

even introduced different tropes, so that the Psalm retains not much more than the idea of God as a Shepherd, King, and Host.

Such examples might be quoted by hundreds.

We cannot avoid the question, "Did Christ and the apostles, who chose to draw their quotations from this version rather than from the Hebrew, believe in what some moderns are insisting upon—viz., the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament? If they did, their ignoring of the Hebrew verbiage is simply amazing. Indeed, to my mind, their silence regarding the original books is a great gulf in which the verbal theory is swallowed up as effectually as were Korah, Dathan and Abiram.

It is interesting to note the arguments with which the advocates of the verbal theory endeavor to meet the inference from the apostolic use of the Septuagint.

That I may deal fairly with them I will quote from recent statements.

In a letter to one of our papers denunciatory of those who cannot accept the verbal theory, the writer says: "Where our Lord used this version (Septuagint) He set the seal of inspiration on it." To which we reply, then, we have two reports of what an Old Testament writer said, both claiming to be verbally accurate, yet differing in their verbiage, which is an absurdity. We do not dispute the statement that our Lord gave the authority of inspiration to whatever he quoted; but when he represents a previous writer as saying a certain thing, and we find that said writer did not use the identical words that Christ puts upon his pen, but only the general thought, it seems to us to be the extreme folly of bigotry to assert that He set the seal of His inspiration on more than He quoted. Indeed, such an assertion is virtually a charge of untruthfulness against the Master. We cannot wonder that the reverence and candor of Bible scholars is offended at such claim.

Another method of avoiding our inference from the New Testament use of the Old was recently proposed by a prominent controversialist—viz., there may have been an old Hebrew text differing from that we now possess which both the New Testament and the Septuagint writers followed. If we should grant this, the inference would be more disastrous to the verbal theory, for then we would have *two original* documents which are verbally diverse, unless we assume that our received Hebrew text is erroneous—an assumption which the verbalist would of course deny. It is the habit of some critics when pressed with a present difficulty to take refuge in something which they imagine may have been in remote antiquity; but it is only losing themselves deeper in the woods.

The most plausible expedient of the verbal theorists is to fall back upon what they claim to be the explicit declaration of the apostle in 1 Cor. ii. 13, "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." But this has weight only with the reader of the English Bible. Liddell and Scott's lexicon says of the word *logos*, the plural of which is used in this passage, "It never