

Now, does it not at the outset seem very strange that if God should undertake to communicate his mind to man, he should do it in this mixed way, so that nobody could with any certainty discover it? If one will take the trouble to read the 119th Psalm he will see that this was not the light in which David regarded the Scriptures which were in use in his day. It is, moreover, certain that this is not the light in which Christ and the apostles regarded the Old Testament. They quoted it as the Word of God—as an authority from which there was no appeal. When Christ declared that not one jot nor tittle should pass from the law till all was fulfilled, are we to suppose he was saying anything so meaningless as that what was true would come to pass? He was speaking of certain writings, known to those he addressed as “the law,” or “the law and the prophets,” and he was maintaining their validity in every particular. The apostles also quoted the Old Testament as that which was to silence all controversy; and they claimed the same authority for their own testimony. There is just one exception which proves the rule. I refer to the advice which St. Paul gives on the subject of marriage in 1 Cor. vii, where he says that for some of his recommendations he had no divine command, and, therefore, they were to accept them as *his* counsel, not the Lord’s, though he spoke as one who had the spirit of Christ, v. 40. Can anything more clearly show how utterly at variance the views of the apostles respecting divine inspiration were from the notions of the new school to which I have referred, who represent that the writers of Scripture were inspired only in the same way as religious teachers generally are?

Is it for one moment conceivable, if the Old Testament contained a good deal of fiction, and a good deal which is merely the product of oriental ignorance and prejudice, as is