

STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

Volume I

Bibliology

Compiled by

Stanton W. Richardson, M A.

St. Paul Bible College, St. Paul, Minnesota

Fourth edition, Revised in 1969, printed in United States of America

Format revised by Rev. Richard W. Rutherford, M.C.M., M.Div. Revisions were to: (a) Scale the 8.5 x 11 format to 7 x 8.5. (b) To divide Volume One into four sections: Bibliology, Theology Proper, Angelology, and Anthropology. (c) To create consistency in margins, indentations and outline numbering. All content concerning theological study is unchanged.

PREFACE

The following study was compiled as a result of the need for a class-room handbook in Biblical Theology. It was compiled by Stanton W. Richardson, M A. while teaching at the St. Paul Bible College.

Dr. Richardson recognized the fact that many good works had been written on Christian Doctrine. Yet, some were not suited for Bible College use because of their complexity and depth. Still others did not seem to come up to the level demanded by Bible College students.

Dr. Richardson also recognized the impossibility of covering such material thoroughly and completely within the given time restraints. However, this text should serve as a guide in the various studies in Biblical Theology and that the guidance will always be directed to the Holy Scriptures.

Dr. Richardson noted that these studies did not necessarily constitute the official statement or theology of the then St. Paul Bible College. They were merely compiled by him for class-room use.

The American Standard Version of the Bible was the original reference throughout these Studies. It was Dr. Richardson's desire that The New American Standard Version replace the ASV in these studies.

It was Dr. Richardson's prayer that "every student who uses these Studies will always endeavor to permit the Word of God to be the final authority, and that the convictions of this writer will not be adopted unless such adoption comes as the result of a study of the Word of God for himself."

Rev. Richard W. Rutherford, M.C.M., M.Div.
Omaha, Nebraska, 1998
Printed in United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SURVEY OF WORK	4
I. INTRODUCTION	5
A. DEFINITION of THEOLOGY	5
B. RELATION of THEOLOGY and ETHICS	5
C. RELATION of THEOLOGY and RELIGION	6
D. RELATION of THEOLOGY and PHILOSOPHY	6
E. THE NECESSITY of THEOLOGY	7
F. THE SOURCES of THEOLOGY	9
G. THE DIVISIONS of THEOLOGY	11
H. CONCERNING METHODOLOGY and THEOLOGY	12
II. BIBLIOLOGY	15
A. SCOPE of STUDY	15
B. REVELATION	15
C. GENUINENESS	29
D. CREDIBILITY	35
E. CANONICITY	39
F. INTEGRITY	44
G. INSPIRATION	51
H. ENGLISH VERSIONS of the BIBLE	60
III. BIBLIOGRAPHY	71

SURVEY OF WORK

This text is compiled so as to cover one unit's work. The study given is not intended to be exhaustive. At best a text like this will serve as a guide to further study of the Bible and other writings on theology.

Bibliology covers a critical study of the Bible. This would rightly belong to a course in General Introduction or Christian Evidences but we include it here. The subject of Revelation will be looked into. Natural Revelation will be studied with a view to finding its value. This will be followed by Special Revelation as found in the Word of God and more particularly in Jesus Christ.

The Genuineness of the Bible will be studied in a general way together with a brief study of Credibility. Questions concerning Canonicity and the place of our present books in the Bible will be investigated. We will look for the answers to the question, "Is the Bible today the same as it was when it was written, the infallible Word of God?" We conclude our study in Bibliology with a biblical study of Inspiration.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. DEFINITION of THEOLOGY.

1. The term “theology” is today used in a narrow and a wide sense. The word itself comes from two Greek words meaning God and word, discourse, and doctrine.

2. In the narrow sense, therefore, theology may be defined as the doctrine of God. But in the prevailing and wide sense the term has come to mean all Christian doctrine, i.e., it has come to embrace not only the specific doctrine of God but also the relations He sustains to the universe.

3. In this wide sense, we may, accordingly, define theology as “the science of God and of the relations between God and the universe” (Strong, Sys. Theology, p. 1).

B. RELATION of THEOLOGY and ETHICS.

1. Yet theology in this latter sense must not be identified either with ethics or with religion.

2. Mackenzie says “Ethics is the science of conduct. It considers the action of human beings with reference to their rightness or wrongness, their tendency to good or to evil” (Manual of Ethics, p.1).

3. But Shedd well says that ethics “does not properly include the Gospel or redemption.

a. Ethics is wholly legal” (Dogmatic Theology, I. p.16).

b. He adds: “It is true that ethics is affected by Christian theology; so that Christian ethics differs greatly from pagan ethics. It is more comprehensive, because pagan ethics is confined to duties between man and man, while Christian ethics embraces duties toward God. Christian ethics differs also from pagan in respect to the motive presented. In pagan ethics, the motive is legal and founded in fear; in Christian ethics the motive is evangelical and founded in love. Yet theology contains immensely more than belongs even to Christian ethics, because it includes the doctrines of the trinity, the incarnation, the apostasy, and redemption, together with eschatology. None of these divisions belong properly to ethics.” (ib., pp.16,17).

C. RELATION of THEOLOGY and RELIGION.

1. Religion differs from theology and ethics inasmuch as it pertains more to the worship and service of God.
2. Whereas theology has to do with the nature of God and his relation to the universe, religion embodies man's response and actions toward Him.
3. Likewise religion may be rightly separated from ethics inasmuch as many people worship God or gods and still live in all manner of immorality.

D. RELATION of THEOLOGY and PHILOSOPHY.

1. Windelband defines philosophy as follows: "By philosophy present usage understands the scientific treatment of the general questions relating to the universe and human life" (A History of Philosophy, p. 1).
2. But while both philosophy and theology assume to teach what is true concerning God, man, the world, and the relation between God and the universe, their methods are very different.
 - a. "Philosophy seeks to attain knowledge by speculation and induction, or by the exercise of our own intellectual faculties. Theology relies upon authority, receiving as truth whatever God in his Word has revealed" (Hodge, Sys. Theo., I. p. 56).
 - b. Both these methods are legitimate, and when kept within their respective spheres must arrive at the same conclusions.
2. When philosophy, however, ignores God's revelation in His Word it does not take into consideration all the facts and gets into dangerous, if not false, positions. We may, therefore, say with Leander S. Keyser: "The Bible also sets forth a philosophy, in the fundamental sense of an adequate World View, which means an adequate explanation of the cosmos and all its varied phenomena" (The Philosophy of Christianity, p. 24).

E. **THE NECESSITY of THEOLOGY.** The necessity of theology grows out of the following facts:

1. The Character of the Bible.

a. The most apparent need for theology comes from the character of the Scriptures.

- 1) The Bible is not a theological treatise.
- 2) It sets forth truth by way of law, commandment, history, poetry and parable, appealing to every age and every walk of life.
- 3) Through it all runs a clear purpose and a unity of truth and thus it is the province of theology to discover and to set forth.

b. We might as well expect an articulated theology in the Bible as a scientific botany in nature.

1) History testifies that the Bible needs to be scientifically interpreted in the light of the best reason and by the aid of the Holy Spirit.

2) How can it be expected that its sacred contents should be comprehensively understood without classification and interpretation?

2. The Development of Doctrine.

a. Theology deals with religious truths which have come down to us as doctrines or tenets of the faith.

b. Church history teaches us that the Holy Spirit has constantly led the Church to a clearer conception of the truth.

c. It is the province of Biblical Theology to summarize, to group, and to formulate the various results derived from the Scriptures.

3. The Nature of the Church.

a. The need for theology grows also out of the very nature of the Church, which is the community of all believers.

b. It is vain to decry confessions, or creeds, or theology; they are as unavoidable as the constitutions, written or unwritten, which bind men in the same society. The Church is not organized on mere sentiment, sympathy, or fellowship. It is founded on the truth.

c. It is a community of faith.

1) There can be no real fellowship or coherence where there is no common standard as to the meaning of language or the content of faith.

2) There can be no edifying worship, no consistent teaching in school or pulpit without some kind of theology.

4. The Idea of Proportion.

a. The idea of proportion also demands a proper formulation of belief.

1) No doctrine or phase of doctrine must be maintained at the expense of another.

2) No unessential feature must be magnified; no abnormal development can be tolerated; for undue emphasis placed upon one idea must obscure others equally important.

b. Theology aims at symmetry. It strives to present the whole truth in right relations.

5. The Need for Defense.

a. Theology is demanded as a means of defense against aggression.

1) The first age of the Church was that of apologetics, in which the fathers maintained the divine origin and character of our holy religion.

2) Then followed the age of polemics, in which the great question of Christ's divine Sonship was finally settled.

b. Whether the danger comes from heresy within or from assault without, theology seeks to defend the faith. The creeds which it has formulated have been the bulwarks of the Church.

6. The Organizing Instinct of the Intellect.

a. The human intellect is not content with a mere accumulation of facts: it invariably seeks to unify its knowledge and to systematize it.

b. Hocking says: "A self is a unity which cannot forever live, or face the prospect of living, with mental disorder.... We cannot lead completely rational lives until that latent agreement among our scattered insights can be grasped as a principle giving unity to the whole world view" (Types of Philosophy, p.431).

d. Of course he is thinking of philosophy; but the argument is equally true in theology. The mind is not satisfied merely to discover certain facts about God, man, and the universe; it seeks for the relations between these persons and facts and to arrange these discoveries in a system.

d. Strong says, speaking of the mind: "Just in proportion to its endowments and culture does the impulse to systematize and formulate increase" (pp. cit., I. p.16).

F. THE SOURCES of THEOLOGY.

1. True Sources

a. The Scriptures. “The Christian revelation is the chief source of theology. The Scriptures plainly declare that the revelation of God in nature does not supply all the knowledge which a sinner needs; Acts 17:23; Eph. 3:9,10. This revelation is therefor supplemented by another in which divine attributes and merciful provisions only dimly shadowed forth in nature are made known to men. This latter revelation consists of a series of supernatural events and communications, the record of which is presented in the Scriptures” (Strong).

b. The Holy Spirit.

1) The Bible is a spiritual book and communicates spiritual truth, which must be spiritually discerned.

2) The natural man is incapable of spiritual discernment. He must be born again of the Holy Spirit, who not only moved men to write the records, but who remains their interpreter, and who is the Guide into all truth. Without His illumination, theology is a mere academic pursuit without saving power.

c. Nature. “The universe is a source of theology. The Scriptures assert that God has revealed Himself in nature. There is not only an outward witness to his existence and character in the constitution and government of the universe, but an inward witness to his existence and character in the heart of every man. (Rom. 1:17-20; 2:15). The systematic exhibition of these facts, whether derived from observation, history or science, constitutes natural revelation.1, Strong, op.cit., I, p.26.

2. Secondary Sources. Note: Secondary sources are neither necessarily true nor false sources of theology; they are listed for our information.

a. Reason. In the broad sense, reason is the mind’s ability to know God and man’s relation to him, and not simply the logical faculty. In the broad sense there is a three-fold office of reason in theology (following Hodge, pp. 49-53).

1) Reason is necessary for the reception of a revelation.

a) Without some ideas of space, time, cause, substance, design, right, etc., we have no other knowledge.

b) This includes, of course, the knowledge of God’s revelation of Himself in nature and in Scripture.

2) Reason must judge of the credibility of a revelation.

a) The credible is that which can be believed.

b) To be credible a revelation must be possible, but it need not be entirely comprehensible.

c) That is impossible which “contradicts any well authenticated truth, whether of intuition, experience or previous revelation” (Hodge, op. cit., p. 51).

3) Reason must judge of the evidence of a revelation.

a) Faith without evidence is not faith by mere fancy.

b) This evidence must be both appropriate and adequate.

c) “Historical truth requires historical evidence; empirical truth the testimony of experience; mathematical truth, mathematical evidence, moral truth, moral evidence; and ‘the things of the Spirit,’ the demonstration of the Spirit” (Hodge, op. cit., p.53).

b. Mysticism or Christian Experience.

1) In the sense that the Spirit illuminates the minds of all men, enabling them to understand the revelation God has made of Himself in nature and the Scriptures, Christianity is a form of mysticism.

2) However, Christian experience is a witness to the truth of the Scripture, but is not an independent source of knowledge of divine things. Scriptural mysticism is therefore a kind of secondary source of theology.

c. The Church.

1) Romanism holds that the church, rather than the Scriptures, is the final authority in theology.

2) According to Calvin, Romanists teach, that “since the Church is governed by the Spirit of God, she can walk safely without the Word; in whatever direction she moves she cannot think anything but the truth, and hence, if she determines anything without or beside the Word of God it must be regarded in no other light than if it were a divine oracle.”

3) But as Calvin adds, the fact is that the Holy Spirit “desires to be inseparably connected with the Word of God; and Christ declares the same thing of Him when He promises Him to the Church “ (Institutes, II, pp. 398-9).

G. THE DIVISIONS of THEOLOGY.

Theology is generally divided into Biblical, Historical, Systematic, Dogmatic, and Practical Theology.

1. Biblical Theology.

a. Biblical Theology seeks to determine the meaning of the Scripture and to arrange and classify the facts of Revelation.

b. Shedd maintains that if Biblical theology should examine the Bible as a whole, “it would become systematic theology” (op. cit., I, p.11).

c. But Davidson insists that it is not simply a matter of sources.

1) He says: “In Biblical theology the Bible is the source of knowledge, and also supplies the form in which the knowledge is present” (Theo. of the Old Test., p. 1).

2) This we may accept as the better definition.

2. Historical Theology. Historical Theology “traces the development of the Biblical doctrines from the time of the apostles to the present day, and gives account of the results of this development in the life of the church” (Strong, op. cit., p. 41). It embraces two departments: Church History and History of Doctrine.

3. Systematic Theology

a. Systematic Theology is “the orderly and harmonious presentation of the truths of theology with a view to unity and completeness” (Mullins, The Chr. Rel. in Its Doctrinal Expression, p. 2).

b. Strong holds that the materials for Systematic Theology are furnished by Biblical and by Historical Theology (op.cit., p.41).

c. But Hodge, evidently thinking of Systematic Theology, insists that the Bible contains all the facts of theology and is the only infallible source of this science (I.15; cf. above under # 6).

d. Davidson again holds that it is not merely a matter of sources. He says: “In Systematic Theology, while Scripture supplies the knowledge, some mental scheme, logical or philosophical, is made the mold into which the knowledge is run, so that it comes out bearing the form of this mold” (op.cit., p.1).

e. Whatever contribution may be made by Historical Theology, we must ever be careful to make the Bible the primary and only infallible source.

4. Dogmatic Theology. Dogmatic Theology is “in strict usage, the systematizing of the doctrines as expressed in the symbols of the church, together with the grounding of these in the Scriptures, and the exhibition, so far as may be, of their rational necessity.” Strong (op.cit., p.41).

5. Practical Theology. Practical Theology treats of the application of theology in the regeneration, sanctification, and edification of men. It embraces courses in Homiletics, Pastoral Theology, Evangelism, and Missions.

6. Christian Apologetics. Apologetics is the science which vindicates the truths of Christianity.

a. Generally, apologetics is studied under a two-fold aspect:

1) of defending its essential nature and relations,

2) of showing the falsity of principles opposed to it.

b. Some scholars make a difference between apologetics and an apology, the latter being strictly a defense against some purported truth, whereas the former is more positive in presenting the facts of Christianity and shows wherein the truth lies.

7. For our purposes, we will adhere more strictly to the studies in Biblical Theology. Of necessity, there will be occasions when our study will take the nature of Systematic Theology or Historical Theology, or perhaps even Christian Apologetics. In any case the Bible will be considered the primary source.

H. CONCERNING METHODOLOGY and THEOLOGY.

Theology is no exception to the rule that all branches of study should be pursued systematically and with a distinct aim. As theology deals with the most important truths, it should be presented in an orderly way.

1. Terminology

a. First of all, the language of theology should be as simple as possible.

1) Archaic and technical terminology should be avoided, especially in a work intended for students rather than for scholars.

2) A violation of this principle is responsible in part for the misconception that theology is merely a scholastic pursuit unrelated to life.

b. Technical terms can not be avoided altogether, but their meaning should be evident from the context.

1) The language of the ancients was no doubt the very best for them.

2) But the growth of ideas and the constant change in the meaning of words require language which clearly expresses the present apprehension of truth.

2. The Scientific Process.

a. Theology claims to be a true science, because it follows chiefly the inductive method, which requires:

- 1) exact observation,
- 2) correct interpretation of observed facts,
- 3) rational explanation of these facts,
- 4) orderly construction coordinating and systematizing these facts.

b. But theology cannot be confined in its treatment of the phenomena of the higher life to the narrow sphere of a natural science.

1) Theology looks toward finality and infinity; science is mundane. Hence theology is more than science though in harmony with it.

2) Theology takes cognizance of intuitions, convictions, and revelations which transcend the facts with which ordinary science deals.

c. Nevertheless, all these must be treated in an orderly manner.

3. The Point of View of Methodology.

a. In the limited and more technical sense, methodology has a particular reference to the controlling principle or the point of view of theology.

1) It is concerned about the central dominating idea, around which the system revolves.

2) Unless a true center be found, theology will be erratic as was ancient astronomy, which made the earth and not the sun the center of the system.

b. Various methods have been applied in the construction of theological systems.

1) The Anthropological Method. This method makes sinful man the center; it begins with man's disease, sin, and ends with redemption, the remedy for this disease.

2) The Trinitarian Method. The advocates of this method emphasize the divine sovereignty and hold that the Trinity is the basis and starting point, that Christology is only a division of theology, that Christ is only a single person of the Trinity, redemption only one of the works of God, and sin an anomaly in the universe, not an original and necessary fact, and that, therefore, the Christological method is fractional (after Shedd).

3) The Christological Method

a) The Christological method does not imply that a system of theology must begin with Christology, but makes the person and work of Christ the center. “The center is not the beginning but it throws light on the beginning and on the end, Christology furnished the key for theology and anthropology-- the doctrine of God and the doctrine of man.” (Schaff).

b) More positively, this method insists that theology is greatly simplified by starting with Christ, for here is a concrete fact, a personality. “The doctrine of Christ” says Schaff, “is the soul and center of all sound theology. Moreover, as in the first centuries the conflict waged round the person of Christ, so in the latter years this same question is again uppermost.”

c) Briefly speaking the Christological Method treats of God, man, and sin as presuppositions of the person and work of Christ.

d. The Synthetic Method

1) A more popular method is the Synthetic Method which “starts from the highest principle, God, and proceeds to man, Christ, redemption, and finally to the end of all things” (Hagenback, Hist. of Doctrine, II, p.152).

2) This will be the method used in our studies of Biblical Theology with the one modification that a preliminary study of the Scriptures will be made first.

3) The doctrines which will be treated as follows:

- 1) Bibliology: Doctrine of the Bible.
- 2) Theology: Doctrine of God.
- 3) Angelology: Doctrine of Angels (including Satan).
- 4) Anthropology: Doctrine of Man.
- 5) Christology: The Doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ.
- 6) Soteriology: The Doctrine of Salvation.
- 7) Ecclesiology: Doctrine of the Church.
- 8) Eschatology: Doctrine of Last Things.
- 9) Pneumatology: Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

II. BIBLIOLOGY

A. SCOPE OF STUDY.

1. Bibliology is the doctrine of the Scriptures.
2. It includes all of the topics relating to the written revelation of God, namely:
 - a. Revelation.
 - b. Genuineness.
 - c. Credibility.
 - d. Canonicity.
 - e. Integrity.
 - f. Inspiration.
3. The student should learn the meaning of the above mentioned topics, together with reasons for believing in a special revelation and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures.

B. REVELATION.

1. DEFINITION - (See also pages)
 - a. Revelation (apocalypsis, unveiling) is an unveiling of that which before was hidden (Rom. 16:25; Rev. 1:1). It is a communication of truth from God to man (Heb. 1:1,2).
 - b. God revealed Himself:
 - 1) To Abraham (Gen. 15:1).
 - 2) He spoke to Moses from the burning bush (Ex. 3:4).
 - 3) He spoke to Aaron out of the cloudy pillar (Num.12 :5).
 - 4) He spoke to Samuel (I Sam 3:4).
 - 5) He spoke to David through the prophet Nathan (II Sam. 12:1).
 - 6) God spoke through the prophets throughout the entire period of the Old Testament.
 - 7) And, as indicated in Hebrews 1:1,2, God has spoken or revealed Himself in the person of His Son.
 - c. As God’s revelation came to the prophets and others in “divers portions and divers manners” and in turn was put into writing, we have the written revelation of God - the Word of God, the Bible. Paul told the Romans that these writings were for our learning (Rom. 15:4). This was God’s method of conveying the truth concerning Himself and His work to mankind.

d. Notice some important factors in revelation according to the above explanation:

1) God is active in revelation. God is active in revelation as opposed to the idea that revelation is deepened spiritual insight which leads to an ever-increasing discovery of God on the part of man.

2) Revelation is an impartation of truth. In revelation God makes known truth which is a disclosure of Himself and His actions toward men. God may impart this truth in at least three ways, namely:

a) By entering into the horizon of the person to whom He would convey this knowledge (Gen. 12:7).

b) By a direct communicating of the things He would make known (Gen. 15:13-16).

c) By removing from the mind of man any impediment to the realization of this knowledge (Luke 24:31).

3) Revelation was to Bible writers. God revealed Himself to any number of individuals and in any number of ways, but insofar as written revelation is concerned it should be confined to the Bible writers.

2. KINDS of REVELATION. The Bible testifies of a two-fold revelation of God: a revelation in nature and a revelation in the Bible as the Word of God.

a. Natural Revelation

1) Definition. Natural Revelation, also called General Revelation, is the act of God whereby He continually makes Himself and His truth known to all men in nature, history, and conscience.

a) Such revelation is communicated through the media of natural phenomena, occurring in the course of nature or of history.

b) It is addressed to all intelligent creatures generally, and is accessible to all men; and it has for its object the supplying of the natural need of the creature, and to lead him to seek the true God.

2) The Revelation of God in Nature. The Bible everywhere recognizes a revelation of God in nature. The Psalms are full of it. (Psa. 19:1). Job and his friends all argue it. Moses assumes it (Psa. 90). The prophets bring it into their discourses (Isa. 40, etc). Jesus continually brought spiritual lessons from nature; and Paul says that God “left not Himself without witness, in that He did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with good and gladness” (Acts 14:17).

3) The Revelation of God in History.

a) The Old Testament writers felt that God was revealing Himself in the history of men

1] We read in Daniel, “Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are His. And He changeth the times and the seasons; He removeth kings, and setteth up kings” (Dan. 2:20,21).

2] “This matter is by decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones; to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will, and setteth up over it the basest of men” (Dan. 4:17).

b) Repeatedly the prophets spoke of various nations as working out God’s will, particularly His judgments.

1] The thirty-third Psalm says, “Blessed is the nation whose God is Jehovah”, (v.12).

2] Paul declares that God has “made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him” (Acts 17:26,27). He also says: “There is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1).

c) More specifically, God revealed Himself in the history of the chosen nation Israel. Israel’s own conception of this shows this clearly.

1] Israel recognized God as the only God, “The Lord our Lord is one Lord,” (Deut. 6:4) was peculiar to Israel and Israel only among the nations.

2] They held Him as one who should be worshiped (Deut. 6:5).

3] They recognized His voice of authority over them (Deut. 5:32,33).

4] They knew their position before God as opposed to the heathen nations (Deut. 7:1-3).

5] They believed in direct revelation from God (Deut. 5:24).

6] They evidently apprehended God’s purpose of redemption through sacrifice (See Lev. chs 1-7, Ch. 16, etc.).

d) God’s revelation to Israel is not only seen in the nations’ thought-concepts; it is also seen clearly in the events of her history.

1] God brought them up out of bondage of Egypt, put the fear and the dread of them upon all surrounding nations, and gave them the land of Canaan.

2] When they apostatized and worshiped other gods, He allowed the surrounding nations to oppress them; but when they repented and turned to Him, He delivered them.

3] He prospered the kings who sought after Him.

4] Whenever the nation departed from Him, calamities came upon them.

5] The Israelites recognized all these things as coming to them from the hand of God -as His revelation to them, and through them to the world.

4) The Revelation of God in Conscience.

a) The Old Testament does not contain the word conscience which may be due to the fact that the heart was regarded as the conscience.

b) Paul said that the Gentiles who were without the law of God showed “the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith . . . (Rom. 2:15).

c) There is indication here that God revealed himself to man’s conscience. While we cannot say that man’s conscience is God in the soul, yet God evidently makes his existence known and to some degree, at least, gives man - through his conscience - a sense of right and wrong.

5) Value of Natural or General Revelation. Natural Revelation, although insufficient, gives us the following with regard to God:

a) The Existence of God. This is the cosmological argument.

1] “Every effect must have an adequate cause. The world is an effect. Therefore the world must have had a cause outside of itself and adequate to account for its existence.” (Hodge, p.208).

2] J. H. Barrows says, “The Himalayas are the raised letters upon which we blind children put our fingers to spell out the name of God” (Quoted in Strong, p.27).

b) Personality of God. Berkhof gives three things as bearing witness to the personality of God.

1] Human personality demands a personal God for its explanation.

2] The world in general bears witness to the personality of God. In its whole fabric and constitution it reveals the clearest traces of an infinite intelligence, of the deepest, highest and tenderest emotions, and of a will that is all-powerful. Consequently, we are constrained to mount from the world to the world’s maker as a Being of intelligence, sensibility, and will, that is, a person.

3] The moral and religious nature of man also points to the personality of God.

c) Power and Divinity of God.

1] Through God's revelation of Himself in the universe we see His Power and Divinity.

2] Paul asserts this in Romans 1:20, where he says: "For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity."

d) The Nature of God. There is also revealed something of the nature of God.

1] His providence is evident through the history of man. "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5:45.

2] And more than that His righteousness is evident

3] Thiessen says that conscience not only reveals to us God's existence, but also:

a] that He sharply distinguishes between the right and wrong:

b] that He always does that which is right;

c] and that He holds His rational creatures responsible for always doing the right and refraining from the wrong.

d] It also implies that every transgression will be punished.

4] If we study carefully the first chapter of Romans we see that Paul argues that the revelation of God through nature is sufficient so that the heathen who sin are without excuse.

e) Insufficiency of Natural Revelation.

1] Natural Revelation cannot reveal the plan of redemption and is thus insufficient for the sinner.

2] Neither can Natural Revelation give to us an adequate description of the character and work of God. Acts 17:23 and Eph. 3:9 seem to bear out this contention:

a] "For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this I set forth unto you."

b] "And to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which for ages hath been hid in God who created all things."

b. SPECIAL REVELATION.

1) Definition. Special Revelation is a self-manifestation and a self-presentation of God to man through the Word of God. In other words, Special Revelation deals with a personal God who, as a Person, reveals Himself to man.

2) Proof of Special Revelation. The purpose of our study is to offer evidence that God not only revealed Himself in the Person of Christ, but that He had centuries before manifested Himself to prophets who in turn spoke to the people. Not only did He speak to the nations through the prophets, but He manifested Himself by attesting to the miracles performed in His name. A concluding evidence will be offered in the fact that God still reveals Himself in the hearts of men as they experience the redemptive power of God.

a) Special Revelation of God: MIRACLES.

1] Attestation and Accreditation of the Revelation.

a] If God is to reveal Himself, He must attest and accredit the revelation or men would never believe the revelation to be from God.

b] This attestation and accreditation is best found in what is commonly called miracles. Miracles were the credentials that God offered to those who questioned the authority of the ones to whom God had divinely commissioned.

c] Thus we reach a first conclusion, that a personal God would attest and accredit His work, which leads to the possibility of using miracles.

2] Draw Attention to Truth. Strong (p. 128) points out that the great epochs of miracles -- represented by Moses, the prophets, the first and second coming of Christ -- are coincident with the great epochs of revelation.

a] He states that they are the natural accompaniments of new communications from God.

b] His conclusion concerning this particular phase of possibility of miracles was that the miracles usually ceased or were withdrawn when the truth intended to be communicated had gained sufficient currency and foothold.

3] Proof of Divine Mission.

a] Christ constantly appealed to his miracles as a decisive proof of his divine revelation (See John 5:20,36; 10:25; etc.).

b] Sacred writers under both dispensations appealed to these wonders as proofs that they were messengers of God.

b) Special Revelation of God: PROPHECY.

1] Definition:

a] "Prophecy is the foretelling of future events by virtue of direct communication from God." Strong

b] This definition does not include the forth telling of the word of God by the prophets to an immediate audience such as we find in much of the Pentateuch. Together with his definition, Strong lists 5 requirements for prophecy:

1} The utterance must be distant from the event.

2} Nothing must exist to suggest the event to be merely

natural prescience.

3} The utterance must be free from ambiguity.

4} It must be so precise as to secure its own fulfillment.

5} It must be followed in due time by the event

predicted.

2] Means by which Prophecy was communicated. Hamilton suggests (op.cit., p.94), three ways that God could reveal Himself to man and communicate with him:

a] Theophany, that is, by appearing face to face with man, and holding direct conversation with him.

b] Dreams and visions --

1} In a dream God reveals Himself while the person is unconscious. The revelation actually being in the mind itself.

2} In a vision, the person receiving the revelation is in a conscious state, a trance, during which he consciously perceives the vision in the external world.

c] By the supernatural quickening of the minds of chosen men so that they could, by the use of their spiritually quickened faculties, perceive clearly and correctly the spiritual truths which God wanted revealed to his people, and by giving them proofs that their revelation was from God.

1} It was in this way that the prophets and apostles wrote the words of the Bible.

2} What they wrote was free from error and what was recorded was the truth that God wished them to record.

3] Elements in Prophecy

a] The predictive element in prophecy is outstanding, and must be acknowledged as supernatural or explained away or denied.

1} Critics do their explaining by saying that such predictive prophecies were not written until after the event took place; or, the predictions were merely late interpolations; or, when admitted to be genuine, that they were not really fulfilled.

2} Unfortunately, some of the chief predictions (Hamilton, op.cit., p.133), e.g., those of Amos of the approaching Assyrian invasion, the captivity of Israel (Amos 5:27; 7:11,17); those of Hosea and Isaiah of the fall of Samaria (Hosea 7: Isaiah 37:26-36) Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years' captivity and subsequent return (Jer. 25:11,12) are of such nature which can be neither expunged from the text, nor gotten rid of as unfilled, except by doing violence to the text.

b] The Messianic element in prophecy is of utmost importance as it has the longest range of all prophecies and bears on more of the text than any other single element.

1} This element begins in the garden of Eden, continues through the promises of Abraham, through the Mosaic age, through the tribe of Judah and the house of David, and culminates in the prophecies of Isaiah -- fulfilled in the New Testament.

2} Thiessen lists eighteen (18) distinct prophecies of this nature that have already been fulfilled that give strong proof that God revealed Himself in prophecy. Christ was to be:

- a} born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14; Matt 1:23),
- b} of the seed of Abraham (Gen. 12:3; Gal. 3:8),
- c} of the tribe of Judah (Gen.49:10; Heb. 7:14),
- d} of the lineage of David (Ps 110:1; Rom. 1:3).
- e} born at Bethlehem (Micah 5:2; Matt.2:6),
- f} anointed of the Spirit (Isa. 61:1 ; Luke 4:18,19),
- g} ride into Jerusalem on an ass (Zech. 9:9;

Matt.21:4,5),

- h} betrayed by a friend (Ps. 41:9; Jn. 13:18

- i} sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zech. 11:12,13;

Matt. 26:15; 27:9,10),

26:31,56),
 broken (Ps. 22:16; 34:20; Jn. 19:36; 20:20,25),
 (Psa. 69:21; Matt. 27:34),
 Matt.27:46),
 27:57-60),
 2:27),
 22:43-45).

j} forsaken by His disciples (Zech. 13:7; Matt.
 k} pierced in hands and feet but not to have a bone
 l} men were to give Him gall and vinegar to drink
 m} to part His garments and to cast lot upon His
 n} he was to be forsaken of God (Psa. 22:1;
 n} to be buried with the rich (Isa. 53:9; Matt.
 o} He was to rise from the dead (Psa.16:8-11; Acts
 p} ascend on high (Psa. 68:18; Eph. 4:8) and
 q} sit at the Father's right hand (Psa. 110:1; Matt

3} Have we not in these predictions that have already been fulfilled a strong proof of the fact that God has revealed Himself in prophecy? And, if He has done this in these predictions, then what is there to hinder us from believing that He has done this in the others also.

4] Counterfeit Prophecy.

a] Prophecy, in order to be a revelation of God, must distinguish itself from the prophecies made by men of the world.

b] Robert Ingersoll predicted that within ten years there would be two theaters to one church.

1} Yet, he made the prediction in a day when modern liberalism was permeating the church and the theater was fast becoming an accepted form of amusement.

2} Such prophecy is obviously not a revelation of God.

c] Garden, the Italian mathematician, predicted the day and hour of his own death, and then committed suicide at the proper time to prove the prediction true.

d] H. G. Wells, modern historian, has made many prophecies or predictions that have come true, but we have to discount such testimony with the fact that an equal number of his predictions have failed to materialize in the specified time.

5] Special Revelation of God: JESUS CHRIST.

a] "To those who deny supernatural revelation, Jesus is necessarily a problem" (Orr, Revelation and Inspiration),p.131.

1} They must do something with all the super-natural claims made about Him -- they either must deny them or accept them.

2} If they accept them, it must be admitted that He was the Son of God and that He not only revealed that God was with Him, but that He was very God Himself.

3} If they deny the super-natural claims, they must explain away such assertions -- and this they do.

b] Liberal View

1} Insofar, as His birth is concerned, He is the son of two peasants -- Joseph and Mary.

2} His early life was not unusual.

3} When He reached about thirty years of age, He became the originator of a remarkable religious movement; in so doing He clashed with the ecclesiastical heads of the day, which ultimately led to His arrest and crucifixion.

4} As to whether or not He claimed to be the Messiah is a moot question with many of this school.

a} His soul was one of singular purity -- but not sinless.

b} His religious and ethical ideals were of the highest nature and well worth being patterned after.

c} He gave some proof that certainly God was with Him.

d} His continual polemic against the outward, ceremonial and legal in religion, in favor of the spiritual worship, and an inward morality of the heart, made Him the true Founder of the Kingdom of God on earth.

e} He gave up His life on the cross in fidelity to his convictions, but according to this new interpretation did not rise again.

f} It is allowed that His disciples believed that He did rise again and the preaching of a Risen Lord gave rise to the Christian Church. But all this is fiction for another day, and the church of the future must content itself with a Jesus on whose grave, as Matthew Arnold said. "The Syrian stars will look down" (Orr, op.cit., p.133).

c] Conservative View.

a] The true picture of Christ is not gained by critically taking to pieces the above picture.

1} Instead, a more positive task of regarding Jesus in the light of His own revelation of God and Himself will suffice.

2} We read, "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His son." Heb. 1:1,2 RV.

3} Thus we have a statement of the New Testament writer that God spoke or revealed Himself to the world in the person of Christ: "I am He that beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me." John 8:18.

b] Thiessen lists a three-fold revelation of God that comes to us in Christ. In Him we have 1} revelation of the existence of God, 2} of the nature of God, and 3} of the will of God.

1} Existence of God.

a} He is the best proof for the existence of God, for He lived the life of God among men.

b} He was not merely supremely conscious of the presence of the Father in His life and in constant communion with Him (John 8:18,28,29; 10:41, 12:28).

c} But showed by his claims (John 8:58, 17:5), sinless life (John 8:46), teaching (Matt 7:28, 29; John 7:46), works (John 5:36; 10:37; 15:24), office and prerogatives (Matt. 9:2, 6; John 5:22, 25, 28), and relations to the Father (Matt. 28:19), that He was God.

2} Nature of God. He revealed:

a} The absolute holiness of God (John 17:11, 25).

b} The profound love of God (John 3:14-16).

c} The Fatherhood of God, not indeed of all men, but of true believers (Matt. 6 :32; 7:11; John 8:41,44).

d} And the spiritual nature of God (John 4:19-26).

3} The Will of God. He revealed also the will of God; that all men should:

a} Repent (Luke 13:1-5).

b} Believe on Him (John 6:28-29).

c} Become perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect (Matt.5:48).

d} And that the believers should carry the Gospel to all the world. (Matt. 28:19,20).

5] Special Revelation of God: CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

a] The test of the special revelation that God has made to man is found in a genuine NEW TESTAMENT experience in the hearts of his creatures.

1} The work of grace that God performs is exclusively Christian both in its accomplishment and in its acknowledgment.

2} Paul tells us: "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold they are become new." (2nd Cor. 5:17). And it is in these new creatures that God reveals Himself to an unbelieving world.

b] Lorimer, writing in the Argument for Christianity, p. 451, depicts how vastly different the other religions of the world are in this respect, "Jesus is the Savior, Redeemer, the propitiation for the sins of the world, through whom humanity received the fullness of grace unto eternal life.

1} What Buddhist ever affirmed this or anything like this of Siddartha?

2} No Chinese teacher ever dreamt of saying that Confucius had appeared to lay down his life for the sheep.

3} And no Parsee ever supposed Zoroaster had atoned for this iniquity of the people.

4} What devout Mussulman ever considered Mohammed as anything more than a prophet sent to proclaim the unity of God?"

c] Hamilton continues (op.cit., p.319) “The first thing we find is that Christianity possesses the power of making over lives of men and women.

1} Christianity finds a man sunk in the depths of moral degradation and sin and changes him into a man honored and respected by all who know him.

2} Christianity takes Saul breathing out slaughter upon the followers of the ‘Name,’ and changes him into the Apostle Paul, filled with love for the brethren and a zeal for carrying the gospel to the heathen.

3} Christianity takes a rake and changes him into Augustine, the saint, the great theologian.

4} Christianity takes a John Bunyan, a prisoner in an English jail and makes him into a revered author of “Pilgrim’s Progress”, the book that has inspired Christians for two centuries.

5} Christianity sends its Wesleys, its Whitfields, its Moodys, its Chapmans and its Billy Sundays, through the length and breadth of our land preaching the doctrine of redemption that is in Jesus Christ.”

d] The Word tells us that not only has God revealed Himself in Salvation to men, but after having experienced such redemption, we have fellowship with Him. (I John 1:3). The Christian is:

1} Bestowed with spiritual gifts (Eph. 1:3).

2} Given the gift of eternal life(Rom. 6:23).

3} The peace of God (Rom. 5:1).

4} And many other things all provided in the Person of Jesus Christ.

6] Special Revelation of God: BIBLE. The Scriptures as a whole are a revelation of God according to Strong, (op.cit., p.111), and all the subjects in this study are a part of that revelation. It is with the internal evidence of such Scriptures, however, that we are concerned.

a] Teaching of Scripture. The Scripture indicate that they are a revelation of God.

1} In at least 3808 places in the Old Testament the expression, “Thus saith the Lord,” “And God said . . .”, or its equivalent is found. (Evans, Great Doctrines of the Bible).

2} At times he spoke audibly from heaven, on other occasions from the burning bush or the mountain top.

a} Whether he spoke theophanously in human form, or in no perceptible form whatsoever --

b} he spoke in such terms that the message was received intelligently by whom it was addressed

b] Content of the Revelation.

1} The Scriptures are not merely man's thoughts of God, but a revelation of God by Himself of His own nature. Orr says, (Holy Scripture and Modern Negation" Fundamentals, Los Angeles, 1917):

2} "That it (the Bible) contains a record of true supernatural revelation; . . . a supernatural revelation of what God revealed Himself in word and deed to men in history". In Orr's few words, the method of such a revelation is given -- "in word and deed"

a} In word, God said, "I AM that I AM", (Ex. 3:14) designating His eternal nature; ". . . be ye holy for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44), designating his holiness; "I am Jehovah, the God of all flesh; "Let us make man in our image" (Gen. 1:26), designating His absolute Lordship over all flesh; designating Himself as Creator; "Come now let us reason together, saith Jehovah, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, though they be red as crimson they shall be as wool" (Isa. 1:18), designating Himself as man's redeemer.

b} In deed, He revealed Himself as God in sending the flood, in confusing the tongues of the people, in opening the Red Sea, in sending the manna, in preserving his people in warfare, in the slaying of thousands, in attesting the words of the prophets by miracle, and finally -- in the birth, ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

C. THE GENUINENESS OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

1. Introduction.

a. The next two topics properly belong to the department of Biblical Introduction; but for the sake of completeness they must receive brief treatment here.

b. First of all we speak of the genuineness of the books of the Bible.

1) A book is genuine if it is written at the time to which it is assigned and by the man or men to whom it is ascribed.

2) It is said to be “forged”, or “spurious” if it is not written by the man to whom it is ascribed. The Apocryphal Gospel of Thomas is not “genuine”, for it was not written by Thomas; nor is it “credible”, for its contents are mostly fables and lies (Eavns, Book of Books, p. 38).

c. We may discuss this subject in two parts.

2. The Genuineness of the Books of the Old Testament.

a. Old Testament books quoted in New Testament.

1) Time will not permit an examination of all the books in the Old Testament; this is the task of Biblical Introduction. We can deal with only in a more general way.

2) To begin with we note, that all but eight of the books of the Old Testament are quoted in the New as genuine.

a) These eight are Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah (Raven, Old Testament Introduction, p. 19).

b) The last three of these belong to the Minor Prophets, which were counted as one book; and reference to some books in this group sanctions them all.

c) None of the eight were omitted because they were regarded as spurious, but because they did not serve any definite purpose of the New Testament writer.

b. Ancient Jewish authorities. In the second place we call attention to ancient Jewish authorities. *Specifically, the Jewish historian Josephus.*

1) The Jewish historian Josephus (b. ca. A.D. 37) wrote to Apion (1. 8): “For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine.

a) And of them five belong to Moses . .

b) The prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books.

c) The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers.”

2) Ruth was sometimes counted with Judges, and Lamentations with Jeremiah, and Josephus probably did this so as to have twenty-two books, the same as the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

3) Philo of Alexandria (b. B.C. 20) “never quotes an apocryphal book, although he does quote from nearly all the books of the Old Testament” (Strong, op.cit., p.166).

4) The author of the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus says (writing about B.C. 130), that many and great things had been delivered to the Jews by the Law and the Prophets and by others that had followed their steps, and that his grandfather, Jesus, had also written something about learning and wisdom. His grandfather must have lived about B.C. 170, and Ecclesiasticus bears testimony to the fact that as early as that date the Jews had the Old Testament in its present threefold division.

c. Testimony of Septuagint. In the third place we mention the testimony of the Septuagint which was a Greek translation of the books of the Old Testament.

1) We do not know the exact date at which the LXX was translated, but c. 285-150 B.C. are safe limits.

2) There are 287 undisputed quotations from the Old Testament in the New, and over one-half of these are from the LXX.

3) The Jews in general took kindly to this version until the Christians adopted it as their Bible. When this occurred, Aquila, probably a Jewish proselyte of Pontus, prepared a new translation into the Greek, which the Jews accepted instead of the Septuagint. This was about the middle of the second century of our era.

4) Now the Septuagint contained all the books we today have in our English translation of the Old Testament; in other words, it bears testimony to the fact that in B.C. 150, all the books which we have in our Old Testament were in existence.

d. Testimony of Samaritan Pentateuch.

1) The Samaritan Pentateuch is not a translation, but “the Hebrew text written in Samaritan or old Hebrew characters, with various divergences from the Hebrew text of the Masoretes? (Davis, Bible Dictionary, s.v. Versions).

2) Three opinions have prevailed as to the date of this work:

a) some holding that it originated before the kingdom was divided under Rehoboam, i.e., in the tenth century before Christ;

b) others, that it originated when a priest was sent back to Samaria to instruct the heathen colonists who had been brought to Samaria, i.e., some time after B.C. 722;

c) and still others, that it originated when the temple was built on Mount Gerizim about 425 B.C.

3) Even if we accept the last view as the most probable, the Samaritan Pentateuch testifies to the existence of the first five books of our Bible as early as the fifth century before Christ.

e. Testimony of Internal Evidence.

1) We notice in the fifth place the testimony of internal evidence.

a) Internal evidence is that which comes from the Bible itself. In 2 Kings 22:8 we read that Hilkiah the high priest found the “book of the law” in the house of Jehovah. This was in the days of Josiah, about 621 B.C.

b) Now while liberalism claims that this was only the book of Deuteronomy, tradition claims that it was the whole Pentateuch. The “book of the law” would seem to include all the books of the Pentateuch; but the statement in 2 Kings. 23:2, that the king read in the ears of the people, “all the words of the book of the covenant”, may refer only to lx. 20-24 (cf. Deut. 4:13).

c) On the basis of these facts the conservative holds that the Pentateuch existed as early as 621 B.C.

2) Again, in Amos 2:4 we read that Jehovah will not turn away the punishment of Judah, “because they have rejected the law of Jehovah, and have not kept his statutes”.

a) Now Amos prophesied about 795-784 B.C. His statement indicates that the Mosaic law was in existence in his day.

b) In Hosea 8:12 we read that Jehovah said: “I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law; but they are counted as a strange thing”. Hosea prophesied about 785-725, and joins Amos in testifying that the Law existed in his day.

c) And finally, we repeatedly read in the Pentateuch that Moses was asked to write and did write what God had told him in a book (Ex. 17:14; 24:4; 34:27; Num. 33:2; Deut. 31:9-26). When we recall Moses' preparation for such a task (Acts 7:22), we do not find it difficult to believe that he is the author of the Pentateuch.

3) We have now traced the evidence back from New Testament time to the time of Moses. We need not trace the history of the remaining books. We merely repeat that they were in the original Septuagint. The remaining facts concerning them must be dealt with in Biblical Introduction.

f. Testimony of Christ.

1) But we would, in the sixth place, notice the testimony of Christ.

a) If He is God incarnate, His testimony is decisive.

b) To say that He accommodated Himself to the ignorance and prejudice of His time is to suggest a course of action "unworthy of the character of an honest man, unworthy of the dignity of a prophet, blasphemous as applied to Jesus, who is God over all blessed forever" (Saphir, The Divine Unity of Scripture, p.53).

c) And to say that when He emptied Himself He laid aside His attribute of omniscience and became limited in knowledge is either to be ignorant of the Biblical doctrine of the Kenosis, or deliberately to pervert it. Jesus must either be accepted as God manifest in the flesh, or He cannot be accepted at all.

2) To begin with He used a number of terms which indicate that He accepted the Hebrew canonical writings which were in general use in His day as Sacred Scripture.

a) He speaks of them:

1] as "the Scripture", and "the Scriptures" (John 5:39; 10:35; Matt. 26:54);

2] "the law", for the entire Old Testament (John 10:34);

3] "the law and the prophets", for the entire Old Testament (Luke 16:16; Matt. 22:40);

4] and "the Scriptures of the prophets", for the writings of the prophets (Matt. 26.56).

5] Even Ladd admits that the use of these nouns "implies a belief in the divine origin of those writings to which the titles are applied" (The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, 1. 34).

b) But He also confirms the traditional view as to the authorship of a number of the books.

1] We may mention the Mosaic authorship
a] of Exodus (Mark 7:10; 12:26; cf. Ex. 20:12; 21:17; ch. 3),
b] of Leviticus (Matt. 8:4; of. Lev. 14:4-32),
c] of Deuteronomy (Matt. 19:8; cf Deut. 24:1-4);
d] the Isaian authorship of the disputed part of Isaiah (Matt. 8:17; Luke 4:17,18; cf. Isa. 53:4; 61:10);
e] and the Danielian authorship of Daniel (Matt. 24:15; cf. Dan. 12:11).

2] Surely His testimony must be accepted as conclusive. While this does not include all the books of the Old Testament, His endorsement of those which are the main targets of criticism and His attitude toward the existing canon as a whole, furnish solid proof for the genuineness of the books of the Old Testament

3. Genuineness of the Books of the New Testament. 27

a. External Evidence. As for external proof we may note the fact that by the end of the second century the collection of the books was practically complete.

1) At least twenty of the books of our New Testament were at that time recognized as apostolic (all but Hebrews, 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, Jude, James and the Revelation).

2) By the beginning of the fourth century the remaining seven books “were received by most of the churches, and at the end of the century they were received by all” (Angus-Green, Cyclopedic Handbook to the Bible, p. 39).

3) In the West the Damasine Council of Rome (382), in which Jerome was a leading spirit, recognized “perhaps for the first time”, exactly the same books given (neither more nor less) in our modern Bibles (Souter, op.cit., p.196).

4) The third Council of Carthage (397), at which Augustine was present, recognized all the books of the New Testament, mentioning them by name (Angus-Green op.cit., p. 41).

5) From this time on there was general agreement on this subject in the West. In the East it took a little longer before all the books were accepted by the whole church; but by the year 500 the whole Greek speaking church seems to have accepted all the books in our present New Testament (Souter, op.cit., p.188).

b. Internal Evidence.

1) As for internal evidence it may be said that criticism is more and more returning to the traditional view as to the date of the several books. Doubt is still cast upon 2 Peter, the Pastorals, the Gospel of John, and one or two other books, but there are outstanding scholars who recognize the genuineness of all the books of the New Testament.

2) It may be added that the argument from style and vocabulary has been greatly discounted in recent times.

a) Again and again it has been demonstrated that on the basis of literary peculiarities alone, books concerning whose unity there is no question can be shown to have a composite authorship (e.g. Romana Dissected, by E. D. Mc Realsham).

b) Style changes with the subject-matter and the age of the author. Sometimes the differences in style between two products of an author maybe accounted for on the ground that he had an amanuensis for the one work and not for the other, or a different one for the several books that he wrote (e.g., First and Second Peter). Thus it is seen that literary characteristics must be interpreted in the light of many things and cannot be made an index to the authorship of a book when standing alone.

3) As for the Pastoral Epistles it may be added that they do not need to fit into the Book of Acts, as liberals usually insist that they must, if they were written by Paul.

a) Paul was most probably released from his first imprisonment and so wrote the Pastorals after the account of him in the Acts.

b) This is, indeed, the accepted explanation of conservatives with regard to them.

4) The Gospel of John is rejected by some because of its emphasis on the Deity of Christ.

a) It is said that the Synoptics do not reveal any such belief concerning Him during the first century.

b) How do we know what was the true view of Christ in those early days except on the basis of the Gospels?

c) No one can say that because John stresses the Deity of Christ somewhat more than the Synoptics do that John does not come from the first century.

D. THE CREDIBILITY of the BOOKS of the BIBLE.

1. Definition.

- a. A book is credible if it relates truthfully the matters of which it treats.
- b. It is said to be “corrupt” when its present text varies from the original.
- c. Credibility then embraces both the ideas of truthfulness in the records and purity of text. A brief word must be said on this subject concerning both the Old and New Testament.

2. Credibility of the Old Testament.

a. Received by Jesus Christ.

1) The credibility of the Old Testament is established by the fact Christ received the Old Testament, as relating truthfully the events and doctrines of which it treats (Matt. 5:17,18); John 10:34-36; Luke 24:27,44,45).

2) He definitely endorsed a number of the leading things in the Old Testament as true; as, for example:

- a) The creation of the universe by God (Mark 13:19);
- b) the direct creation of man (Matt. 19:4,5);
- c) the personality of Satan and his malignant character (John 8:44);
- d) the destruction of the world by a flood in the days of Noah (Luke 17:26,27);
- e) the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the rescue of Lot (Luke 17:28-30);
- f) the revelation of God to Moses at the Bush (Mark 12:26);
- g) the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (see under Christ’s testimony to the genuineness of the Old Testament, above);
- h) the manna in the wilderness (John 6:32);
- i) the existence of the tabernacle (Luke 6:3,4);
- j) the experience of Jonah in the big fish (Matt 12:39);
- k) and the unity of Isaiah (Matt. 8:17; Luke 4:17,18).

3) We have already said that if He was God manifest in the flesh He knew what were the facts and if He knew them, He could not accommodate Himself to the erroneous view of His day and remain honest. His testimony must, therefore, be accepted as true, or He must be rejected as a religious teacher.

b. Proof derived from history. History furnishes many proofs of the correctness of the Biblical representation of life in Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Mede-Persia, etc.

1) A number of the rulers of these countries are mentioned by name in Scripture, and none of them are represented in a manner contradictory to what is known of them in history.

2) Shalmaneser IV is represented as besieging Samaria, but “the king of Assyria” is said to have carried Israel away into Assyria. This agrees with history, which indicates that Sargon II (722-705) carried them away.

3) Neither Belshazzar in Daniel 5, nor Darius the Mede (Dan. 6) are any longer regarded as fictitious characters. Some still question the identification of the latter with Gobryas, appointed by Cyrus as his governor of Babylon after its capture from the Chaldeans (Robert Dic Wilson, in ISBE).

c. Proof from Archaeology.

1) Without trying to deal with all the problems, we may mention some of the contributions of Archaeology to the truthfulness of the Old Testament.

a) The Babylonian “Epic of Creation” cannot be considered a confirmation of the Biblical account; but it shows that the idea of a special creation was widespread.

b) The same can be said about Babylonian legends of the Fall.

c) More important for our purpose is a tablet that has been found in Babylon which contains an account of the Flood. Barton says that this account is so much like the Biblical story that ‘nearly all scholars recognize that they are two versions of the same narrative; or two accounts of the same event’ (Arch. and the Bible, p. 277).

2) The so-called battle of the kings (Gen. 14) can no longer be regarded with suspicion, since the inscriptions in the Valley of the Euphrates “show beyond reasonable doubt that the four kings mentioned in the Bible as joining in this expedition are not, as was freely said, ‘etymological inventions,’ but real historical persons. Amraphel is identified as the Hammurabi whose marvelous code of laws was so recently discovered by De Morgan at Susa” (Wright, The Testimony of the Monuments to the Truth of the Scriptures, in The Fundamentals, II.24). The Egyptian hieroglyphics indicate that writing was known more than a thousand years before Abraham (Orr. The Problem of the Old Testament, p. 79).

3) Archaeology also furnishes proof of the fact that Israel lived in Egypt;

a) that the people were in bondage in that land;

b) and that they finally left the country (Kyle, Deciding Voice of the Monuments, p.140f).

c) The Biblical date of the Exodus has lately been confirmed by the researches of Prof. Garstang and Sir Charles Marston at Jericho (New Biblical Evidence, p. 155).

4) The Hittities, whose very existence was questioned until recently, have been shown to be a powerful people in Asia Minor and Palestine (Kyle, Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures, in the Fundamentals, II. p.31).

5) We could go on and give archaeological proof for the truthfulness of many other facts in the Old Testament, but this will suffice to suggest that scholars should be cautious regarding things in the Bible for which we have no archaeological confirmation as yet. We may find such proof any day.

3. Credibility of the New Testament

a. Competent writers. The writers of the New Testament were competent to bear testimony and to teach divine truth.

1) Matthew, John, and Peter were disciples of Christ and eye-witnesses of His works and teachings.

2) Mark, according to Papias, was the interpreter of Peter and wrote down accurately what he remembered of the teaching of Peter.

3) Luke was the companion of Paul and, according to Irenaeus, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him.

4) Paul was definitely called and appointed by Christ, and he claims that he received his Gospel directly from God (Gal. 1:11-17).

5) James and Jude were brothers of Christ, and their messages come to us with this background.

6) All of them had received the endowment of the Holy Spirit and so wrote not merely from recollection and human insight, but as qualified by the Spirit for their tasks.

b. Writers were honest. The writers of the New Testament were honest.

1) The moral tone of their writings, their evident regard for the truth, and the circumstantiality of their accounts indicate that they were not deliberate deceivers but honest men.

2) The same thing is also apparent from the fact that their testimony endangered all their worldly interests, such as their social standing, their material prosperity, and even their very lives. What could be their motive in inventing a story that condemns all hypocrisy and is contrary to all their inherited beliefs, if they had to pay such a price for it?

3) As Paley says there is not satisfactory evidence that false witnesses have ever so acted in support of what they taught. We, therefore, conclude that the writers were honest.

c. Harmony of writings.

1) Their writings harmonize with each other.

a) The Synoptics do not contradict but supplement each other.

b) The details in the Gospel of John can be fitted together with the first three Gospels into a harmonious whole.

c) The Acts furnish an historical background for ten of Paul's Epistles.

d) The Pastoral Epistles do not have to be fitted into the Book of Acts, for in none of the three is it intimated that they belong to the period of the Acts.

e) Hebrews and the General Epistles, as well as the Revelation, can without any violence to the contents be fitted into the first century.

2) Doctrinally also the writings of the New Testament harmonize.

a) Christ is Deity in the Synoptics as well as in John's Gospel.

b) Paul and James do not contradict each other, but present faith and works from their own viewpoints. There is a difference of emphasis, but not of fact.

3) There is progress in the unfolding of doctrine from the Gospels to the Epistles, but not contradiction. The twenty-seven books of the New Testament present one harmonious picture of Jesus Christ and His work. This argues for the truthfulness of the record.

d. Agreement with history and experience. Their accounts agree with history and experience.

1) There are many references to contemporary history in the New Testament, such as the

a) enrollment when Quirinius was governor of Syria (Luke 2:2),

b) the acts of Herod the Great (Matt. 2:16-18),

c) of Herod Antipas (Matt. 14:1-12), of Agrippa (Acts ~6:1), etc.;

d) but thus far no one has been able to show that the Bible account is contradicted by a single fact derived from other trustworthy sources.

2) And as for experience, we have already said that if we grant the existence of a personal, omnipotent, and loving God, miracles are not only possible but probable.

a) Physical miracles do not occur often now, because they are not needed in the sense in which they were needed then. They were intended to attest God's revelation when first made; but now that Christianity has been introduced they are no longer needed for this purpose.

b) Spiritual miracles still occur in abundance.

c) We may, therefore, say that there is nothing in experience that contradicts the narratives of the Gospels and the Epistles.

E. THE CANONICITY OF THE BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE.

1. DEFINITION.

a. Etymologically. The term "canon" comes from a Greek word meaning "a reed or rod"; a measuring -rod, hence a rule or standard.

b. Common Usage.

1) The term "canon" came to be used therefore as referring to those sacred books which had been "measured" or approved, that is, accepted as inspired of God.

2) Briefly speaking, when we speak of the canon of Scripture we are referring to those sixty-six books which compose our present Bible all of which are regarded as genuine and divinely inspired.

2. THE NEED FOR A CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

a. The Scriptures originally appeared Book by Book, or as the case might be, on separate scrolls. The authority of such books or scrolls was just as great as it is today.

b. Later on these books were bound together into volumes which came to be known as the Bible.

c. As the collection of Books was being made, a number of spurious books found their way into such volumes and were regarded by some as having equal authority with other books which were genuine and divinely inspired. For example, the Latin Vulgate, used exclusively for hundreds of years before the reformation, contains some spurious books.

3. DETERMINING FACTORS IN CANONICITY

a. Genuineness and Inspiration

1) The only external basis upon which the canonicity of a book can rest is that of the personal testimony of those who knew the writer and received the original copy from him.

2) Their testimony to the fact of such genuineness together with their knowledge of This inspiration gives good evidence that the book is canonical.

b. Apostolicity

1) Some writers choose to call apostolicity the determining factor in canonicity.

2) By apostolicity is meant that a book was written or endorsed by an apostle. This is a true factor but cannot be considered apart from “Genuineness and Inspiration” mentioned above.

3) Insofar as the Old Testament is concerned the books would have had to have possessed canonical authority before they were recognized by Israel or Israel would not have recognized them.

4) Recognition, it must be remembered, is the effect, not the cause of canonicity.

c. Contents. Were the contents of a given book of such a spiritual character as to entitle it to a place in the sacred canon? On the basis of this test most of the apocrypha were eliminated and the ones which we now have retained.

d. Universality

1) Was the book received by the church?

a) This is not a true or accurate test inasmuch as the canonicity of the Books of the Bible does not need a church or church council to decide its canonicity. The authority of a church cannot say arbitrarily which books are canonical and which are not.

b) As mentioned before a book was canonical if it was considered genuine and inspired by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written by those in the ages following, and in a continued series.

c) All that a church council can do is to examine the testimony and declare what tradition has to say about the genuineness and inspiration of a book.

2) As stated under “apostolicity” recognition is the effect not the cause of canonicity.

4. CONCERNING OLD TESTAMENT CANONICITY.

a. Proof of canonicity of Old Testament

1) Most important parts of the Old Testament are quoted by our Lord and his apostles (see also “Genuineness”).

2) The Hebrew Bible contains exactly the same Books as our present Old Testament.

3) Josephus records the same Books in the Jewish Scriptures as we have at present.

4) The testimony of early Christian writers.

5) Early versions include only those books which we have at present.

b. Closing of Old Testament canon. Raven suggests three things that indicate that the canon of the Old Testament was closed in the days of Ezra and that the final collection was made by him and members of the Great Synagogue:

1) The testimony of Josephus that the canon was completed in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus (465-425 B.C.) in the life-time of Ezra.

2) Ezra was especially concerned with the sacred books. He is called “the scribe” (Neh. 8:1,4,9,13; 12:26,36), ‘a ready scribe in the law of Moses’ (Ezra 7:6), and ‘a scribe of the words of the commandments of Jehovah, and of his statutes to Israel’ (Ezra 7:11).

3) The character of Ezra’s time was such that the collection of the sacred books may appropriately have been made in it. After the Exile the people were founding anew the religious institutions of the nation. What could be more natural than to gather the volumes of the sacred library?

5. CONCERNING NEW TESTAMENT CANONICITY. Proof of New Testament Canonicity:

a. Thirteen catalogues of canonical books made by early church fathers and two church councils indicate that our present 27 books are to be considered canonical. Seven of the thirteen lists are identical with our present New Testament, four leave out Revelation, one omits James and Jude, and one is not sure of Hebrews.

b. The Doctors of the Church quoted only from the canonical books when giving authoritative rulings on questions of doctrine.

c. All of the early versions with the exception of the Syriac contain all of our present New Testament books.

6. THE ANTILEGOMEN A. Origen distinguished between the homologoumena, the books universally recognized as Scripture, and the antilegomena, the books more or less opposed or the “disputed books.”

a. Antilegomena of the Old Testament

1) Song of Solomon -- objected to because it is a poem of merely human love.

2) Ecclesiastes -- tended toward Atheism.

3) Esther -- did not contain the name of God.

b. Antilegomena of the New Testament.

1) Hebrews -- unknown authorship.

2) II Peter -- differs from I Peter in style and vocabulary.

3) James -- the writer represented as a servant, not as an apostle.

4) Jude -- writer not represented as an apostle; also writings are much like Apocryphal writings.

5) II and III John -- writer is represented as a “presbyter”, not as an apostle.

6) Revelation -- authorship and nature of the book.

7. THE APOCRYPHA.

a. Definition

1) The word “apocrypha” signifies “that which is bidden, obscure, without authority.”

2) It is the name given to sixteen books written from about 350 B.C. to 100 A.D. which are Jewish in authorship and interest and written in the Greek language, covering such subject matter as ethics, religion, and history.

b. Names of the books.

1) I Esdras

2) II Esdras

3) Tobit

4) Judith

5) The Rest of Esther

6) The Wisdom of Solomon

7) Ecclesiasticus

8) Baruch with Epistle of Jeremiah

9) The Idol Bel and the Dragon

10) Song of the Three Holy Children

11) The History of Susanna

12) The Prayer of Manasses

13) I Maccabees

14) II Maccabees

15) III Maccabees

16) IV Maccabees

c. Value of the Apocrypha.

1) First Maccabees is a historical work of great importance giving an account of the Jewish war of independence in the second century B.C.

2) Ecclesiasticus is a valuable ethical treasure, helpful in tracing the text of the Old Testament of that time.

3) Other books were read in the churches simply for the edification of the people.

d. Why not Canonical?

1) In spite of the fact that the Apocrypha are found in many modern Bibles, particularly the old family Bibles, these books are not to be considered canonical. The Roman Catholic church at the Council of Trent (A.D. 1546) affirmed the equal canonical authority of all the books of the Vulgate which included eleven books of the Apocrypha.

2) The following reasons are given in support of the contention that the books of the Apocrypha are not canonical:

a) They are not included in the Hebrew Bible.

b) The Jews never have regarded these books as inspired or canonical, but emphatically declare them to be apocryphal.

c) The Christian Fathers rejected them as uninspired.

d) The Apocrypha contain misstatements, anachronisms, geographical absurdities, falsehoods, ridiculous and incredible stories, and contradictions to the plain doctrines of the Bible-thus are to be rejected on the basis of their contents.

e) They were not written by prophets or inspired men, but by writers who with one exception do not claim inspiration. The one exception proves that he is uninspired because he forged the name of Solomon.

F. THE INTEGRITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

1. Definition. The integrity of the Bible refers to the fact that it is today what it has claimed to be since it was written, the intact, uncorrupted, infallible Word of God.

2. Terms. Before going further into the study of the integrity of the Bible, we need to understand a few more terms.

a. Manuscript: A manuscript refers to a copy of the Scripture in Hebrew or Greek, the languages in which they were originally written, the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek.

b. Autograph: That which was written with one's own hand; an original, or author's manuscript.

c. Translation: A copy of the Scriptures in a language other than the original languages. Translations are sometimes referred to as versions.

3. Notations.

a. It should be noted that there are no original manuscripts or autographs extant today, whereas we have literally thousands of copies of manuscripts.

b. The text of any translation is not inspired by God.

1) That is, the translators were not inspired while doing their work, as the writers were.

2) The translations where correct are the inspired Word of God so far as their contents are concerned.

3) They are the inspired Word by virtue of the fact that the English words for instance, have the same content of meaning which the Hebrew and Greek have. The content of every word where correctly translated, is the same as the content of the Hebrew or Greek word from which it is translated.

c. Distinguish therefore between:

1) the actual English word which is not inspired,

2) and its content or meaning which is the inspired Word of God because taken from the original inspired text.

3) This fact makes the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts the final authority where translators differ, but also makes the accurate translation, the reliable and authoritative inspired Word of God for all general purposes of Bible study.

d. The present day manuscripts, where accurate, are the inspired Word of God in that the words contained in them are the words which God caused the writers to use when putting down in writing the things already revealed. While the copyists were not inspired when transcribing the manuscripts, yet when copying word for

word, they merely reproduced on another parchment the very words which God inspired.

e. Inasmuch as there are no originals extant today the crucial question is whether or not the present texts are the same as the originals. The history of the transmission of the texts assures us of the integrity of the extant manuscripts.

4. Integrity of the Old Testament. The evidence for the present accuracy of the text of the Hebrew Old Testament is presented by beginning with our present English Bible and tracing its ancestry as far as possible.

a. 1901 - American Standard Version (ASV or RV)

b. 1526 A.D. - Hebrew Bible first printed. Since the first printing all editions of the text have been practically the same.

c. 916 A.D. - The text of the Hebrew Bible was taken from Hebrew manuscripts of which there are now about 1000 in existence. The oldest of these manuscripts dates back to 916 A.D. To determine what the text was before that date, we must have recourse to means other than Hebrew manuscripts.

d. 500-900 A.D. - The Masoretic text. The Masora is a collection of Hebrew marginal readings and criticisms of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. The Masoretes were a group of Hebrew scholars who were learned in the Masora; they were scribes who wrote down the Masora and variant readings which tells us what the Hebrew text of the Bible was as far back as 500 A.D.

e. The method of securing accuracy. The method of securing accuracy, although not dated specifically, is most important to the evidence for the present accuracy of the Hebrew Old Testament. Not only the Masoretes but scribes since the time of Ezra had an almost superstitious reverence for the text itself. They followed a unique plan of securing accuracy whereby they ascertained the exact number of words and verses in a given book or on a given page and copies were not complete until every Word was counted. Not only were words counted but the scribes would check the middle words and verses so that they could be assured of absolute accuracy in the copy.

f. 400 A.D. - The Latin Vulgate. The Latin Vulgate translated by Jerome, and a commentary by the same man, in which the Hebrew words were transliterated into Latin, assures us that the Hebrew text of A.D. 400 was the same as it was today.

g. 200 A.D. - The Talmud, a book containing a collection of the sayings of Hebrew scribes handed down orally through centuries, and committed to writing about A.D. 200, sections being added later, contains citations from which almost all the Law and large portions of the other books can be reconstructed. Thus we know the text of A.D. 200 and probably for several centuries before.

h. First Century A.D. - Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. Such quotations indicate that the Bible of our Lord and His apostles was the same as our Old Testament today.

i. c.285 to 150 B.C. - The Septuagint (LXX). The Septuagint is a Greek translation of the Old Testament made by some 70 Greek scholars gives us the text of the Old Testament of that time. This translation is sometimes referred to as the LXX (70). The difference between it and our present day manuscripts are very slight and unimportant. Thus we have substantially the same Old Testament text which our Lord and His apostles used and upon which they placed their approval.

j. 450 B.C. The Samaritan Pentateuch.- A translation of that portion of Scripture into the Samaritan language at the time of Nehemiah, about 450 B.C., agrees almost exactly with the present text. This is most important proof, for there could be no possibility of collusion between the Jew and the Samaritan.

k. 450 B.C. to time of writing. Accuracy of transmission. For the accuracy of transmission of text previous to 450 B.C. we depend upon two important arguments together with the evidence they present.

1) The comparison of historical data of the Old Testament with that of recorded history of the contemporaneous nations shows that the transmission of the text of the Bible has been written accurately. Note some of the evidence:

a) The names of 26 or more foreign kings whose names have been found upon documents contemporary with the kings, are found in the Bible. These names are spelled the same in the Bible as on the monuments. They are kings from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Mede-Persia, Damascus, Tyre, and Moab.

b) Six kings of Israel and four from Judah are found in the Assyrian records.

c) In the case of the 41 or more foreign kings found in the Hebrew text, the letters composing their names have been correctly transliterated, and in the case of the 10 kings of Israel and Judah, the 40 letters composing their names are found in the Hebrew text in a manner which conforms with the correct transliteration of the Assyrian text.

1] This shows that for 2300-3900 years, the text of the proper names in the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted with the utmost accuracy.

2] This tells us also that the scribes who wrote the originals had the original sources of their historical information at their disposal, and that the transcribing scribes did their work with the utmost of care. If the writings are so correct in the names they must have been so in the sayings, deeds, and facts of history which they recorded.

d) Again, the customs, laws, and proper names mentioned in the various historical periods as found in the history of the Old Testament, harmonize with those found in the inscriptions.

e) The kind of foreign words embedded in the documents of the Old Testament argue strongly for the genuineness and accurate transmission of the original text. This sort of evidence is very trustworthy because the time at which a document was written can generally be determined by the foreign words in its vocabulary.

2) The accuracy of the transmission of text of the Old Testament is seen from the analogy with which the inscriptions were transmitted over a long period of time.

a) In other words, the argument is that if it was possible for inscriptions of secular documents to be transmitted accurately over a long period of time, why could not the Sacred writings be transmitted accurately over similarly long periods of time? In fact, Sacred writings could be considered accurate more so from this standpoint than the secular writings as seen in the extreme regard and care they had for the Scriptures.

b) Note some of the evidence.

1] The testimony supplied by the history of the transmission of the text of other ancient documents supported as it is by what we know of the text of the Old Testament for the last 2000 years, justifies the presumption that the copies of the latter text existent 2000 years ago, had in like manner been transmitted from the originals.

2] The fragments of classical writers found in the recently discovered papyri of the first century, when compared with modern printed editions based on Mss., many of which are not 1000 years old, show that with a few important variations, the classical authors have been correctly transmitted for 2000-5000 years.

3] About 650 B.C., copies of records of Hammurabi, 2000 B.C., were made for the library of Ashurbanipal king of Assyria. In these, mention is made of the temples of Hammurabi. About 500 B.C., Nabunaid, the last Babylonian king states in his inscriptions that he found the foundation stones of these temples. Thus, these records have been transmitted accurately for 1500 years.

4] The library of Ashurbanipal at Ninevah had thousands of documents, copies of originals going back hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of years.

5] Some part of the Egyptian Book of the Dead were in use in the same form nearly 4000 years.

6] Scores of duplicates and triplicates among the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian documents show that from 2000-4000 B.C., copies were often made with absolute exactness and generally with substantial accuracy.

3) Conclusion concerning Accuracy of Old Testament.

a) The conclusion must therefore be reached:

1] that because of the testimony of manuscripts back to A.D. 916 and of versions back to 285 B.C.,

2] and of the comparison of the historical data of the Bible with that of the inscriptions, and of the analogy of the accurateness of the inscriptions,

3] the text of the Old Testament as we have it today, is substantially the same as that of the originals. It is a text we can depend upon.

b) See "E" P. 41 - "Dead Sea Scrolls"

5. Integrity of the New Testament.

a. The evidence for the integrity of the New Testament is abundant and is dated much closer to the time of writing than that which is presented for the Old Testament.

1) The following evidence is presented to show that the New Testament as we have it today is substantially the same as when it was written.

2) Most of the evidence is found in the biblical manuscripts although the writings of the church fathers is also important.

b. Citations of Scripture by Apostolic and Church Fathers. Such citations made by these men from the first to third centuries cover practically all of the New Testament.

c. Pottery Shards. These were broken pieces of pottery upon which are written in ink 84% of the Greek New Testament, representative of all the Books, dated from the second through the fifth centuries, offer excellent textual material by which to ascertain the text of those years.

d. The Papyrus Manuscripts. These were written in Koine Greek of the first three centuries. there are about 5000 fragments.

e. The Diadache. Written in A.D. 80, a course of instruction for young believers written in Greek, quotes from the Synoptics and fourteen other Books.

f. The Diatesseron of Tatian. A harmony of the Gospels in Syriac, date A.D. 170.

g. The Syriac Palimpsest. A translation of entire New Testament made A.D. 150, extant copy dated A.D. 400, agrees with present text in essential details. There are minor differences due to idiomatic departures in translations.

h. The Coptic Version. Written in A.D. 150, a complete translation of the New Testament.

i. The Latin Vulgate. A translation by Jerome, dated A.D. 400, covers entire New Testament.

j. The Chester Beatty Manuscripts. Bound in codex form, third century, Gospels and Acts, found 1932, “a witness to the substantial integrity of our textual tradition” (Dr. Kenyon).

k. The Primary Uncials.

1) Codex: A manuscript in leaf form; distinguished from the scroll.

a) Codex Vaticanus (b) In Vatican library, fourth century, probably middle of century. Copies accessible. Copies given by Pope 1868-81.

b) Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) In St Petersburg, (Leningrad), fourth century, about A.D. 375. Next to Vaticanus in value. Contains whole of New Testament. Copies accessible. Found by Tischendorf 1844 in a monastery on Mt. Sinai.

c) Codex Alexandrinus (a) British Museum, fifth century, probably first half, contains almost all of New Testament, copies accessible. Given to King James in 1624.

d) Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (c). In Paris in the fifth century.

e) Codex Bezae (D) In Cambridge, England, sixth century, Gospels and Acts, copies accessible.

f) Codex Washington (W). Washington, D.C., date uncertain, from fourth to sixth centuries, copies accessible.

2) Uncials: The uncials were manuscripts written in hand printed letters.

3) Cursives: Manuscripts written in flowing writing; similar to the writings of our day.

b. Conclusion concerning Accuracy of New Testament.

1) In addition to the foregoing evidence, Dr. A. T. Robertson quotes Kenyon to the effect that in 1912 there were 4,065 Greek manuscripts known and catalogued. Others are being discovered, witness the Beatty codex.

a) When we add to all this some 8,000 manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, and 1,000 of the other versions, and remember that the originals were still in existence 100 years after John's death, as shown by the writings of Tertullian.

b) We must say with Hamilton, 'The text of the New Testament is surer than that of any other ancient document.'

2) Again quoting Hamilton from his book *The Basis of Christian Faith*, "We learn that the text of the Greek New Testament which we use today, such as that of Nestle, Tischendorf, B. Weiss, Westcott and Hort, or the resultant text of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which takes the textual readings upon which at least two of the others agree, is so accurate that eminent scholars have expressed the opinion that there is no doubt that we have the text of the New Testament as it came from the hands of the original writers, in 999 words out of every thousand, and that the one out of every thousand about which there is still doubt, in no instance affects the meaning of any vital doctrine of the Church."

6. The Dead Sea Scrolls.

a. In the spring of 1948 some wandering Bedouins found jars in a cave near the north end of the Dead Sea, the jars containing some papyrus scrolls. In turn the scrolls were taken to Jerusalem and placed in the Syrian Orthodox Convent.

b. Most important findings were the fragments which contained parts of Isaiah, with Isaiah 1:1 word for word.

c. There were at least four other scrolls that contained a commentary on the book of Habakkuk and parts of a "manual of discipline" from some Jewish sect.

d. Dr. Wm. F. Albright, at St. Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, dates these scrolls at about 100 B.C. which would be about 1000 years older than any other manuscripts of the Old Testament.

G. INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

1. Meaning of the term.

a. We can only look to the Scriptures themselves to determine what the word inspiration means.

b. The word “inspiration” occurs only twice in the Authorized Version and not at all in the Revised Version. The two references in the AV follow:

1) Job 32:8 “But there is a spirit of man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding” (RV translates “breath” instead of “inspiration”).

2) II Tim. 3:16 “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.” (RV translates “Every Scripture inspired of God . . .”

c. “Given by inspiration of God” is the translation coming from the Greek word theopneustos, a compound word composed of two words, theos, God, and pneo, to breathe. Thus inspired of God means God-breathed.

d. From the verb, pneo comes the noun pneuma meaning “spirit.”

1) In 255 of the 385 instances where pneuma is translated “spirit” it is personified, referring to the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit.

2) Hence the word theopneustos may be translated given by God through the Spirit.

2. Method of Inspiration.

a. The New Bible Dictionary indicates that it is the writings that are actually inspired (out-breathed by God), not necessarily the inspiration of men. “Inspiration is a work of God terminating, not in the men who were to write the Scripture (as if, having given them an idea of what to say, God left them to themselves to find a way of saying it), but in the actual written product.” (NBD p. 564).

b. It is the Scripture (graphe), the written text, that is God-breathed.

1) The Scripture is not man’s word or the fruit of his thought and premeditation, but actually God’s word, spoken through man and written with man’s pen.

2) The Old Testament prophet usually received revelation from God verbally and he spoke what he heard. Thus, the word of the prophet became God’s word. This is called spoken revelation.

3) Inspiration follows the same pattern:

a) God moves upon man and “out-breathes” the revelation through

man who in turn writes it down. This is written revelation.

b) God thus speaks His own words (not necessarily in verbal tones) and these God-given words become the sacred Scriptures as they are put into writing.

4) The Scriptures bear out the fact that inspiration actually refers to God speaking or breathing through the Bible writers.

a) In Hebrews 1:1,2, “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son. “

1] In “times past” evidently refers to the Old Testament,

2] and “these last days by His Son,” could well refer to the life and works of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels.

b) Again, Peter gives similar teaching. II Peter 1:19-21, “We have also a more sure word of prophecy. For the prophecy came not in old times by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” This Scripture teaches that Scriptures did not come by man but from God who spoke through man.

c) David also testified that it was God speaking through him as he wrote: II Sam. 23:1,2 - “The Spirit of the LORD (Jehovah) spake by me, and His word was in my tongue,”

c. Man’s part in the producing of the Scriptures was merely to transmit what he had received. As the NBD states, “Psychologically, from the standpoint of form, it is clear that human writers contributed much in the making of Scripture-historical research, theological mediation, linguistic style, etc. Each book is in one sense the literary creation of its author; but theologically, from the standpoint of content, the Bible regards the human writers as having contributed nothing, and Scripture as being entirely the creation of God.”NBD, p. 565)

d. The matter of God’s words getting through the man so that it is written down correctly is evidently involved in inspiration. If God’s words are going to be written down in man’s style then God must and does enable the writer to write inerrantly. The writing will be in the vocabulary of the writer but by inspiration God chooses the words so that the written material is in God-chosen words.

e. Theodore Gaussen’s definition of Inspiration relates to all of these points:

1) Inspiration is that inexplicable power which the divine Spirit put forth of old on the authors of Holy Scripture, in order to their guidance, even in the

employment of the words they used, and to preserve them alike from all error and all omission. From his work Theopneustia.

2) Note a few facts as we analyze the above definition:

- a) “inexplicable power” - cannot be fully explained
- b) “Holy Spirit” - the Spirit of God
- c) “put forth of old” - no such inspiration today
- d) “on the authors of Holy Scripture” - limited to Bible writers
- e) “in order to their guidance” - the mode or method of inspiration
- f) “employment of words” - verbal inspiration
- g) “preserve . . . from error” - inerrant, without mistakes
- h) “from . . . all omission” - plenary inspiration, nothing left out.

3. Negative ideas concerning inspiration

a. Inspiration is not mechanical dictation. The Bible writers were not physically or psychologically controlled that they had no freedom or creativeness in their writings. If this were true all the books of the Bible would have one style.

b. Inspiration does not obliterate or do away with the writer’s personality, style, outlook or cultural conditioning. As Warfield says, If God wished to give a series of letters like Paul’s, he prepared a Paul to write them, and the Paul he brought to the task was a Paul who spontaneously would write just such letters.” Inspiration and Authority of Bible, p.155.

c. Inspiration does not extend to the transmission of the text. Inspiration has to do only with the original writings not to the subsequent manuscripts and translations.

d. Inspiration of biblical writings is not to be confused with the inspiration of writers of great literature. The biblical idea of inspiration relates, not to the literary quality of what it is written, but to its character as divine revelation in writing.

e. Inspiration does not imply the infallibility of the writers of Scripture in all that they said and did:

1) it merely implies their infallibility in the production of the autographs of Holy Scripture.

2) Moses certainly acted contrary to the will of Cod when he smote the rock at Kadesh (Numbers. 20:7-11).

3) David was out of the will of Cod when he numbered Israel (2 Sam. 24:1; 1 Chr. 21:1,2).

4) John was acting in self-will when he wanted to call down fire on the Samaritans (Luke 9:54).

5) Peter was not led of the Spirit when he dissembled at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14).

6) Yet all that these and the other authors of the Scriptures wrote is verbally inspired.

7) In other words, inspiration holds to the inerrancy of the records rather than to the infallibility of the men who wrote them.

4. The Extent of Inspiration.

a. If we take inspiration to mean that the authors of Holy Scripture were kept “from all error and from all omission,” there is no reason to discuss the “extent” of inspiration, for such a view clearly accepts all Scripture as equally inspired.

b. But because of the opposition to the position we are taking, and for the sake of clearness, we must speak further on this subject.

1) Verbal Inspiration.

a) By verbal inspiration we mean that the very words of the Scriptures are inspired, and yet leaves room for the differences in style and the individualities of the writers.

b) But it must be added that this verbal inerrancy is affirmed only of the autographs of Holy Scripture; it is not affirmed of any of the multitudinous versions or manuscripts now possessed by us.

1] If it be asked of what value such a fact can be when the original manuscripts have been lost, we reply, Much in every way. In the first place, we honor the Author of the Scriptures if we conceive of them as inerrant when they were originally given;

2] and, in the second place, we receive a great stimulus to pursue textual research on the view that the originals were verbally inspired.

2) Plenary Inspiration.

a) By plenary inspiration we mean that inspiration extends to every part of Scripture. That is, the Scriptures are equally and fully inspired through out the entire Bible.

b) Inspiration is not limited to ethical and theological truth, - - it extends to all truth.

1] The Bible is our only infallible, complete, and final authority “for all saving knowledge, faith, obedience, and practice.”

2] But such a statement is scarcely adequate. It leaves room for the view that in matters of history and science the Bible is not trustworthy.

3] Now the real facts in the case are that it has taken archaeology hundreds of years to uncover some of the history presented in the Bible for millenniums, and that science has only recently discovered a number of things which have been in the Bible for centuries.

4] The few seeming discrepancies in numbers in our modern versions can be explained on the basis of errors in copying. Even the fact that some of them exist in the ancient manuscripts does not prove that they were in the original copies.

5. Distinction between Revelation, Inspiration and Illumination.

a. Review:

1) Revelation is the act of Cod the Holy Spirit imparting truth to a Bible writer. Cod may give the revelation verbally or by appearing in some manner by His Spirit to the horizon of mans thinking so that the revelation is known.

2) Inspiration. Inspiration is the act of Cod the Holy Spirit speaking (out-breathing) the revelation through the Bible writer and at the same time enabling him to write it down correctly.

3) Illumination. Illumination is the act of God the Holy Spirit enlightening the minds of believers to understand the truth already revealed and by inspiration written down.

b. Revelation gives the writer something that is truth from God and therefore not something of his (the writer) own discovery; inspiration is the out breathing of God in the writer and the enablement to write it down correctly; illumination helps the believer to understand it.

c. We have seen in our previous study that Revelation is not inspiration; similarly illumination is not inspiration.

1) Paul, writing to the Corinthians, explained such a distinction: I Cor. 2:9-12, "but as it is written, Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, And which entered not into the heart of man, Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God."

2) You will note that these verses teach that the Spirit enables man to know, or to receive the things of God. This is illumination. In other words, the order is this way: The writer received a revelation - by inspiration he wrote it down - the Spirit now enlightens the believer so that he might understand it.

d. The Scriptures which we have studied in connection with inspiration have borne out the truth that it is God speaking through the Bible writer.

1) This does not mean that the Bible writer is simply passive and God merely talks through him.

2) It means that God is active in the individual - using the individual's vocabulary, his knowledge, his training, etc.

6. Proof of Inspiration. We must again be as brief as possible in treating this most important subject. But four proofs for the full inspiration of the Bible may be given.

a. The Argument from the nature of its contents.

1) In its science as well as its -religious teaching it bears the marks of divine inspiration. How did the writers of Scripture know that the earth is a globe (Isa. 40:22; Prov. 8:27; cf Job 26:10), so long before modern science discovered it? How did they know that the earth is hung upon nothing (Job 26:7), that air has weight (Job 28:25); that light existed before the sun (Gen. 1:4,14); that light is vocal (Job 38:7); and that there is "an empty space" in the northern heavens (Job 26:7)? All of these things are comparatively recent discoveries of science.

2) And how could mere man produce a book that commands all duty, forbids all sin, including the sin of hypocrisy and lying, denounces all human merit as insufficient for salvation, holds out as man's only hope of salvation the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ, and condemns to hell for all eternity those who persist in sin. In view of the nature of the Bible we must ascribe its authorship to the Holy Spirit.

b. The Argument from the unity of the Bible.

1) Though composed by something like 40 different men over a period of nearly 1,600 years, the Bible is one book. It has one doctrinal system, one moral standard, one plan of salvation, one program for the ages.

2) Speaking of the Mohammedan, Zoroastrian, and Buddhist Scriptures, Orr says, they are "Destitute of beginning, middle, or end.

1] They are, for the most part, collections of heterogenous materials, loosely placed together.

2] How different everyone must acknowledge it to be with the

Bible!

a] From Genesis to Revelation we feel that this book is in a real sense a unity.

b] It is not a collection of fragments, but has, as we say, an organic character . . . There is nothing exactly resembling it, or even approaching it, in all literature” (The Problem of the Old Testament pp. 31,32).

c. The Argument from the claims of Scripture. Is it proper to argue for inspiration from the Scriptures? Yes, if we have found them to be truthful in other respects. That they are truthful we have already shown under the credibility of the Scriptures. Let us now see what the Scriptures claim for themselves.

1) In the Old Testament alone the writers of Holy Scriptures introduce their message more than 3,800 times by such statements as “The Lord spake,” “The Lord said,” “the Word of the Lord came.” This is on an average of about four and a half times to a page.

2) In the New Testament we have such expressions as, “in words which the Spirit teacheth,” “as it is in truth,” “the word of God,” and “the commandments of the Lord.”

3) The writers tell us repeatedly that God told them to write and that they did write all that He gave them (Ex.17:14;24:4;34:27; Num.33:2; Deut.31:24; Jeremiah.30:1,2; 36:1,2,4,27-32; Heb.2:2, 1 Cor. 14:37; Rev. 1:11; 2:1,8,12,18 etc). We have already shown that there is every reason for believing in their honesty in other matters; we must, therefore, accept their testimony in this respect also.

4) The writers of Scripture claim absolute authority and perfection for their writings (Deut. 28:58,59; Isa. 8:20; Gal. 1:20; Rev. 22:18,19).

a) Such a claim can originate only in a blind conceit, a wild fanaticism, or in a profound conviction that they spake as the oracles of God.

b) There is no reason to ascribe either conceit or fanaticism to the authors of Scripture; therefore their claims must be accepted as due to a profound conviction that they were the mouthpieces of God.

5) One book recognizes another book as speaking with absolute authority (Josh. 1:8; 8:31,32; Ezra 3:2; Neh. 8:1; Dan. 9:1,2,11,13; Zech. 7:12; Mal. 4:4; Acts 1:16; 28:25; 1 Pet. 1:10,11).

a) Peter puts the writings of Paul on the same plane as “the other Scriptures” (2 Pet 3:15,16).

b) This recognition of one book by another is an important indication of the unity pervading the Bible.

6) The Old Testament is declared to be thus fully inspired (2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20,21).

a) The translation of 2 Tim. 3:16 in the American Standard Version is wrong.

1] It is not demanded by the Greek, and the context requires that we translate as in the Authorized Version.

2] The margin in the ASV recognize the former fact when it suggests, "Every Scripture is inspired of God, and profitable."

b) Robertson contends that the Greek maybe rendered, "All Scripture, etc. (New Short Grammar, p. 281).

d. The Argument from the testimony of Christ as to the New Testament.

1) Christ promised His Holy Spirit to the disciples to bring things to their remembrance, (John 14:26), to guide them into all the truth and to show them things to come (John 16:12,13); and the disciples claim to have received this Spirit (Acts 2:1-4; 11:15-17).

2) In this promise there may be a reference to the Gospels, the Acts and Epistles, and the Revelation respectively. At any rate they cover the threefold need of the disciples in the writing of the New Testament.

3) The Catholic Church claims that this promise is for the Church throughout its history as enabling it to speak with authority; but the result has been the development of a tradition that in many cases nullifies the teaching of the New Testament.

e. Addendum.

1) Inerrancy.

a) The following statement with regard to inerrancy is found in the Statement of Faith of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. "The Old and New Testaments inerrant as originally given, were verbally' inspired by God and are a complete revelation of His will for the salvation of men. They constitute the divine and holy rule of Christian faith and practice".

b) The Board of Managers of the Christian and Missionary Alliance further expanded on This statement as follows:

1] Inerrancy as it is used in' relation to the sixty-six canonical books of the Bible mean that these writings, as originally given, were free from all error. The Scriptures are in accord with truth and not contrary to fact. If the Bible is the truth of God then He must have revealed it accurately and so supervised its communication that it was infallibly recorded.

2] The Spirit of God so employed the minds, imaginations and faculties of the human authors of the Bible, so as to allow for the free exercise of their own type of writing, but at the same time to insure that The Words written were those that God wanted to have recorded. If the use of human instrumentality allows for any degree of fallibility in the writing of the Scriptures, then it is not possible to guarantee immunity from error, even in those parts of Scripture which set forth redemptive truth.

2) Note further a definition of inerrancy.

a) The Bible in its entirety is God's written Word to man, free of error in its original autographs, wholly reliable in history and doctrine.

b) Its divine inspiration has rendered the book "infallible" (incapable of teaching deception) and "inerrant" (not liable to prove false or mistaken).

1] Its inspiration is "plenary" (extending to all parts alike) "verbal" (including the actual language form,) and "confluent" (product of two free agents, human and divine).

2] Inspiration involves infallibility as an essential property, and infallibility in turn implies inerrancy. This three-fold designation of Scripture is implicit in the basic thesis of Biblical authority. Clark Pinnock, A Defense of Biblical Infallibility, p.1.

c) Critical scholarship has done much in recent decades to revive some of the problems and concerns of inerrancy; this has been true of certain seminaries particularly.

1] Proponents of such "limited" inerrancy state that the Bible is inerrant in matters of faith and doctrine but not in matters of history and cosmology (the branch of Metaphysics which treats the character of the universe as an orderly system).

2] It is not our purpose here to explain the implications made in the former statement but simply to make the student aware of the fact that to have an infallible Bible which is authoritative in all matters we must regard all of the Bible as giving us the very words of God in all matters of faith, conduct, history and cosmology.

7. CONCLUSION

a. We, therefore, conclude that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God. God breathed the Scriptures through men, and as He did so He so guided and enabled them that the words which they wrote down were actually God's words, not man's. We aver all of this for the original documents, not subsequent manuscripts and translations.

b. Inspiration extends to all truth theological, ethical, scientific, historical! The Bible is our only infallible, complete and final authority "for all saving knowledge, faith, obedience, and practice."

c. We further conclude that Textual Criticism has given us such a perfect Hebrew and Greek text, that if the originals should be found they would differ little, if any, from our present critical texts. Because of these facts we consider the Scriptures our final authority in all matters of which they treat.

H. ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

1. Sixth to Fourteenth Centuries.

a. Until the Fourteenth Century there were no complete translations or Versions of the English Bible.

1) A Celtic-Saxon poet-singer named Caedmon (c.670 A.D.) translated portions of the Bible into English poetical paraphrases.

2) Shortly after this another renowned scholar named Bede, a monk, (674-735 A.D.) translated portions of the Bible into the English language, completing the gospel of John on the day of his death.

b. King Alfred the Great (848-901 A.D.) translated the Ten Commandments and portions of the Psalms.

c. None of the above translations are extant today with the exception of King Alfred's Psalter which may be found in the British Museum.

d. Later on in the Tenth Century copies were made of the Gospels. Six of such copies are found in the museums of Great Britain,

e. No other English Versions of any portion of the Bible have been found until those dating in the middle of the Fourteenth Century which were copies of the Psalter translated by William of Shoreham and Richard Rolle.

2. Fourteenth Century to Present.

a. The Wycliffe Bible -- 1380

1) John Wycliffe (1320-1384) was an outstanding Oxford scholar who translated the entire Bible into the English language.

a) The Council of Torosa in 1229 had forbidden the very possession of a Bible but Wycliffe saw that the only way of defeating Rome and getting the people back to God was to put the Word of God into the hands of the people.

b) By 1380 A.D. he had translated the entire New Testament and by 1382 the whole Bible appeared in English. His translation was made from the Latin Vulgate and not from the original languages.

2) Wycliffe was severely persecuted by the church for his efforts, was twice tried for heresy, was condemned, excommunicated, but was permitted to live. He lived to expose the awful wickedness in the clergy and was the instrument in God's hand to place the Bible into the hands of the English speaking peoples in its entirety. After his death in 1384 his body was ordered dug up and burned.

b. The Tyndale Bible -- 1525

1) Printing from movable presses came into being in 1455 in Gutenberg; 70 years later we received our first printed English Bible. It was during this same Fifteenth Century that William Tyndale was born (1484) who as a student under Erasmus was "singularly addicted to the study of the Scriptures."

2) Tyndale went to London in 1523 to translate and print the Bible but had no opportunity to carry out his work. In 1525 he went to Cologne but was forced to flee to Worms where he issued an edition of 3000 copies of the New Testament.

3) Most of these copies were hidden in merchandise cases and shipped into England. There was a great demand for them by the common people but the clergy immediately took steps to destroy all the copies which could be obtained.

4) Tyndale's translation of the New Testament was a step forward in textual criticism inasmuch as his was a translation from the original Greek. Later on he published portions of the Old Testament.

5) In 1535 William Tyndale was brought to trial for heresy, was condemned and imprisoned for 16 months. He was then taken out, strangled and burned at the stake. His last words were, "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England."

c. The Coverdale Bible -- 1536. Myles Coverdale (1488-1569), a Cambridge graduate, followed Tyndale's work by translating the entire Bible into the English language in 1536. His translation did much to bring the common people and ecclesiastical authorities together.

d. Matthew's Bible -- 1537. Thomas Matthew, the assumed name of John Rogers, brought out a revision of Tyndale's and Coverdale's Bibles in 1537.

e. Taverner's Bible -- 1537. Richard Taverner (1505-1575) printed a revision in 1537 and is important in that the marks of his Greek scholarship show up in the translation.

f. The Great Bible -- 1539. In 1539 Myles Coverdale made a revision of the Bible and because of its large proportions was called "The Great Bible." In reality, this work was simply a revision of the John Roger "Matthew" Bible. This Bible is sometimes referred to as Cromwell's Bible, also Cranmer's Bible.

g. The Geneva Bible -- 1560. The Geneva Bible, translated in Geneva, Switzerland, was the first Bible to have the text broken into verses. Over 150 editions were printed of this Bible between 1560 and 1564.

h. The Bishop's Bible -- 1568. The Bishop's Bible is a revision of the Great Bible, published by Archbishop Parker in 1568. This is sometimes called Parker's Bible.

i. The Douai (or Douay) Version -- 1582.

1) Catholic refugees who had fled to the continent under the reign of Queen Mary established a college at Douai in Flanders. William Allen, an English scholar, projected the plan of producing an English Bible for English Roman Catholics. The work was started and before it was finished the college was moved to Rheims where the work was finished in 1582. Later a Rheims Version was published in 1589.

2) The Douai Version is a translation of the Vulgate and was adopted by the Roman Catholic Church as authoritative.

j. The Authorized (King James) Version -- 1611.

1) James I came to the throne in 1603 and became a student of the Bible. Inasmuch as there was controversy concerning the translations extant at that time, he appointed 54 men to translate the Bible. Only 47 of the men finished the work.

2) The revisers were organized into six groups, two at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge, each group working on a specified portion of the Bible.

3) Later six men were chosen to complete the revision. The six groups worked from 1604 to 1607 and then the six revisers worked from 1607 to 1611.

4) The title page bore the statement concerning the activity of King James and thus is sometimes called the “King James Version”. The common name for this version is the “Authorized Version” although neither parliament, convocation, privy council, nor king, is known to have laid down any law that would entitle this version to be so named.

k. The Revised Version -- 1885 and 1901 (ASV)

1) The Authorized Version held sway for more than two centuries without any major revisions being made. Biblical scholarship however made rapid strides and with the finding of many ancient manuscripts, the need was seen to make a revision.

2) The first public move to make a revision came from the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. Bishop Wilderforce presented a resolution that a committee of both Houses to be appointed to report on the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version.

3) The Committee was named and within five months a Revision Committee of Biblical scholars had been named. The committee numbered fifty-four with Episcopalians in the lead and included Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Unitarians. No Roman Catholics were accepted.

4) The purpose laid before the Revision Committee included the following of the text of the Authorized Version wherever possible. Furthermore they should revise the headings of chapters and pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.

5) This English Committee organized into two separate Companies of twenty-seven (27) men per company, one for the Old Testament and one for the New Testament Each company was required to work through its portion twice Their work began in June, 1870.

6) Later in that year Dr. Angus visited America and at the request of Bishop Ellicott held a conference with some American scholars on the possibility of co-operating with the British Revision Committee. A body of thirty (30) men was organized in December, 1871 which began work in October, 1872, as Old and New Testament Companies after the pattern of the English companies.

7) In May, 1881, the English Committee finished the revision of the New Testament, the Old Testament not being published until May, 1885. This Bible came to be known as the Revised Version although later on it was distinguished from

the American Revised Version by its title The English Revised Version.

8) The American Committee made use of the Revised Version of 1885, changing some words and spellings that were antiquated. The Standard American Edition of the Revised Version was published in August 1901. This Bible is called the American Standard Version by the publishers but is more commonly known as the Revised Version. Undoubtedly, this version is the outstanding translation of the entire Bible in the English language today.

l. Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament - 1952

1) The statement on the jacket of this version says: "The Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament is an authorized version of the American Standard Version of 1901 and the King James Version of 1611."

2) Continuing the statement: "Embodying the best results of Biblical scholarship, this Version expresses the meaning of the Scriptures in English diction which is designed for use in public and private worship and preserves the simplicity and beauty of the King James Version."

3) This version is the work of the Standard Bible Committee, appointed in 1929 by the International Council of Religious Education on behalf of the forty Protestant denominations associated in that body.

4) We might say that this version is "authorized" only in the sense that the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America have authorized its publication. There has been more controversy over this version than any other version. It is not our purpose here to discuss the controversy.

5) Published by Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1952.

m. Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. -1946. The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament is not regarded as a modern speech translation but a Revision of the American Standard Version published in 1901. This New Testament was translated by a Committee similar to the work of the Committee which worked on the Revised Version. The work has been very popular and is regarded by many as outstanding in that field. Date. 1946.

n. The New English Bible - New Testament - 1961

1) "The New English Bible, New Testament, is written in modern English and provides an authoritative version of the New Testament. It is an entirely new translation from the original Greek. It was prepared by outstanding Bible and literary scholars for ease in reading and understanding, thus making it particularly suitable for student comprehension and classroom use." Quote from letter of February 5, 1962, John Brett-Smith, Oxford University Press.

2) The translators of this work did not attempt to make a “new” Authorized Version as the Revised Version of 1881 was sometimes referred to, but “a genuinely new translation, in which an attempt should be made consistently to use the idiom of contemporary English to convey the meaning of the Greek The present translators were enjoined to replace Greek constructions and idioms by those of contemporary English.” Introduction, New English Bible, p. vii, ix.

3) The work was published jointly by the Oxford University Press and the Cambridge University Press, in 1961.

o. Other translations. Recently a number of Bibles and New Testaments have been published, known as “Modern Speech Translations.” Some of them as listed as follows:

1) James Moffatt’s Bible

a) James Moffatt, Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, published his modern speech New Testament first in 1913, later in 1917. The Old Testament was published in 1924 and 1925, the complete Bible being published in 1926.

b) Scholars regard this New Testament as one of the best modern critical texts whereas his Old Testament is not held in such high esteem.

2) The Smith and Goodspeed Bible. Dr. J. Edgar Goodspeed, Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek, Chicago University, published a modern speech version of the New Testament in Chicago, in 1923. The language is wholly American, being made from the standard critical text of

3) Westcott and Hort.

a) Chapter and verse numbers are placed in the margin of certain editions; quotations from the Old Testament are distinguished by being set apart and properly enclosed. This work is entitled The New Testament: An American Translation.

b) A colleague of Dr. Goodspeed, Dr. J. M. Powis Smith published a modern speech translation of the Old Testament in 1927. In 1931 Dr. Goodspeed’s New Testament and Dr. Smith’s Old Testament were combined and published in a single volume by University of Chicago Press.

4) F. S. Ballentine’s New Testament. F. S. Ballentine, rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, published a translation of the New Testament in 1909 called The Modern English New Testament which was revised in 1922 and published under the title of A Plainer Bible for Plain People in Plain America. Much of his work patterned after Moulton’s Modern Reader’s Bible.

5) The Twentieth Century New Testament

a) The Twentieth Century New Testament was an English product published simultaneously in London and New York. This was the first of the modern speech translations to appear, based on the Westcott and Hort text, and having access to the manuscript of the New Testament of Richard Francis Weymouth, which was published later.

b) This New Testament, even though published anonymously in 1898, owes much of its translation to Mrs. Mary Higgs, Oldham, England. She solicited the help of at least a dozen outstanding English Bible scholars. It is said that this was the first translation to feel the influence of the papyri discoveries. Chapter and verse numbers are in the margins, quotations from the Old Testament are printed in smaller type and set apart, and footnotes indicate frequently the influence of the books of the Apocrypha and the Book of Enoch. A new arrangement of the books has been provided and within each section they are placed in chronological order.

6) R. F. Weymouth's New Testament. Richard Francis Weymouth, Baptist layman of England, left at death a translation of the New Testament in modern speech which was revised and published in 1903; revisions were made in 1924 and 1933. This version has had considerable use in America.

7) W. G. Ballantine's Riverside New Testament. William G. Ballantine, Congregational minister, and President of Oberlin Theological Seminary (1891-1906) published the Riverside New Testament in 1923, being a translation from Nestle's text. This volume is more literal than other modern speech versions. Chapter numbers are retained but verse numbers are omitted entirely.

8) Helen Barrett Montgomery's Centenary Translation of the New Testament. The Centenary Translation of the New Testament is the only translation of the New Testament to be made by a woman. Published in Philadelphia in 1924, it does not differ greatly from the text of Westcott and Hort although made from an uncertain text. This work signalized the completion of one hundred year's work of the American Baptist Publication Society.

9) Berkeley Version of the New Testament. Gerrit Verkuyl, Former New Testament Fellow of Princeton, in 1945 published a translation of the New Testament, based upon Tischendorf's Greek, Nestle's text as well as a number of good translations. The title The Berkeley Version, is taken from the place of publication, Berkeley, California. This New Testament is regarded by some Greek scholars as one of the finest and most scholarly.

10) The Berkeley Version - Old Testament

a) A completely new translation from the original Hebrew. Hebraic scholars of various denominations, mostly professors of their respective seminaries prepared this translation. "Each translated portion has been reviewed by at least one other member of our staff and many books by several of them, but no translator is responsible for the work of another translator, the editors or the publishers."

b) This translation has made use of the Dead Sea Scrolls that contained passages from the Old Testament and where those scrolls contained items that bore on the translation, the translator found profit in consulting them. The translation has abundant foot-notes, has made use of Arabic numerals.

c) Published by Zondervan Publishing House in 1959.

11) Charles B. Williams' The New Testament

a) Williams' New Testament in modern speech is a translation "in the language of the people." J. R. Mantey, Department of New Testament Interpretation, Northern Baptist Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, states: "In teaching a postgraduate Greek Seminar class in which the whole school year was spent studying translations of the New Testament, it became increasingly apparent to all those making the study that Dr. Williams' translation possessed unusual and unparalleled merit, not only in the rendering of tenses but also in bringing out clearly and accurately the meaning of all the Greek words and ideas."

b) Dr. Charles Williams has become one of the best-known religious and classical scholars of our time. Published by Moody Press, Chicago, 1949.

12) The New Testament in Modern English - J. B. Phillips

a) Phillips' translation of the New Testament is a reproduction of four former works which had been published over a period of eleven years, the first of these being Letters to Young Churches (Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, James, Petrine Epistles, Johannine Epistles and Jude) published in 1947. This work was widely accepted and much used among clergy and laity alike. Later he published The Gospels (1952), The Young Church in Action (Acts, 1955), and The Book of Revelation (1957). The present work comprises these four works in one binding.

b) Mr. Phillips, by his own admission, states that it is nearly impossible to keep away from interpretation while making a translation.

1] His own opinion is that he has kept away from "any manipulation of New Testament Scripture to fit some private point of view . . ."

2] His translation seems to bear out the fact that he has tried to translate words to be consistent with the contextual meaning. His work is imaginative, readable, and intelligible.

c) Published by The Macmillan Company, 1958 (5th printing in 1959).

13) The Amplified New Testament

a) This translation is an English translation from the original Greek giving “multi-shaded meanings destined to fascinate and intrigue the hearts and minds of readers.”

b) “Twenty-seven translations and versions of the New Testament in whole or in part were assiduously examined and the greatest lexicographers of all times continuously consulted. The Greek text of Westcott and Hort was pursued with meticulous care. A four-fold aim has been kept in view:

1] That it should be true to the original Greek.

2] That it should be grammatically correct.

3] That it should be understandable to the masses.

4] That it should give the Lord Jesus Christ His proper place, the place which the Word gives Him. “ Preface, Amplified New Testament.

(c) Published by Zondervan Publishing House in 1958.

14) The Amplified Old Testament

a) This translation followed by four years the Amplified New Testament and is similar to the New in format. “it is intended to reveal, together with the single-word English equivalent to each key Hebrew word, any other clarifying shades of meaning that may have been concealed by the traditional word-for-word method of translation. This is the first time, to our knowledge, that the full meaning of the key words of the original Hebrew text has ever been offered in an English version of the Old Testament.”

b) The translators avow that the translation is “free from private interpretation and is independent of denominational prejudice. It is based primarily on the accepted Hebrew text, with a determined effort to keep, as far as possible, the familiar wording of the earlier versions, and especially the feeling of the ancient Book.” Preface, Amplified Old Testament.

c) Published by Zondervan Publishing House in 1962.

p. The New Testament - Translated from the Latin Vulgate. This New Testament is a Revision of the Rheims-Douay Version published in the Eighteenth Century. The work covered a period of over five years under the direction of more than thirty Biblical scholars of the Roman Catholic Church; the work was published in 1941 by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine Revision.

q. The Holy Bible - Catholic Family Edition.

1) Translated from the Latin Vulgate by the Episcopal Committee by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine The New Testament translation had already been published in 1941.

2) Published by John Crawley, 1956.

r. The Holy Bible from Ancient Manuscripts.

1) This Bible is a translation from the Peshitta, the authorized Bible of the Church of the East. It is based on Peshitta manuscripts which have comprised the accepted Bible of all those Christians who have used Syriac as their language of prayer and worship for many centuries. The English reader thus has a text which was translated anciently into a branch of the Aramaic language and used by Christians from earliest times.

2) George M. Lamsa, B. A. F. R. S.A., the translator, has given a major portion of his life to this work. He is an Assyrian, a native of ancient Bible lands. His background together with his knowledge of the Aramaic (Syriac) language has enabled him to recover much of the meaning that has been lost in some of the other translations of the Scriptures.

3) Published by A. J. Holman Company, Philadelphia, 1957.

s. The Septuagint Bible (Revised Edition)

1) This translation was made from the oldest version of the Old Testament. It contains all those books which have been accepted as canonical by both Jews and Christians alike.

2) The Septuagint (pronounced Sep'tuajint and meaning "seventy", conveniently abbreviated LXX) is the only version of the Old Testament dating from the third century before the Christian era.

3) Charles Thomson (1729-1824) first translated the Septuagint Bible into English: it was published in Philadelphia in 1808. Thomson was regarded as one of the finest Greek scholars of his day. In many places his translation "predicted" the Revised Version (1811- 1885), the revisers having used the Septuagint Bible in their translation.

4) The publishers of this present edition call the Septuagint Bible”a basis for an English Textus Receptus”..

5) Published by the Falcon’s Wing Press, Indian Hills. Colorado, 1960.

t. The New Testament in Four Versions. A compilation of the King James Version (1611), Revised Standard Version (1946), Phillips Modern English (1958) and the New English Bible (1961).

u. The New American Standard Bible. A revision of the New Testament of the American Standard Version (1901). Published by Moody Press in 1963.

v. The “Living Letter” series. A paraphrase by Kenneth N. Taylor of the Psalms and Prophets, the Minor Prophets and all of the New Testament. Published by Tyndale Press beginning in 1962.

w. The New Scofield Reference Bible. An updating of the 1917 edition of the Scofield Reference Bible.

3. NOTE: The above listing of English Bibles and New Testaments does not in anyway exhaust all of the work in this field. There are numerous sectarian translations, many translations which are eccentric in character, besides any number of lesser portions of the Bible which have been given wide usage. An endeavor has been made to present the student with a list of the most widely used translations.

III. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. Augustus Hopkins Strong; *Systematic Theology*; Judson Press; 1907
- B. Charles Hodge; *Systematic Theology, Three Volumes*; Eerdmans; 1995
- C. William Whiston; *The Works of Flavius Josephus*; Associated Publishers
- D. R.K. Harrison; *Introduction to the Old Testament*; Eerdmans; 1969
- E. Everett F. Harrison; *Introduction to the New Testament*; Eerdmans; 1964
- F. James Orr; *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Five Volumes*; Eerdmans; 1939
- G. H.D. McDonald; *Theories of Revelation: An Historical Study 1700-1960*; Baker; 1979
- H. *Manual of the Christian and Missionary Alliance*; 1994

NOTE! Dr. Richardson did not include a “Bibliography” as such in his three volumes on theology. He expected the students to use the library of St. Paul Bible College, which contained the works cited in the volumes. The above volumes are in the library of Pastor Rutherford and are available to those taking the course on Bibliography.