught that the Apocrypha is a revelation from God; for it is easy to find there, what cannot be found in the truly canonical Scriptures, authority for offering prayers and oblations for the dead, for the merit of good works, for purgatory and for some other distinguishing peculiarities of the papal creed. Her testimony is questionable—

4. Because she has added to the true canon, or rather to the generally accredited canon, not only the Apocrypha which was scarcely less known in the time of our Saviour than the Old Testament Scriptures, but which was never directly quoted by him or his apostles; but she has added to the Bible a mass of tradition which she holds to be of equal, and practically, of superior authority to the Bible—traditions much more voluminous than the Bible—which, on her testimony, were handed down in their purity from Christ and his apostles, and which, when ex-

amined, are found to add to, modify, contradict, and materially change the teachings of the Sacred Scriptures. But how can her testimony be good for the Bible, when it is not good for her Apocrypha and for her traditions? But we do not receive her as a true witness—

5. Because she withholds from the people those “living oracles of God,” which were originally written for the people, and addressed to the people, and *all* of them declared to be “profitable” to the people, “for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness.” If she is afraid to intrust the people with God’s oracles, we should be afraid to trust her as a witness to the truth of these oracles.

6. But the testimony of the Church is discrepant and therefore not entitled to the fullest credit. Admit that the Council of Carthage did, A. D., 397, publish a full catalogue of all the books of the Bible, was not the Council of Laodicea, which sat thirty years earlier, equally infallible? And did she not then publish a true and full catalogue from which the Book of Revelation was excluded? In what are called the “Apostolic Constitutions,” the Epistle of Clement was included in the Canon—were these Constitutions spurious? Has the Church ever condemned them? Are they not still of equal authority with any of her traditions? Why then did later Councils erase from the catalogue of sacred books the Epistle of Clement? Again, some of the Fathers to whom she appeals as witnesses to testify in other matters, put into the Canon the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Book of Enoch, and the Shepherd of Hermas, while others entitled to equal credit are found testifying in favor of legendary stories of the most childish character, of many Apocryphal books, and even of the Sybilline oracles? What right then have we to cut their testimony in two, and receive what we like as true, and reject that which appears to us fabulous, or not entitled to full credit?

On such grounds as these, we cannot but receive with hesitancy and doubt even the testimony of the Council of Carthage, though held at an age when there were such lights in the world as Chrysostom and Augustine; especially when we know that in



that day, there was also a great deal of darkness and superstition, and more especially when we know that there is much better evidence (presently to be adduced) to commend the Bible to our implicit belief. That the Bible as it now is, was received and admitted to be true by the Church at large many a long year before the Council of Carthage, is proved by the references to its varied books to be found in the writings of the early Christian apologists. And the Council of Carthage did no more than to proclaim a fact that had existed long previous to that day. The canon of the Old Testament was complete hundreds of years before the coming of our Saviour, and the canon of the New Testament was complete probably while the last of the apostles was still living. It seems to us to have been closed with the concluding verses of the Revelation, not only as it refers to that book, but to all the other parts of "the word of God and the testimony of Jesus."

We come now to notice the proof of the Scriptures from miracles and prophecies. It is the main ground taken by Dr. Plumer in the unpretending little volume, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. With a happy facility he has condensed, in a very small space, the essence of what occupies many a ponderous tome in our theological libraries. And what is more, he has divested the subject of all obscurity, making it plain, simple, easy to be comprehended, and convincing. We therefore take great pleasure in commending it to the readers of this REVIEW.

But has he, or have any of the writers on miracles and prophecies, made the testimony thus derived sufficiently strong, and so enlarged as to embrace—except by inference—either the entire canon, or the plenary inspiration of every text? In our day we have to deal with men who admit miracles and prophecies almost as fully as we could wish, but who contend that they apply as evidences only to a limited extent, and that they neither attest the divine origin of many portions of the Bible, nor "the plenary and literal inspired authority" of many of its parts. We were sorry to see the other day an extract purporting to be from the writings of Dick, whose defence of a verbal inspiration ranks

next in our estimation to that of Gausson, which attributes to him these words: "In all those passages of Scripture which were written by revelation, it is manifest that the words were inspired, and this is still more evident with respect to those passages which the writers themselves did not understand." The legitimate inference from the beginning of this extract is, that revelation only applies to a portion of the Scriptures, and not to the whole; to a larger or smaller portion, as may suit the judgment and critical acumen of the commentator; he being the sole umpire of deciding what in the Scriptures is revealed, and what is not revealed. The following extract from Gasparin presents this subject in the proper light:

"The watchword of the system of spurious inspiration, a watchword adopted by all its representatives: 'The word of God in Scripture.' According to this maxim, Scripture as a whole is not the word of God, and we must make a distinction between the Bible and revelation. I am only astonished to see Christians using such language in their writings, and then ascending the pulpit to read the Bible to the people, as if it were the word of God. Whatever be the book of Scriptures they open, if it be even a historical book, they let the people believe it is God himself who speaks in each verse. Their very first duty, in my opinion, would be to separate the part which is human from that which is divine, the fallible from the infallible, and thus to say to their brethren, 'Here is the word of God which was in the Bible, and which I have extracted. Let us lay hold on that which comes to us from God, not on that which comes from men.'" Pp. 149, 150.

All this applies to the use which many make of miracles and prophecies, not as evidences of the whole Bible, but only of those parts of the Bible which they suppose God has revealed. But if asked, Are they useless as evidences? we answer, emphatically, No. They have their use, and a very important one, in placing the entire sacred record beyond a doubt. When Nicodemus said to the Saviour, (John iii. 2,) "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these works that thou doest, except God be with him," he states the principle upon which the use of miracles as evidences apply, as attestations to the personal character and relations of the witness—he came

from God; his works prove it. The witness therefore which he bears must be true. The same principle was stated by Peter on the day of Pentecost, when he said, (Acts ii. 22,) "Ye men of Israel hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him, as ye yourselves also know." These testimonies from miracles were, therefore, to Jesus of Nazareth as both "Lord and Christ,"—the true witness, whose word is sufficient to establish beyond a doubt the truth of his own revelation. But has he done it? We shall see.

When the Lord Jesus quotes the Scriptures of the Old Testament, his testimony evidently applies not merely to the particular books where such quotations are to be found, but to the whole collection of which these books formed a part. There can be no dispute that collections were then universally received under a particular name, and are so received by the Jews even to the present day. Nor does he appeal to this collection as a whole, but he refers to the particular sections into which the books of the Old Testament were divided, under the well known names of "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." (Luke xxiv. 44.) For as every one knows, that whole section of Scripture which forms the *Cetubim*, *Hagiographa*, or *Holy Writings*, was sometimes included in the "Prophets," and sometimes classed by itself. In the latter case, it was called the "Psalms," because that was the book with which it began. (See *Prideaux's Connexion*, Vol. II., p. 61.) There can then be no doubt of the meaning of the words continually repeated by our Lord "That which is written;" "The Scriptures;" "The Law;" "The Law and the Prophets;" "The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." In every case, the reference is to the books enumerated by Josephus and unanimously received by the Jews as divine.

If we now turn to the particular references in the New Testament—(we need not quote the chapter and verse)—we shall there find such as these: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures;" "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets;" "All this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets

might be fulfilled;" "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken;" and "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself;" "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me;" "Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer;" "The law and the prophets were until John;" "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail;" "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them;" "How then shall the Scripture be fulfilled that thus it must be:" "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me;" "Think not that I am come to destroy the law. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."

With such references as these before us, (and if there was any necessity they could be greatly multiplied,) can we doubt for a moment, that the Lord Jesus bore his testimony to the entire canon of the Old Testament—to all the books of which it is composed, no matter by whom written, or by whom compiled; whether, as tradition will have it, by Ezra and the Great Synagogue, or by some private individual inspired of God for this very work; to the entire canon as it then stood, and as it now stands; maugre the defects and the interpolations in it, which biblical critics have labored hard to discover, just as the old Samaritans did, who rejected all of the Old Testament but the Pentateuch? Let it also be remembered that the Saviour refers to it as to a code from the great Lawgiver, which could not be broken; referred to it not merely in its detached parts, but as a whole; and referred to nothing else as the word of God. Nor is there in all that the Saviour has said of the Scriptures, the remotest allusion to any defect or any error, verbal or otherwise, in the entire collection. To the canon, thus far, we have then all the assurance that can be given by the testimony of God's own Son, that it is perfect and complete; that there is in it nothing redundant, nothing interpolated, nothing defective; but that

it contains just what God designed it to contain, and nothing else.

It may not be improper here to remark that the passages already quoted to show the perfection of the canon very clearly imply the plenary inspiration of its contents, since they take for granted the infallible authority of the text. "The plenary and literal inspired authority," in the resolution of Dr. Smith, is the great stumbling-block in the way of many modern expositors of the word, and they contemptuously cast it aside. They are afraid of too much "literality." But our Saviour seems not to have had any such fears. He always appeals to the text, in its ordinary and literal import. Nor does he differ in this respect from his own countrymen, the Jews, who were rigid literalists. Indeed, the written word, and just as it was written, was the authority to which he constantly appealed. It was in his hands "the fire and the hammer" which he invariably employed, not only for their instruction, but for the exposure of their hypocrisy, and their hatred, and their envy, and their avarice, and all their other violations of the divine code. And this authority was unanswerable. With the literal word, too, he utterly demolished the traditions of their oral law. For the scribes and Pharisees had their oral law and their traditions, just as their disciples, the Roman Catholics, now have, which they palmed upon the people as authoritative expositions of the text, or as supplying pretended omissions in it—making these addenda the practical rule of faith, and giving them a rank superior to the written word.

Having thus indicated, without making any thing like a full statement of the testimony of our Lord to the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures, and to their plenary and literal inspiration, showing that he referred always to the written word and to nothing else; thus establishing the whole as a literal transcript of the divine authority, let us now turn to the testimony of the apostles that we may see its perfect unison with that of their Lord. John, for example, in his details of the tragedy of the cross, is manifestly imbued with the same spirit of literality which is apparent in all the references of his Master, closing almost

every incident by adding—"that the scripture might be fulfilled." They cast lots for his coat "that the scriptures might be fulfilled." "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." They pierced the side of our Lord, but brake not his legs, as of the two thieves, "that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." Then adds the apostle, "Again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced."

Peter also appeals to the Scriptures, and to the fulfilment of the Scriptures, (see Acts ii.) in that wonderful manifestation of the Spirit which was witnessed on the day of Pentecost, and shows clearly that David referred to Christ when he said, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *Hades*, neither suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

As the Lord Jesus had drawn an argument from one of the historical books of the Old Testament, in proof that the doctrine of the resurrection was there taught by a single word, where it is written: "I *am* the God of Abraham," etc., and added, "he is not the God of the dead, but of the living," so Paul founds an entire doctrine on one word, nay, on less than a word, on the singular being used in the Scripture instead of the plural: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed." In the same epistle (Galatians.) he goes even the length of personifying Scripture, attributing to it an office which belongs distinctively to God and God alone. "The Scripture," he says, "foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." And, again, a little further on: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."

When so much is made to rest upon a word, a jot, or tittle of Scripture, is it to be presumed that the original inspiration included only the thought, and not also the language, the form, the mode, the arrangement, nay, anything else which is necessary to constitute it literally a divine revelation? The proper answer to this question is fully implied in our references to the testimony of Christ and his apostles. For they were literalists.

Nor did Neander learn from "the Life of Christ," which he has written from a semi-neological stand-point, to speak so slightly as he has done of verbal inspiration, saying, "The old mechanical theory of inspiration has now been generally abandoned."

Any one who concedes the competency of Christ and of his apostles to bear testimony in a matter so important, can scarcely fail to discover ample proof, in the way we have already indicated, that the canon of the Old Testament is complete, and that its inspiration is plenary and perfect. In the sequel we shall notice some of the objections to what is sneeringly called the "old mechanical theory," and hope to furnish a more thorough vindication of our position. Meanwhile let us advert to the testimony on which the canon and inspiration of the New Testament can be firmly established.

For this proof we need not go to the Council of Carthage, nor to any other council of the Church, either in its comparative purity or in its palpable apostasy. The same testimony which has been given to the Old Testament, has been given to the New, with only this difference: The Lord Jesus Christ in person bore testimony to the Old Testament; but to the New he bears the very same testimony by his divine representative, the Holy Spirit. If upon some of the promises of Christ of more than questionable application, the Church of Rome founds its claim of authority, with nothing either external or internal to support it, how much, how infinitely higher is that claim when it has been attested by miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost? Such attestations, we maintain, have been given to all the books of the New Testament, and they bear on their face the stamp of divinity—the seal of God. The canonicity of many of the books of the New Testament seems never to have been questioned; while others were not so readily received as canonical. There were theorists and critics then as there are theorists and critics now, who seemed to imagine that a book must be written by an apostle in order to give it validity. And accordingly there was an early tradition without a shadow of evidence to support it, that the Gospel of Mark, who was not an apostle, was written under

the superintendence of Peter, and that the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, which were in the same category, were written under the superintendence of Paul. But it is nowhere said that the gifts of the Holy Spirit were restricted to the apostles, and that they and they only were endowed with adequate gifts to write a canonical book. All that has been revealed on the subject is that "holy men wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

But to this general evidence we may add that which is more specific. If asked, for example, why the Gospel of Luke, who was not an apostle, was received as canonical, while the many treatises to which he refers in his opening chapter have been suffered to perish, we answer, that perhaps he himself has given us the reason (Chap. i. 3,) where he claims as in our translation to have had "perfect understanding of all things *from the very first*." The Greek text is *ἀνωθεν*—*from above*. If this be so, and we have no wish to strain a point about which doubts may be entertained, there is here a claim for the inspiration of his work which entitles it to more than ordinary weight.

Then, again, there is another internal testimony given after most of the books of the New Testament were written. See 2 Peter iii. 15, 16: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Examine this testimony, and it will be found that all Paul's epistles are here classed as Scripture. But nothing in that day was thus called but a canonical book. The Apocrypha was not; the Jewish Targums were not; nor were the Epistles of Barnabas, or Clement, or the Shepherd of Hermas. "Wrest as they do the *other* Scriptures." What *other*? We answer, the entire Old Testament, and all the New, with perhaps the exception of the Apocalypse and the Gospel of John, to which may possibly be added one or two of the minor epistles.



But the Lord Jesus, it may be said, has never given the same attestation to the canonicity of the books of the New Testament that he has given to those of the Old. In reply, we may ask, What more have we the right to expect than that which he has actually given? What more is needed as the foundation for implicit faith in the entire canon? Has he not all power in heaven and on earth? all wisdom? all truthfulness? Has his promise ever failed? Did he not in accordance with his promise bestow the gifts of the Holy Ghost, not only upon his apostles, but upon others—the gift of inspiration included? And as under his dictation, the last survivor of the apostles was taught *what to write*, and closed his message by solemnly adding: “For I testify unto every man that hearth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book”—what further testimony do we need? And if that is not enough, let us remember that in his mediatorial reign “he is head *over all things* to the Church.” *Over all things*,—revelation, the canon, the rule of faith, inspiration,—every thing which pertains to the Church or contributes to its edification. And as head over all things, he has, in his providence, admitted into the canon that which is “profitable,” but has set aside and even blotted out from the remembrance of man many a work that once aspired to that high honor. If it were the height of impiety to add any thing to or to take any thing from, the book of Revelation, of a like impiety are they guilty who would add any thing to, or take any thing from the canon—the book of life—God’s own word which shall never return to him void. We must, then, either give entire credence to the canon—receive it with implicit faith, or we must deny him the Headship of the Church.

Will it be said that all this is but inferential proof, and not sufficient to command our implicit faith? But let it be remembered that inferential proof is often stronger than that which is

direct and positive. And so we esteem it on the question before us. The promise of the Saviour,—and he cannot lie,—assured his people that he would not leave them comfortless, that he would afford them a sure guide who would be with them forever; that he would himself teach them what to believe and what to do; and he forewarned them of apostasies from the primitive faith; and as these apostasies have manifestly arisen, where else are we to look but to some monument which he has erected, to some chart in which he has mapped the way of life, for our direction amid the perils to which we are exposed; and such a monument, such a chart, we have only in the Sacred Scriptures. Here then is the proof, not only from the promises of Christ, but from necessity and our own consciousness. We need it, and he himself has supplied the need. Chillingworth thus speaks of the Bible, and what he says receives a loud amen from the heart of every true believer: “I, for my part, after a long, and as I believe and hope, impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my feet, but upon this rock only. Propose me anything out of this book and require whether I believe or no; and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with my hand and heart, as knowing *no demonstration can be stronger than this*: GOD HAS SAID SO, THEREFORE IT IS TRUE.” This, and this only, is the profession of an *implicit faith* in the Sacred Scriptures.

We have already intimated that the testimony which establishes the canon of the Scriptures proves also the inspiration of the text. As to inspiration, it was among the schoolmen and not among the apostles that subtle questions arose as to whether the Holy Ghost merely kept the writers from error, or whether he suggested first of all the resolution of writing, then the choice of a subject, then the selection of words, then the arrangement of materials, and finally the disposition of the words. It is the spurious inspiration of our modern teachers, and not the plenary inspiration of our Lord which has taught men to fancy that the inspiration is intense when doctrines are in question, and that it becomes insensible when the matter is one of facts and of history;

it being thought that in this way, the sacred writers may be supposed to retain, to some extent, their individuality, which otherwise, it is conceived, they must have wholly lost; whereas our Lord acknowledges no such interruptions and intermissions in inspiration, and declares every part of the Sacred Books equally infallible.

Let it be borne in mind that the authority of the Bible rests on two facts which are often too much confounded, but which it is of special importance to distinguish: the divine guarantee for the canon, and the divine guarantee for inspiration. For if the canon be uncertain, if the collection of sacred books be subjected to our judgment, which is necessarily variable, the absolute authority of the Bible disappears. It disappears, because every one has the right to modify its contents; and especially it disappears, because a deadly uncertainty hovers over the whole of it and begets universal distrust. Faith in Scripture henceforth becomes impossible for plain men who know that a multitude of critical questions are raised with which they cannot directly grapple, and in spite of all their efforts, they end by feeling that the whole foundation of their belief is shaken. This is the reason why we have given so much space in this article to the testimony for the canon.

On the other hand, if inspiration be incomplete or discontinuous, the absolute authority of the Bible disappears in like manner. Who shall say how far the errors, the interruptions, extend? Who shall hinder suspicion from spreading, and prevent the most generally received portions of the Bible from being attacked in their turn? In books where the true and the false, the human and divine, are mingled in different proportions, we may readily set some portion apart, and fancy that we accept of that as God's word; but even then we make only a partial concession. The question may arise in the mind, May we not have been mistaken in our selection? The divinity of this portion may be of our own making. What is true elsewhere holds especially true here—that we never can thoroughly adore a God of our own making. So we never can have the same reverence for a partial, that we have for a plenary inspiration. We must be-

lieve that God speaks in the whole Bible, or it loses its authority. How he speaks we do not know, nor do we care to know. How holy men wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, God has never told us. It is enough for our faith that he claims the whole as his word; and far be it from us to question or dispute his claim. He has employed human agency in the declaration of his will, and while the individuality of the writer is clearly seen in every page, the *theopneustia* or inspiration is complete. And if this is a mystery too deep for our comprehension, it is no contradiction; yet it may and does serve as a test of our faith in God, just as it was a test of the faith of Nicodemus, when the Lord Jesus said, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

It is sometimes objected that inspiration was not needed, or, at least, it was not needed in the same degree or with the same intensity for history as for doctrine; for matters of which the writers had personal knowledge as for the revelation of mysteries which they could not otherwise know; for the expression of their personal affections, desires, and wants, as for those matters which respect our relations to God and the duties thence arising. But in reply, we may say that plenary inspiration respects every part of Scripture alike, and we are not authorised to speak or think of it as being greater or less in degree or intensity in one part than in another. It is all of God—*theopneustia*. It is all too of man. For "holy men wrote" it—every part of it—"as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." God spake to them as men, employed them as men, made them the instruments of declaring his will; and though men of like passions and infirmities and conditions and circumstances as other men, he made known to them what he was pleased to reveal. All this is natural and in perfect accordance with his other works. Instead, therefore, of its invalidating, it serves to corroborate the proof already indicated, that the Bible, the whole Bible, is of divine authority. For in speaking to men, as men, and using the common language of men, now the Hebrew, now the

Chaldee, and now the Greek, and now even the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, he has given the clearest evidence that he designed it to be received and understood in the obvious and literal import of these different tongues.

But if the Bible is inspired, it is of course infallible—infallible in all its parts. But no one will understand us as claiming this infallibility to the same extent for all the translations of the Bible; no, not even for the Latin Vulgate which has received the infallible(?) imprimatur of Rome; nor for the Douay version, especially where countenance is given to image worship, by so translating Hebrews xi. 21, as to make Jacob worship the top of his staff; nor yet for the common English version—and perhaps there is no better in any language. Still all the versions which we have been able to consult, contain, in all matters of primary importance, the true sense and import of the originals. In most cases they are as literally faithful as we have reason to expect from fallible men. Nor do we claim the same infallibility for the manuscript copies of the Bible, or for the printed copies, as for the original. The “various readings” indicate errors which all candid men are ready to concede. When Brian Walton published his Polyglot, in which were noticed the various readings in the MSS. then discovered, it occasioned at first great alarm for the integrity of the text, and the distinguished John Owen wrote an elaborate essay in its defence. But when upon a more minute examination it was found that these various readings, numerous as they were, made no material change in any precept, doctrine, narrative, or fact, the alarm at once subsided, and the Scriptures still retained the full confidence of the Church as ever. In like manner, scientific objections have been urged against the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures, from history, geography, astronomy, geology, ethnology, and the like; and these for a while seemed unanswerable. But a more thorough acquaintance with these subjects has in so many instances confirmed the truth of revelation, as to establish it, if possible, upon a still firmer foundation than ever.

But as we have put the work of Gasparin at the head of this article, the reader has a right to expect that we should notice it

more at large. It is, however, no easy task so to sketch even the outlines of an original work such as this, and do it anything like adequate justice. Suffice it to say, that he has followed Gausson, without imitating him, in defending the canon and the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. His battle-ground is Geneva, and in the first part of his work, he shows conclusively that the School of Romanism is essentially a school of doubt. In the second part, he takes up Rationalism as a natural offshoot or reaction from Romanism, and shows by its varied teachings, whether in the vulgar, the mystic, or the present new form, that it is a school of doubt. He then turns to the school of faith, finding there, as Chillingworth did, solid ground upon which to rest his hope of life—the testimony of God to the canon as it is, and the testimony of God to plenary inspiration in the fullest sense of the term. In the discussion of his subject, he shows a familiar acquaintance with the writings of Newman, and Wiseman, and Reuss, and Strauss, and Hegel, and Neander, and Tholuck, and of many others less known, as Scherer, and Cellerior, and Secretan, and Martin, and Huetius, and Royer Collard, and many more whom he quotes to elucidate his positions. But it will give the general reader a better conception of his manner, as well as throw light upon the subject, to quote a part of what he says of Neander :

“If Christians think they may decry a providentially formed canon, and an inspiration absolutely plenary, they ought to know what awaits them. They will not sink so far as the theories of M. Scherer, of this I am sure; but are they sure they will not fall into the theories of Neander? Are not Neander’s praises in every mouth? Are not Neander’s works in the hands of all? \* \* \* Neander expresses himself very freely on the canon. He makes it up after his own taste; but we are now so much accustomed to such excesses of biblical critics, that I need not dwell upon them. I would only observe that in his list of rejected books, Neander places the first Gospel, ‘which merely has for its basis some collection of the discourses of Christ made by Matthew in the Hebrew language.’ As to the Gospels of Mark and Luke, I really do not know if I ought to consider them as admitted by Neander, who sees in them ‘nothing but a collection of scattered traditions.’ But this point belongs rather to the canon than to inspiration, and it is of inspiration in Nean-

der's sense of the word that I wish to speak. Let us seek for it then in 'the Life of Christ,' which now in the original or by translations is within the reach of every one. Neander first establishes 'the progress' which the theology of our day has made: 'The old mechanical theory of inspiration has now been generally abandoned.' Thanks to this progress, that theology which examines the sacred writings has henceforth as its object 'to establish the real value of the facts related to us by separating them from the subjective form which tradition has given them, and to fill up, as far as possible, the inevitable gaps which are always found in fragmentary writings.' So soon as we have to do only with traditions, and with traditions too, clothed in a subjective form, which require the help of German learning before they present even a part of the evangelical reality, we need not wonder at the errors of the New Testament. Was Luke mistaken as to the taxing? What can be more simple? 'What right have we to demand from him so exact a knowledge of things in which he had no interest? Such mistakes as to time are to be found in all writers?' In all writers these are to be found, and therefore in the evangelist, who has done like others, gathering together their recollections—picking up the best accredited reports, and making out of them a history as exact as possible. It is thus that in regard to the shepherds and the song of the angels, Neander tells us the history was probably made up in the following fashion: 'One of the shepherds was met with who had seen the heavenly vision, and who retained a powerful remembrance of it.' This man was interrogated. He told the story as well as he could, but we cannot guarantee 'his having related the very words which he had heard.' There seems to be very little regard to certainty here; moreover, some details are treated as of no consequence. 'Whether it was from the advice of Herod or from other motives the Magi directed their course to Bethlehem, is a matter of little moment.'" Pp. 182–187.

After citing other examples of the same cast from the pen of Neander, Gasparin says: "Such are the securities which the favorite rationalism of the present day offers us for the integrity of Scripture."

In regard to the Assembly's resolution, which comes in direct conflict with the schools of doubt, it may be proper to remark that our theological institutions need to be peculiarly watchful, inasmuch as constant references are there made to the deep learning and profound research of theologians who go even further

than Neander in calling in question the entire truth and authority of what God has revealed. And in biblical criticism, as now conducted, it is exceedingly difficult to separate the precious from the vile. In criticisms perfectly legitimate, there is ample scope for the student, a much broader field than he can fully explore, while he retains the full assurance that "the Bible is true," and not a word of it can be broken. When we bring before the people the word of God, they are accustomed to regard it as speaking with authority; and unless it is wrested from its true meaning by the sleight of men, they receive with implicit faith all its utterances, whether "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, or for instruction in righteousness." But give them to understand—and they will readily learn it—that there are errors in the Bible, mistakes, interpolations, and that only some portions of it are inspired, and you will shake their faith in the entire fabric, and universal scepticism will be the result.

We refer again to the fact that the Lord Jesus and his apostles always appealed to the Scriptures, to show the effect of such appeals. This was the authority which the adversaries of the cross could neither gainsay, nor resist. It was that which effectually silenced every objection, which the captious unbeliever urged against the teaching of the Saviour. And with the same all-potent weapon, which was the sword of the Spirit, the wonderful conquests of the apostles were achieved. It was the word, and only the word, which was made effectual by the eternal Spirit to the pulling down of the strongholds. But there was a gradual departure from this authority in the subsequent ages of the Church. The Apocrypha was quoted, the fathers, the acts of councils, the legends of the saints, traditionary tales, heathen philosophers, the schoolmen; till at last very little of the Scriptures, almost none, made up the warp and the woof of what was styled Christianity. But what was the effect? Was there light? Was there life? Was vital Christianity the prevailing spirit of the Church? Or was it not in the outward form alone, distorted and disfigured by additions of human device, that it was exhibited to the view of angels and men? Mark its progress



through the dark ages, and see the results of an almost total abandonment of the Scriptures.

If we now turn to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, we shall there see as its chief characteristic a return to the authority of the Bible. The return was gradual. It was hard, for example, for Luther at the beginning to throw off the incubus of custom, of usage, and of human authority in matters of faith and practice. And on some points, perhaps, neither he nor any of the Reformers were completely successful in reëstablishing the Church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. But the Reformers, all of them, acknowledged the authority of the Bible—its supreme, unquestioned, absolute authority. And to this only standard they applied the whole *credenda* and *agenda*—things to be believed and to be done; and though widely different as were their mental powers, their education, and their training, their symbolical books furnish ample proof of a unity more remarkable than had ever before been witnessed since the days of the apostles. Still, as they were men, they were liable to err. And hence we do not claim for them or for their symbolic books any authority over our faith. Indeed, we hold our own “Confession” in entire subordination to the word of God.

It is a great mistake when men impute to the Bible the existing diversities in the confessions of faith and modes of worship among professed Protestants. For these diversities have chiefly arisen from a partial or total abandonment of their great principle. There was no diversity of any material importance among the early Reformers—none except those which papal usage had so deeply engraven upon the minds and habits of the people that they could not readily be thrown aside, and hence they were, in part, retained under the plea of expediency. But these diversities among those who recognise the authority of the Bible, great as they are, and lamentable as they are, are of trivial moment, compared with those which, under a profession of unity, disfigure the papal communion. Bossuet, to bring the Bible into disrepute, and to extol his own Church, has magnified “the variations of Protestantism.” But there is a Rowland

for an Oliver, by Bishop Hurd and other writers, but especially by Archinard, who has traced, step by step, the encroachments of Rome upon "the faith once delivered to the saints," showing a great gulf between the Gospel and the Fathers, and a second gulf between the Fathers and the Popery of Trent.

But they have a very questionable claim to the name of Protestant who deny the "the plenary and literal inspired authority of the Sacred Scriptures." They may be Protestants after a fashion, but not after the model of the Reformation. And when they once let go their firm hold on the absolute and unquestioned authority of the Bible, there is no telling how far they will drift from their only safe mooring. Rome tried it, and we have no reason to believe that her drifting is yet ended. For it is but a little more than ten years since a new article—the immaculate conception—has been added to her creed. And the beginning of all the heresies of this and of every age can be traced to the abandonment of this principle. Then comes the "wresting of the Scriptures;" and it is an easy task to wrest them when their divine authority is a questionable matter.

We need not quote from the Bible the many testimonies to the influence and power of the word. We may merely look at its effects upon ourselves and upon the world around us—upon all who receive it with docility and faith—to be convinced that it is in truth "the sword of the Spirit;" that God himself honors it by making it "the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation;" and that whatever else may perish, his word shall never return to him void.