

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VIII.

THE BIBLE VERBALLY INSPIRED.

BY W. A. JARREL, D. D.

ALL orthodox scholars agree that the substance of the whole Bible is fully inspired of God; that, being fully inspired of him, it is wholly infallible. To be sure, as this article means, these scholars mean that only the originals, whence all copies and translations are made, are inspired. But, though all orthodox scholars hold that all Bible matter is inspired, some of them hold that the words of the Bible are all inspired; others of these scholars hold that only the matter was inspired,—that the inspired penmen were in no degree inspired in the selection of the words in which they convey the Bible matter. By inspiration of the words of the Bible I do not mean that they were always “dictated,” but that the sacred penmen were infallibly guided in their selection. Of course, while this article incidentally proves the Bible inspired, it presumes its inspiration, and confines itself to proving its verbal inspiration. The limit of this article permits the statement and the demonstration of only some of the proofs for verbal inspiration.

I. TO INFALLIBLY INSPIRE THE MATTER OF THE BIBLE WITHOUT INSPIRING THE WORDS IN WHICH THAT MATTER IS REVEALED IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY.

1. An infallibly inspired revelation necessitates that the medium through whom the revelation is made, infallibly select the language in which he conveys it. Inasmuch as no one will claim that the writers of the Bible, without inspiration of God, could infallibly use language, we are shut up to the position

that the words of the Bible are inspired, or that God never gave to man an infallible revelation.¹

2. Remembering that the writers of the Bible were "unlearned ignorant men," with few exceptions, and that much of the Bible is above the comprehension of the most learned, the impossibility of the inspiration of the Bible without the inspiration of its words the more certainly appears. Peter says, that the Old Testament prophets did not understand the inspired messages that were conveyed through them to the New Testament age (1 Peter i. 10). Think how great a portion of the Old Testament prophecies, as well as of the New, is not yet understood by the most learned and devout scholars! Only Christ and his inspired apostles have ever given us infallibly the meaning of the Old Testament—so far as they have expounded it. Who needs be told that no one can correctly write or speak, even though he be the most learned, on a subject that is above his comprehension or of which he is essentially ignorant! To think of Bible writers writing truths that are far beyond the discovery of the human mind without their being revealed to them in words would be to think a more impossible thing than for an unlearned hod-carrier to word the works of law for a Choate, a Blackstone, a Greenleaf; the great works of Euclid and his successors in mathematics; the sublime poems of Milton and other great poets; the heaven-born music of Mozart or Beethoven; the profound works of Leibnitz, Kant, and Hamilton on reason; the scientific works of Newton, Faraday, Beale, Dana, and other masters on science. That an ignorant man could write any or all these from the lips of their authors with-

¹ All true scholarship has demonstrated that even the copies and their translations have been so divinely guarded and directed of God that their readers, for all practical purposes, have a reliably divine revelation.

out the words in which to write them being given him is inconceivable.

3. Verbal inspiration is the only intelligible inspiration of the Bible. From the point last made in the last argument, this proposition is evident. A few years before the death of President Woolsey, of Yale, he declined to prepare an article on the inspiration of the Bible for a leading Quarterly, assigning, as his reason, that the difficulty of doing so was too great for the undertaking.¹

II. VERBAL INSPIRATION IS ONLY WHAT WE SHOULD EXPECT TO CONVEY A DIVINE REVELATION.

1. Only a perfect revelation can reasonably be expected from and by a perfect God.

2. Only an infallible revelation can be a perfect revelation.

3. No revelation can be infallible when changed or made in words selected to convey it by men who are fallible in the use of language and to whom it is but in part understood at best, while much of it is wholly above their comprehension, especially when being revealed.

4. To inspire the language to convey the matter to be revealed is as easy as to inspire the matter. In the name of all common sense and reason, therefore, why should the God who always does his work in the perfect way make his revelation imperfect by giving it to us revised by fallible wording! Such is the necessity for an infallible revelation that we should as well expect God's plans for creation to be modified by some fallible creature as to expect his revelation to be modified by the fallibility of fallen man in selecting the language for its conveyance.

¹ De Witt on Inspiration, page 4.

III. THE BIBLE WITNESSES TO ITS VERBAL INSPIRATION.

1. The Bible selection of nouns, verbs, prepositions, and conjunctions proves it verbally inspired.

(1) This appears in the words revealing the atonement. Though there are Greek words in the New Testament expressing indefinite causes and relations, such as *peri* (three hundred and twenty-five times), *heneka* (thirty-two times), *hoti* (about one thousand, eight hundred times), *gar* (forty-one times), *dioti* (twenty-two times), and others with the indefinite sense; yet, in the Bible, not one of them is used to reveal the purpose of our Saviour's death. But, instead of these indefinite words, are used *anti*, expressing exchange or substitution; *hyper*, of like meaning to *anti*.¹

(2) As to baptism, *pros*, meaning "close by," occurs about five hundred and fifty times in the New Testament, but never to indicate the relation of the candidate and the administrator for baptism to the water. Of *para*, a word occurring in the New Testament about three hundred and ninety-two times, meaning "close by," this is likewise true. But, instead of these words, *en* and *eis*, for "in" and "into," are used to reveal to us the relation of the candidate and the administrator of baptism to the water.

(3) Paul's statement, that he was "caught" "up even to the third heaven," and "into paradise" (2 Cor. xii. 2), very strikingly and significantly illustrates the inspired selection of words. *Heos*, here rendered "even to," means only "so far as." In the New Testament it occurs one hundred and forty-two times. In all its occurrences it excludes the meaning "in" or "into."² But *eis* rendered "into,"—"into paradise,"—is the well-settled word for into a thing. Thus the inspired selec-

¹ See the lexicons and the grammars.

² See Thayer's Lexicon.

tion of words clearly reveals that Paul was "caught up *into* paradise," but only "to the third heaven." This inspired selection of words, also, incidentally reveals that paradise is not heaven, and that they are very nearly located to each other.

(4) The New Testament use of verbs and nouns as to baptism proves verbal inspiration. Thus, to leave no doubt as to immersion as the New Testament act for baptism, while *rantizo*, *ekkeo*, "to sprinkle" and "to pour," and other words expressing various kinds of cleansings and degrees in the use of water, short of immersion, are never used to express the act of baptism; *baptizo*, with its cognates, is the term always there to express the sacred ordinance. In the selection of *bapto*, *nipto*, *katharizo*, and other words to express various kinds of cleansings and applications in the use of water, but never using any of them to express the divine command for baptism, the inspiration of the words is farther manifest.

(5) The Bible words revealing the atonement prove verbal inspiration. In the New Testament, *hilasmos*, *hilasterion*, meaning "expiation," express the atoning work of Christ.¹ But, if Christ's work were reconciliation, as some erroneously teach,—playing on the English word "atonement" by dividing thus, "at-one-ment,"—his atoning work would have been revealed by *katallego*, or some other Greek word or words with similar meaning. By the employment of these terms, and the particles, noticed in the foregoing, see the divine care that Christ's atoning work clearly appear as substitutionary and expiatory. When we consider the persistent attempts to destroy this great and only-hope doctrine from the New Testament, what thanks and praises we owe our Lord for the verbal inspiration that makes it secure!

Equally secure has verbal inspiration of the Old Testament

¹ See Thayer's Lexicon.

made the atonement. In the Old Testament, *kopher*, *pidyon*, *gaul*, and *paudah* reveal the typically atoning work of our Redeemer. *Gaul* reveals Christ's redeeming expiatory work as our kinsman-Redeemer. *Paudah* reveals Christ as our penalty-Redeemer, or redemption from servitude and death. But neither *karah*, *laquach*, *quenah*, nor *shabar*, indicating redeeming, with the exclusion of expiating in penalty-paying, is used in the Old Testament to reveal the redemption of God's people.

The New Testament using *lutron*, corresponding especially to *kopher* in the Old, to buy with the penalty-price, to express our redemption from sin, and *emporeuomai*, *agorazo*, and *oneomai*—words meaning any kind of purchase with no idea of penalty-price—not being used to express the redemption of God's people, emphasize the truth just expressed. Praise God for the inspiration that so carefully revealed Christ's atoning work that it can but forever defiantly stand against all "eisegetical" assaults!

(6) The Bible words revealing the nature and the design of God's punishment of men prove them inspired of God. In the New Testament, *edikeesis*, *epitimia*, *kolasis*, *timoria*, *dakee*, *kolazomai*, and *paideuo* reveal the nature and the design of the different punishments inflicted of God on men. The first five of these words, not containing the idea of chastisement, but only that of judicial vengeance, are nowhere used in the New Testament to reveal the punishment that God inflicts on his children.¹ But, to the contrary, the last two of them, containing the idea of chastisement, reveal only the punishment that God inflicts on

¹ Though *kolasis* does not primarily contain the idea of chastisement, possibly, in rare instances, it may imply reformation as a rare consequence of the punishment it expresses. Thus, though chastisement is hardly, even in rare instances, implied by *kolasis*, its subject may turn it into chastisement. If the New Testament anywhere uses *kolasis* to designate punishment of God's children, it does so in 1 John iv. 18, rendered "torment."

his children. That God punishes his children, not as an infliction of justice,—that having been done in Christ's sufferings,—the more strikingly appears in the inspired selection of the word *paideuo*, to reveal the punishment on them. *Paideuo*, meaning "child-training," occurs in the New Testament nineteen times; but in none of the nineteen times is it used to express the punishment of the lost in either this world or in eternity! But it is always used to reveal the punishment in God's training of his children. How decisively this inspired selection of words shows that Christ took away all penal punishment from the saved, and that the punishment of the unsaved is not parental, but judicial "vengeance," through time and eternity!

Turning to the Old Testament use of words for punishment, we find in *yaukam*, *musar*, and *yausar* the idea of punishment as chastisement on God's people, and *naukam*, to reveal the nature of his punishment on the wicked. What but inspired words of God could so unerringly distinguish between God's design in the punishment of the righteous and of the wicked!

(7) Verbal inspiration is proved by the Bible words revealing the state of man after death. *Hadees* reveals the states of souls between death and the two resurrections. *Hadees* is divided into two departments. In one of these departments are the righteous; in the other, the lost. It is divided into two divisions by a "great" and impassable "gulf." In *hadees* the righteous and the wicked remain until their resurrections.

Ge-enna, in the New Testament, is carefully distinguished from *hadees* by never indicating any part of it; but by always revealing the final place of the lost. In the Greek, compare Luke xxii. 43; xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27, 31; with Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xvii. 9; Rev. xx. 13-15. In comparing these Scriptures, notice that our Saviour and the thief, on their death, went to paradise; that *hadees* designates the place into which our Sa-

viour went at his death, with the penitent thief, that, therefore, paradise is a department of *hadees*; and that *ge-enna* cannot, therefore, be *hadees*, and that *ge-enna* is the final prison for the lost. The "body" is never in the New Testament said to be cast into *hadees*, but into *ge-enna*—owing to the truth that it remains in the grave until the resurrection, and the soul, at the resurrection of the lost, passes out of *hadees* into *ge-enna*.

2. Grammatical constructions in the Bible prove it verbally inspired.

(1) A few samples of doctrinal teachings and doctrinal distinctions revealed in Bible tenses. In Matthew xxvii. 46 and Mark xv. 34 Christ prays, "Why didst thou forsake me?" The words allude to Christ's having been "born under the law" (Gal. iv. 34), "born under" God's judicial wrath, as the substitute of law-offenders against the divine government, and in the place of offenders "forsaken" of God. But the Common Version, the American and the English editions of the Revised Version—except the two latter rightly rendering it as marginal renderings—render it "Why hast thou forsaken me?" as though Christ began to be our substitute and to "bear our sin," not when "born under the law," but when he came to his arrest and to the cross! The American Bible Union Version correctly renders it, "Why didst thou forsake me?" The Greek is *egkateleipes*, aorist.¹ Observe the verbal inspiration emphasized in that both Matthew and Mark employ the aorist instead of falling into the error of nearly all Bible translators and most other scholars. Thus, divine verbal inspiration in so small a matter as a tense teaches the fundamental truth of Christ's substitutionary birth, life, and death—a truth so far demonstrated by the uninspired mind in its attempt to better it in these translations!

¹ See Winer's New Testament Grammar, page 276.

In the First Epistle of John we read: "And hereby know we that we have [*ginoskomen*, present tense] known him [*egnokamen*, perfect], if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I have known [*egnokamen*, perfect,] and is not keeping [*teeron*, present participle] his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." Every English version I have examined hides the important teaching that John designed to teach in his inspired selection of these tenses, viz., that whoever says that he has been in the indefinite past regenerated, and is not now keeping God's commandments, is "a liar, and the truth is not in him" (ii. 3, 4).

Christ says, "What things soever ye desire when ye pray [*proseukes*, present imperative], believe [*pisteuete*, present imperative] that ye have [*elabete*, second aorist] received, and it shall be so to you [*kai estai humin*]" (Mark xi. 24). The teaching of this Scripture is, When we arise from our prayers, we are to believe that in his mind God has answered them when we offered them; and that, when it is best, on earth the answer will appear. But, in changing our Lord's statement, the translators have made him impliedly state that prayer is not answered when it is offered. Verbal inspiration secured the inspired penmen from the error into which uninspired men fell.

(2) Verbal inspiration is witnessed in the revealed oneness of Christ and his people in his redemptive work. Of ourselves, represented by Christ as our substitute-penalty, the Bible says, "Co-crucified [*sunestourothee*, compounded of *sun*, meaning "together" or "as partners," and *stauroo*, "to crucify" (Rom. vi. 6). "Hath co-raised us with Christ [*suneegeiren*, of *sun*, and *egeiro*, "to raise up"] and made us to co-sit with him [*sunekathisen*, of *sun*, and *kathizo*, "to sit"] in the heavenly places" (Eph. ii. 6). This glorious exaltation is begun in that "when we were dead in our trespasses, he co-quickened us

[*sunezōpōieesen*, of *sun*, and *zōpōieo*, "to make alive"] with Christ" (ver. 5). In this Scripture the Christian is revealed as made alive, raised and exalted into "the heavenly places, in Christ as his substitute and representative. He is thus viewed as though all this were his personal history. What inspired exactness and precision of words is this teaching of the fundamentals of our redemption!

(3) Verbal inspiration is witnessed in the Bible voices of moods of verbs. In Acts xxii. 16 we read, *Anastas baptisai kai apolousai tas hamartias sou*, "Arise, have thyself [De Wet.] baptized, and have thyself washed from thy sins." In this passage, baptism is the symbol and the profession of the Christian faith. Paul having been such a violent persecutor of the Christian faith, his personal duty of thus professing his faith, in inspired words, is doubly emphasized by the command being expressed in the middle voice. This may account for baptism being expressed nowhere else in the New Testament in the middle voice. But, as the disciples had so little to do in effecting the baptism of the Spirit, it is revealed in the passive voice (*baptistheesthe*) (Acts i. 5).¹ Inasmuch as first aorists in several verbs² serve simultaneously for it and for the first aorist middle, in Acts ii. 38 the duty of baptism is expressed in the first aorist passive,—a kind of combination of the middle and the passive,—each one of you have yourself baptized. But in our translators' ignoring the middle voice they have witnessed to the verbal inspiration of the Bible, showing thus how man's wisdom differs from divine inspiration.

In Revelation xxii. 11 we read: *Ho adikon adikeesato eti, kai ho ruparos repareutheeto eti, kai ho dikaios dikaiosuneen poiesato eti, kai ho hagios hagiastheeto eti* ("He that is un-

¹ Winer's New Testament Grammar, page 255.

² *Ibid.*

righteous, let him do unrighteousness more and more; he that is filthy, let him make himself filthy more and more; he that is righteous, let him do righteousness more and more; and he that is holy, let him make himself holy more and more." The passive of the words, which I render, "let him make himself," according to the rule, that, "in the *New Testament*, many verbs which in the middle *signification* have uniformly in classical Greek the first aorist *middle*, take, *instead*, the first aorist passive,"¹ thus giving these passive verbs the middle *sense*, is wholly ignored or overlooked by the Common Version, and so far by the Revised as to give only the passive. The former thus hides the awful truth that our characters become so unalterably set in their courses that they imperatively progress us in filthiness or holiness. In representing God, instead of our characters, as directly progressing us in holiness or filthiness, the versions witness to divine inspiration of the words of the Bible as making it incomparably superior to the wording of human wisdom. In *eti*, rendered, "more and more,"—in all its one hundred and eleven occurrences in the New Testament,—indicating acceleration of progress,² the last remark is emphasized. Oh, how divine inspiration of the words of the Bible rebukes the attempt to force the modern infidelity of "another chance in the hereafter" into the Bible!³

3. Fundamental and pivotal truths depending upon but one little word proves verbal inspiration of the Bible.

(1) In Luke xxiv. 25, Jesus, in rebuking the unbelief of his disciples, said, "Fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken," making his character, mission, and work depend on the little word "all," spelled with but three

¹ Winer's *New Testament Grammar*, pages 255, 261.

² *Ibid.*, page 240, and the lexicons.

³ How remarkably significant that all prominently false doctrines as to the Final State deprecate verbal inspiration of the Bible!

Greek letters. What poor "worm of the dust" dare say less than "all"! But, though, possibly, not intending to say less than "all," all "higher criticism" of the Bible, and other phases of unbelief, that take away a word of the Bible, whether by interpretation or otherwise, do say, "less than all."

(2) In Psalm li. 4 the great truth, even now by many scholars not understood, that all sin is and can be sin against God only, is revealed by the inspiration of the little word "only," spelled by but two little Hebrew letters,—*beth* and *daleth*. To be sure, we can injure others and trespass on their rights, but all sin, being a violation of the law of God, and, thus, an assault on the divine Lawgiver and his government, can, strictly speaking, be against "only" *him*.

(3) Christ vanquishing Satan turned upon him but one little Old Testament word, spelled with but four Hebrew letters,—*lamedh*, *beth*, *daleth*, and *vav*,—and with but five Greek letters (Matt. iv. 4).

Follow this line of investigation out, and you can but be overwhelmed by the many like examples, thus burying opposition to verbal inspiration beyond reasonable resurrection. Thus, "The Lord alone did lead them"; "The two shall be one flesh"; "Israel shall dwell alone"; "thou art the God . . . alone"; "The people shall dwell alone"; "thou art the God, even thou alone"; "The Lord alone shall be exalted"; "Unto me every knee shall bow"; "The eyes of the Lord are in every place"; "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil." See Deut. xxxiii. 28; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16; ii. 11, 17; xlv. 23; Rom. xiv. 11; Eph. i. 21; Prov. xv. 3; Gen. vi. 5.

(4) In making our redemption depend on a word in the singular number, Paul witnesses to verbal inspiration. Paul argues: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, and to seeds as of many, but as of one,

and to thy seed which is Christ" (Gal. iii. 16). But what cautious speaker would make the present and the eternal interests of mankind turn upon a word being in the singular number, of the formation of fallible man! If the words of the Bible are not inspired, who can say the Old Testament did not err in here using the singular instead of the plural, and that Paul did not fall into the same fundamental error?

With the words of our Lord I close this line of investigation: "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled"; "The scripture cannot be broken" (Matt. v. 38; John x. 34-35). "The law" is the Old Testament. If so small a matter as the smallest letters in the Hebrew alphabet of the Old Testament, with an ornamental curl, "cannot be broken" "till all be fulfilled," surely, its very words are inspired. What an absurdity—not "one jot or one tittle" "pass away," and not a word of the Bible inspired!

4. Selection of the words of the Bible by unlearned and ignorant men," by "babes" in knowledge, would be an impossibility without verbal inspiration. That most of the Bible writers were "unlearned and ignorant men" is a matter of well-known history. "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marveled; and took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus" (Acts iv. 13). Alluding to the ignorance of the apostles, Jesus called them "babes" (Matt. xi. 25). Yet, of their writings, Winer, in his "New Testament Grammar," says, "In general, the New Testament idiom bears few traces of Hebrew influence" (page 37); "In general the New Testament idiom conforms to the laws of the Greek language; the authors of the New Testament have even adopted many constructions peculiarly Greek . . . and have observed strictly . . . numerous dis-

tinctions entirely foreign to Hebrew" (page 36); "By far the majority of constructions in the New Testament are genuine Greek The New Testament writers have constantly such peculiarities of Greek syntax as differed entirely from their vernacular Idiom,—as the distinction of the different tenses," etc. (page 39). "So far as regards the several rules of grammar, the New Testament is written thoroughly in Greek" (page 38). In a letter to the British and Foreign Bible Society, answering the question "What do you owe to the Bible?" Sir Edwin Arnold said, "My short reply would be, Everything. My longer reply, to be sufficiently serious and comprehensive, would run to reams of paper. But, if, as I suppose, I am addressed as a man of letters, I will simply say, that I owe my education as a writer more to the Bible than to any other hundred books that could be named." Thomas Newberry, editor of the *Englishman's Bible*, who died in 1902, and who was a thorough scholar, shortly before his death, wrote: "As the result of examination of the entire Scriptures in the original languages, noticing and marking whatever necessary, every variation of tense, preposition, and signification of words, the impression left upon my mind is this—not the difficulty of believing the entire inspiration of the Bible, but the impossibility of doubting it." Even scoffing Huxley so felt the force of the wording of the Bible as to say: "This book has been woven into the life of all that is noblest and best in English history." What, as an absurdity, can exceed the thought, that "unlearned and ignorant men," "babes" in knowledge, have so understood the inspired writings as to so word them in the best Greek, of which they knew but the vernacular, they, too, without practice as either writers or speakers, that their work commands the admiration of the most learned philologists, lexicographers, and grammarians of the most learned ages! That these "unlearned and ig-

norant men," "babes" in knowledge, were intrusted with word-
 ing a revelation that, in many respects, was far above their
 understanding, is yet far from being thoroughly understood by
 the most learned and devout biblical scholars, a revelation on
 which all true interests of mankind depend for both time and
 eternity! A manager of a business firm, for trusting an ignor-
 ant man, he, too, ignorant of business matters, with wording
 even a short letter, involving as little as one hundred dollars,
 would, probably, lose his position. Surely, the soul that can
 believe that "unlearned and ignorant men," "babes" in knowl-
 edge, worded the divine revelation, though the Bible says a
 "whale" swallowed Jonah and, after three days, threw him,
 well and alive, out on land, should not complain at the difficulty
 of believing that Jonah swallowed and landed the "whale"
 out on the land!

5. The absurdity of believing that the penmen of the Bible
 worded it is still greater when we consider that the Bible is
 made of sixty-six books; that these books were written by many
 writers of different times, manners, customs, places, countries,
 societies, religions, morals, governments, and ages, including
 over two thousand years; that they, mostly "unlearned and ig-
 norant men," have perfectly worded messages containing matter
 as far above their lives, prejudices, and comprehensions as the
 works of Kant are above those of a common cotton-field negro!
 Well may we join an infidel poet in saying:—

" Whence but from heaven could men in art,
 In several ages born, in several parts,
 Weave such agreeing truths? Or why?"

6. The Bible positively asserts its verbal inspiration. The
 following are only some of the many Bible declarations to its
 verbal inspiration: "These are the words that thou shalt speak
 unto the children of Israel. And Moses . . . laid before

their faces all these words which the Lord God commanded him" (Ex. xix. 6, 7); "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these *words*: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with the children of Israel" (Ex. xxxiv. 27); "He hath said which heard the words of God. . . . He hath said which heard the *words* of God" (Num. xiv. 4, 36); "I will raise them up a prophet, and will put my *words* in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him" (Deut. xviii. 18); "And thou shalt write upon them all the *words* of this law" (Deut. xxvii. 3); "Now it came to pass when they heard all these *words*, they said unto Baruch, We will surely tell the king these *words*. And they asked Baruch, saying, Tell us, How didst thou write all these *words* at his mouth? Then Baruch answered them, He hath pronounced all these *words* unto me with his mouth, and I wrote them" (Jer. xxxvi. 16-18). Referring to the second verse, we see that God spoke "all the *words*" that Baruch had written, so that, instead of trusting the wording of this message which was of incomparably less importance than are many other parts of the Bible, he himself worded every word of it. In this account, five times this message to the king is affirmed the "words of the Lord." The second writing of this message God again worded: "Take again another roll, and write in it all the former *words* that were in the first roll" (Jer. xxxvi. 28); "In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim came the word from the Lord, saying, Thus saith the Lord speak all the *words* that I command thee to speak unto them; diminishing *not a word*" (Jer. xxvi. 1, 2); "The word that came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Write thee all the *words* that I have spoken unto thee in a book" (Jer. xxx. 1); "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the *words* for they are closed and sealed till the time of the end" (Dan. xii. 4, 8, 9); "Should ye not hear

the *words* which the Lord hath cried unto the former prophets ” (Zech. vii. 7). Also, see chapter i. 6. This last scripture affirms that God gave to the former prophets the words that they spoke—not in a few instances, but in all their writings: “Cursed be he that confirmeth not the *words* of this law to do them ” (Deut. xxvii. 26); “Moreover, he said unto me, Son of man, all my *words* that I shall speak unto thee receive into thy heart ” (Ezek. iii. 10). Of all the inspired writings, the Psalmist says: “The *words* of the Lord are pure *words*. . . . Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation ” (Ps. xii. 6); “Which things also we speak, not in the *words* which *man’s* wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth ” (1 Cor. ii. 13). Christ alludes to the words of the Old Testament being inspired when he says: “Man shall live by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God ” (Matt. iv. 4): Christ declares that even his words are but a repetition of the “words ” of the Father: “For I have given unto them the *words* that thou gavest me ” (John xvii. 8); “The *words* that I speak unto you I speak not of myself ” (John xiv. 10). Jesus likewise affirms of the words of his disciples: “For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit which speaketh in you ” (Matt. x. 20); “And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance ” (Acts ii. 4). Who will affirm that the apostles worded the message in languages of which they were ignorant? Yet, as we have seen, nearly all the writers of the New Testament had no such uninspired knowledge of the language of the New Testament as it contains, they being “unlearned and ignorant men ”; not only “unlearned and ignorant men ” as to language—even of their own language—but, though not trained to expression of thought, so apt in its expression that their writings command the admiration, as to precision of expression, of the

most critical scholars of the most learned ages! Implying that the words of the Old Testament are inspired, Peter alludes to the belief of the inspired and the uninspired Christian of his day, that they are inspired, when he says: "That ye be mindful of the *words* which were spoken by the holy prophets" (2 Pet. iii. 2). God exclaims: "Do not my *words* do good to him that walketh uprightly" (Micah ii. 7). "For God hath put in their hearts to fulfill his will . . . until the *words* of God shall be fulfilled" (Rev. xvii. 17). Think of the most learned men clothing the message of revelation in its language! "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my *words* . . . of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed" (Mark vii. 38); "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my *words* shall not pass away" (Mark xii. 31); "For I testify to every man that heareth the *words* of this prophecy, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the *words* of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his part out of the book of life, and from the things that are written in this book" (Rev. ii. 18, 19).

In the foregoing are about forty Bible statements affirming that its every word is inspired. Remember that verbal inspiration does not mean that every word of the Bible is truth and righteousness. But it does mean that, as revealed law, revealed gospel, and as historical records, whether records of words and doings of good or evil men, or of words and acts of God, every word in the Bible is of God's inspiration. In the foregoing, we have seen that David, Zechariah, Peter, and Christ speak of all the Old Testament words as being verbally inspired of God; that the Old Testament prophets assert that their words are "the words of the Lord"; and that Christ and his apostles assert the same inspiration of the New Testament.

To this, notice (1) that to represent the words of the Bible as inspired of God is the common way of both the Old and the New Testament; (2) the Bible does not so much as contain a hint that it is not verbally inspired.

The affirmations of the Bible, that its words are of the Lord, cannot be set aside with the plea that the originals that are rendered words sometimes mean only an utterance or a message, without implying a verbal utterance or a verbal message. This is true of the meaning of words in any language. But, first, as a rule, in any language, words mean words. Second, upon him who affirms that the Bible writers do not mean the very words, when they say "words of God," rests the burden of proof. Third, when he who denies that the Bible means the "words of God" when it says "words of the Lord," attempts to prove that it does not mean the "words of God," he will find himself especially burdened by the truth that he must admit that, beyond controversy, at least some times, when the Bible writers affirm that their messages are in the "words of the Lord," they are to be understood as they affirm. For instances of this, take the giving of the law, the message to Baruch, and the inspiration of tongues on Pentecost. Fourth, in the Septuagint and all versions agreeing that the originals are correctly rendered "words," we have it settled that when the Bible affirms itself the inspired "*words* of the Lord" it means what it affirms.

Leaving out of consideration the overwhelming proofs, offered under the arguments preceding this, from the Bible affirmations of its verbal inspiration, we are shut up to hold that it is verbally inspired—unless we take the out-and-out infidel position, that the Bible writers cannot be relied on. Even if we take the position that the Bible writers are not reliable, we prove

our own unreliability, in assuming the absurd position that "unlearned and ignorant men" have written it.

IV. OBJECTIONS TO VERBAL INSPIRATION.

1. Lest I might overlook some of the strongest objections to verbal inspiration, I asked Dr. Augustus Strong, President of Rochester Theological Seminary, to state them for me. As Dr. Strong stated them, they are:—

"(1) The quotations of the Old Testament in the New. There are ninety-nine passages in which the New Testament quotations differ from both the Hebrew and from the LXX.

"(2) The report of the Lord's words is not literally exact. Had verbal accuracy for our saving use of the Bible been required, it would have been secured. It has not been; therefore, it has not been required. Broadus' 'Commentary on Matthew' (page 59), says, we should be 'cautious in theorizing as to verbal inspiration.'"

Replying to these objections,—

(1) I have shown, in the foregoing, that verbal inspiration, instead of being a theory, is a truth.

(2) But, were verbal inspiration a theory, pray, tell us why those who believe it may not as well "theorize" for it as its opponents "theorize" against it?

(3) As to the quotations from the Old Testament, scholars who have made thorough examinations of them contradict the conclusion as stated by Dr. Strong. Though an old work, "The Origin and Inspiration of the Bible," by L. Gausen, D.D., Professor of Theology, Oratorio, Geneva, is abreast with all present true scholarship, and is incomparably more sober than is the much-vaunted scholarship of our times. Dr. Gausen well says:—

"Here we gladly recall this difficulty; because, like many others, when more closely examined, it converts the objections into arguments. No more is required, in fact, than to study the manner in

which the apostles employ the Septuagint, in order to see in it a striking sign of the verbal inspiration in which they wrote. Were a prophet to be sent of God in our day to the churches speaking in the French tongue, how shall it be thought he would act in quoting the Scriptures? As Osterwalds' and Martins' are those most extensively circulated, he would probably make his quotations in the words of one or the other of them, in all cases where their translations should seem to be sufficiently exact. But also, notwithstanding our habitual practice and his, would take care to abandon both these versions, and translate in his own way, as often as the thought intended to be conveyed by the original did not seem to him to be rendered with sufficient fidelity. Nay, he would sometimes do even more. In order to our being able to comprehend more fully in what sense he meant to make for us the application of such or such a Scripture passage, he would paraphrase the passage quoted, and, in citing it, follow neither the letter of the original text nor that of the translations. This is precisely what has been done by the sacred writers of the New Testament with respect to the Septuagint. Although it was the universal practice of the Hellenistic Jews, throughout the whole of the East, to read in their synagogues and to quote in their discussions the Old Testament according to the ancient version, the apostles show us the independence of the Spirit that guided them, by the three several methods they follow in their quotations. First, when the Alexandrian translators seem to them correct, they do not hesitate to conform to the recollections of their Hellenistic auditors, and to quote the Septuagint version *literatim et verbatim*.

"Secondly, and this often occurs when dissatisfied with the work of the Seventy, they amend it, and make their quotations according to the original Hebrew, translating it more correctly.

"Thirdly, in fine, when they would point more clearly in what sense they adduced such and such a declaration of the holy books, they paraphrase it in quoting it. It is then the Holy Ghost who, by their mouth, quotes himself, modifying at the same time the expression which he had previously dictated to the prophets of this ancient people. One may compare Micah v. 2 with Matthew ii. 6; Malachi iii. 1 with Matthew xi. 10, Mark i. 2 and Luke vii. 27, etc.

The learned Horne, in his 'Introduction to the Critical Study of the Bible' (vol. i. p. 508), has ranged under five distinct classes, relatively to the Septuagint version, the quotations made in the New Testament from the Old. We do not warrant all his distinctions, nor all his figures; but our readers will comprehend the force of our argument, on our informing them that the learned author reckons eighty-eight verbal quotations that agree with the Alexandrian translations; sixty-four that are borrowed from them, but with some variations; thirty-seven that adopt the same meaning with them without employ-

ing their words; sixteen that differ from both the Hebrew and the Septuagint, in which the sacred authors have paraphrased the Old Testament, in order that the sense in which they quote it might be better understood. These numerical data enable the reader to form a just idea of the independence claimed by the Holy Ghost with regard to human versions, when he desired to quote, in the New Testament, that which he had previously caused to be written in the Old. Accordingly, they not only answer the objection—they convert it into testimony" (pp. 162-164).

Says Dr. Adam Clarke:—

"The sacred writers of the New Testament . . . never in any case contradict what they quote from the Old, which cannot be said of the rabbins; they only explain what they quote, or accommodate the passage to the facts then in question. And who will venture to say that the Holy Spirit has not the right, in any subsequent period, to explain and illustrate his own meaning, by showing that it had a greater extension in the divine mind than could have been perceived by men?"¹

The best work on the subject of these quotations is "The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old," by Franklin Johnson, D. D., of the University of Chicago. This book says:—

"The writers of the New Testament, in quoting from the Old, sometimes change the language with the obvious intention of aiding their arguments. It must be added, however, that no changes are made for the purpose of injecting a meaning into the original passage; in every such case the New Testament writer but seeks to bring out more clearly the original thought of the Old Testament; if he exchange one word or phrase for another, he does so for exegetical purposes; and without exception, the view he takes of the quotation is justified when we study it fairly from this point of view. These changes, therefore, are aids to the understanding of the Old Testament, as well as to the belief of the New. Moreover, these changes are exactly such as we find in all literatures" (pp. 83-84).

On page 121, in repeating, he emphasizes the statement: "These writers do not, in any case, bring out of the Old Testament record a meaning which it does not contain." It being, therefore, certain that the New Testament never so quotes an

¹ Commentary on Matthew II. 23.

Old Testament writer as to put into what he says a new meaning, all variations of the quotations in the New from the words of the Old but make the Old plainer for New Testament times, or more plainly apply the Old to the subject under consideration when quoting.

The result, therefore, of scholarly and fair comparison of the citations of the New Testament from the Old is, instead of militating against verbal inspiration, by indorsing the Old as infallible—an impossibility were it not worded by divine inspiration—the New is the inspired, indirect, declaration that the Old is worded by divine inspiration. Inasmuch as the New Testament writers, without being verbally inspired, would not, in quoting from the Old, have dared vary from its inspired wording unless they were equally inspired in wording their writings, the quotations of the New from the Old, also bear witness to the New as being verbally inspired.

(4) As to the statement, "The report of the Lord's words is not literally exact," we would say:—

(a) The Gospels do not in all cases pretend to report the exact words of our Lord.

(b) Verbal inspiration does not involve always reporting "the Lord's words . . . literally exact," but that the report of them is so divinely inspired in its wording as to always report the very words that he used or their "exact" equivalents. Though the Gospels vary in reporting, yet, they never contradict each other.

2. I will, also, notice objections against verbal inspiration not mentioned by Dr. Strong,—but only such as, possibly, call for notice.

(1) That verbal inspiration is disproved by differences in the style of the Bible writers. The answer to this is, that, though verbal inspiration secured Bible writers against the least possi-

ble error in their words, yet it did not obliterate their style or individuality. As the redeemed in glory, impeccable and infallible, will retain their own individuality and peculiarities, so verbal inspiration left to its subjects their peculiarities of style. In no Christian man, whether inspired or uninspired, whatever his calling, did God, or will he ever, obliterate his individual peculiarities.

A meek Moses; an Elijah of thunder; a Job of patience; an Isaiah of evangelism; a weeping Jeremiah; an impetuous Peter; a cold, logical Paul, and a loving and heavenly word-painter John, were equally the harps upon which the Spirit of inspiration played his own selected notes.

(2) Differences in matter and other like differences between the sacred penmen are taken to mean that their words are not inspired.

(a) If this objection had any basis, it would be as fatal to the inspiration of the substance of the Bible as to its wording.

(b) As has many times been proved, the sacred penmen have never been convicted of inconsistencies or "contradictions" against each other. On the contrary, they have, many times, been proved in only harmony with each other. This not being the place to notice alleged "contradictions of the Bible," the reader is referred to the various works, of orthodox writers, on Evidences, to commentaries, and especially to the scholarly, excellent work, by Dr. John W. Haley, entitled "The Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible."

(3) As to the objection that, "the versions being fallible, there is no use in having an infallible original," the reply is: Who would not prefer, in any case, an infallibly worded original? What great care, in even human affairs, to secure a perfectly word-for-word copy of the original, even when it is to be translated, of authors' works, of state and of military docu-

ments, etc. ! If the greatest care is taken in securing the wording of the peace documents between Russia and Japan, and other nations, and all other important matters of earth,—such care that their wording would not be intrusted, finally, to the most adept secretaries,—what a reflection on the God of heaven to impute to him the folly of putting into the hands of copyists and translators, a fallibly worded writing involving incomparably greater matters ! Erroneous originals with erroneous copies and erroneous translations would, indeed, have left us in a deplorable state. That any perfect piece of writing can be so copied and translated as to be practically reliable is settled by all human law and precedent ; while a non-authorized wording or non-superintended or non-approved original, especially when a “ dictated original is procurable, would rarely, if ever, be accepted on any most important matter, whether for translation or otherwise. Again, I ask, what folly ; why reflect on the God of heaven and earth by imputing to him the folly that fallible man would not fall into ! Besides, among honest scholars, it now goes without question, that those dependent wholly on translations practically have in them the divine will. Beginning with an infallibly worded original, Divine Providence has so watched over copyists, manuscript custodians,—as over no human manuscripts and translations,—that even Harnack in a recent work, says : “ Let the plain reader continue to read his Gospels as he has hitherto read them ; for in the end the critic cannot read them otherwise. What one regards as the true gist and meaning, the other must acknowledge to be such.”

FINALLY.

1. The difficulties against other than verbal inspiration are, from whatever point of view, incomparably greater than those against it. In truth, there are no difficulties against verbal inspiration, when fairly and thoroughly examined. But, as we have

seen, the so-called difficulties really are for, instead of against, verbal inspiration. And the many positive arguments for verbal inspiration are what we should expect in support of the divine revelation.

2. As in the fable of the camel, that begged the Arab to let him put his head into his tent, to protect it from the frost, and, on getting his head in, crowded his whole body into the tent, crowding out the Arab; so infidelity seeks to persuade us that God gave us a fallibly worded revelation, fallible revelation, on which, once it has succeeded, it will lose no time in crowding us clear out of all hope. An infallible revelation is the Christian's Gibraltar.