

mand, not I, but the Lord ;" "to the rest speak I, not the Lord." Thus the apostle carefully distinguishes the sound and godly wisdom which he had experimentally by the Spirit—the action of the Holy Ghost in his own mind morally—from what he had from the Lord Himself, so as to give it as His command. This has been stupidly alleged as showing all was not inspired, since part was distinguished as spiritual experience. But this is a mistake as to the whole nature of inspiration, and leads me to some notice of this.

The truth of inspiration is not that all that is stated or recorded as done or spoken was inspired. We have the devil's words, and wicked men's words, and holy, but failing, men's words ; but in such cases the writer was inspired to give us these things as he has given them. So God, knowing our liability to be misled as to inspiration, has inspired Paul to record the difference between the highest spiritual wisdom and apprehension, and inspiration. There cannot be on this point a more important inspired testimony. It decides the question recently raised, and judges the error into which presumptuous men have fallen. The operation of the Spirit forming and leading men's minds is not inspiration in the proper sense of the word. Now the forms and bearings of inspiration are various, though the source and the authority be one, because there is a human element. God's works have to be revealed, and they are so by a simple and blessed statement of them, such as nothing but inspiration could give. Man's failure and sin has to be traced and brought to light in its origin and its development. For this latter, God's ways had to be revealed ; but this had a double character, the history of the facts in connection with which these ways were manifested,