

So the integrity of the New Testament goes. If the Apostle Paul is not to be relied on in regard to the origin of sin, how can he be relied upon in regard to the remedy for sin?

Or take the references to Abraham. The Old Testament relates how he believed and obeyed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness. The Apostle Paul uses this history to teach the doctrine of justification. But if the history is not reliable, the illustration fails and the teaching respecting justification and righteousness becomes doubtful. The references to Abraham are too numerous and varied to admit of denial of its historical accuracy. But if a doctrine of inspiration such as we are combatting be admitted, then Abraham, the father of the faithful, becomes little better than a myth. And so this school of writers teach. But the New Testament writers have put him among the historical characters, and if they are mistaken here they may be also on other important points. No; you cannot play fast and loose with such statements as those which connect the Old Testament and the New Testament together on such vital points. To deny the Old when it is endorsed by the New is to deny the New also.

Further, a doctrine which allows rejection of any Old Testament history, though endorsed by the New, allows also a rejection of New Testament history. That lands us where we cannot trust, for instance, the history of the birth or resurrection of Jesus Christ. New Testament history on these or any other matters is little better than any other history. The Divine element is not necessarily in it. And the final result of it is that Christ's teaching has no other authority than that which arises from our discovery of its excellence. The over-