

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

JULY 1897.

No. 3.

## Doctrinal Theology.

### BIBLIOLOGY.

(Continued.)

The Author of the Bible is God; not man under God; not man and God; but simply God. The Old Testament Scriptures are "the oracles of *God*."<sup>1)</sup> What Moses said in the Pentateuch was "the word of *God*."<sup>2)</sup> The words of the Psalmist are words which "the *Holy Ghost* saith."<sup>3)</sup> By that which is written in Jeremiah, the Prophet, "the *Holy Ghost* is a witness to us."<sup>4)</sup> The things that Paul, the Apostle, writes to the Corinthians, "are the commandments of the *Lord*,"<sup>5)</sup> even as what Isaiah wrote was spoken by the prophet, but "of the *Lord*,"<sup>6)</sup> and by the mouth of His servant David, the *Lord God* said what we read in the Psalm.<sup>7)</sup> In short, every part of Scripture is the *word of God* and can not be broken;<sup>8)</sup> and "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,"<sup>9)</sup> not certain parts of Scripture, of

1) Rom. 3, 2.

2) Mark 7, 10. 13.

3) Heb. 3, 7. coll. Ps. 95, 7. 8.

4) Heb. 10, 15. 16. Cf. Jer. 31, 33. f.

5) 1 Cor. 14, 37.

6) Matt. 1, 22: τὸ ρηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου. Cf. Is. 7, 14.

7) Acts 4, 24 f. coll. Ps. 2, 1. 2.

8) John 10, 34. 35. coll. Ps. 82, 6. 9) 2 Tim. 3, 16.

that Scripture which Timothy had known from a child and which was able to make him wise unto salvation; not only the doctrinal parts; not only the truths and revelations contained in Scripture; but simply ALL SCRIPTURE.

This is what the Bible teaches concerning its author and origin. The statements are plain, as plain as language can be, saying the same thing in many different forms, but with nowhere a restriction or limitation, or a distinction of form and substance, of a divine side and a human side, of doctrinal, historical, and scientific matters, *obiter dicta* or statements *ex professo*. The statements are not made in prefaces or epilogues or foot-notes, but in the body of the book itself. If the Bible teaches anything at all, it certainly teaches that it is in its various parts and as a whole the word of God.

That a statement found in any part or book of the Bible should be accepted as a statement of the *Bible*, not merely of that part or book of the Bible, is but consistent with the nature of the Canon. The various parts of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* were written and compiled at various times in the course of a thousand years. But what is taught in the *Extravagantes Communes*, or in a Bull contained in that part, as, f. ex., in *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, is just as truly the doctrine of the *Corpus Juris* as any doctrine laid down in the *Decretum* in words of Jerome or Gregory I, both the *Extrav. Comm.* and the *Decretum* being parts of the same *Corpus*; and a doctrine contained in the Smalcald Articles is just as truly a doctrine of the Book of Concord as a doctrine confessed in the Nicene Creed. Thus also what Christ says in any of the Gospels, and what St. Paul teaches in any of his Epistles, concerning the Scriptures or any part thereof, is the doctrine and testimony of the Bible concerning itself.

But, we are told, your arguments have hitherto been taken wholly from the New Testament, and you say the doctrine of the divine origin of the Bible is an article of

faith. Was it not an article of faith to believers before the days of Christ and the Apostles, to believers under the old dispensation? Where is the evidence of the Old Testament in its own behalf, whence the readers of Moses and the Prophets might learn and be assured with a divine assurance that what they read were the "oracles of God"? We say, come and see. Israel in all generations from the opening to the close of the Old Testament Canon had in its midst those "holy men of God" who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,"<sup>1)</sup> and who by mouth and pen with divine authority gave evidence to the divine authority of what was "written aforetime,"<sup>2)</sup> Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, Isaiah and the rest of the prophets to Malachi, the penman of the closing book of the Old Canon. They well knew that "the Spirit of Christ which was in them testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow,"<sup>3)</sup> when they prophesied of the coming grace.<sup>4)</sup> "Thus saith the Lord," we hear them say again and again in their written utterances. "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer,"<sup>5)</sup> says David, not in the course of a spoken address to the people, but in the beginning of a written psalm. The word of the prophet is the "word of the Lord which goeth forth out of His mouth,"<sup>6)</sup> whereby He utters His thoughts.<sup>7)</sup> It is the Lord who has "spoken by the prophets, who has multiplied visions, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the prophets;"<sup>8)</sup> and Isaiah, exhorting the people to search the Scripture, calls it "the book of the Lord."<sup>9)</sup>

Thus, then, the divine origin of the Bible is amply established by direct and explicit statements of the Old as well as of the New Testament. But that God himself is the author of the Bible appears and has, since the book of Genesis was written, appeared, in still another way.

1) 2 Pet. 1, 21.

2) Rom. 15, 4.

3) 1 Pet. 1, 11.

4) 1 Pet. 1, 10.

5) Ps. 45, 1.

6) Is. 55, 11.

7) Is. 55, 8. 9.

8) Hos. 12, 10.

9) Is. 34, 16.

There is, perhaps, no literary production of a human mind the authorship of which is more fully and reliably established than that of Julius Caesar's seven books of *Commentaries on the Gallic War*. The work is ascribed to him by the common consent of antiquity, and a long and illustrious line of critics, commentators and editors, by friends and enemies alike.<sup>1)</sup> But the most convincing and conclusive proof is in the work itself. Not that Caesar there explicitly declared himself to be the author of the work; for he does not. He, on the contrary, speaks of Caesar in the third person as he does of Vercingetorix. And yet, to read, to study these *Commentaries* is to be convinced that they are Caesar's work and no other man's. For who but Caesar *could* have written them? The work everywhere bears the stamp of a brilliant mind, of a military genius intimately familiar with the art and science of war, with camps and marches and sieges and battles, the Roman army and its generals, the enemies' forces and their leaders, the entire territory and its strategic advantages and disadvantages, the movements and plans and the very thoughts of Caesar, of consummate statesmanship, of high literary attainments, and of surpassing concern in the name and fame of Caesar. Now, there was but one man of this description known to history who could and would have written those records of the Gallic war, and that was Julius Caesar himself.

Thus, also, and with infinitely greater certainty, we learn from a perusal of the Bible that no one can or could have written this book but God himself. And not only in these latter days can the Scriptures carry with them this conviction; but even the earliest readers of holy Scripture were in the same position with ourselves in this respect. Or who but God should have been the real author of the book of Genesis? Who else could have described in detail

---

1) Cf. Suetonius, Jul. Caes. 56.

the events recorded in the first and second chapters of that book, events of which no human witness ever existed? Who but the Spirit of God could have published the thoughts of God recorded in Gen. 6, 3; 6; 7; Gen. 8, 21; Gen. 11, 6 f., Judg. 2, 20—22; 2 Sam. 24, 16; or reported what transpired on Mt. Nebo according to Deut. 34, 1—6 without a surviving human witness to tell the story of the death and burial of Moses, the servant of the Lord? Who but God could have written the first chapter in Job with all the rest of the book, which from beginning to end is of the same warp and woof? Who but He to whom past and present and future are an everlasting to-day and to whom the destinies of men and nations, the hearts of the great and the humble, and all the plans and ways of God from the beginning of time, when the morning stars sang together, to the fulness of time, when the Son of the Virgin was to be wounded for our transgressions, yea to the present time and to the end of time, were an open book, who but Omniscience himself could have indited the Psalms, the Proverbs, and the books of the Prophets from Isaiah to Malachi? Even as God has not left himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons,<sup>1)</sup> so also he has not left himself without witness, in that he gave us his word, which gives and has at all times given explicit and implicit evidence of its divine origin, by which it is in all its parts the word of the living God.

Did not, then, Moses and the Prophets, the Apostles and Evangelists, write what they wrote? St. Paul says: "I have written the more boldly unto you;"<sup>2)</sup> "I wrote to you in an epistle;"<sup>3)</sup> "I wrote this same unto you;"<sup>4)</sup> "I wrote unto you with many tears;"<sup>5)</sup> "For this end also did I write;"<sup>6)</sup> "Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not;"<sup>7)</sup> "These things write I unto

1) Acts 14, 17.

2) Rom. 15, 15.

3) 1 Cor. 5, 9.

4) 2 Cor. 2, 3.

5) Ibid. v. 4.

6) Ibid. v. 9.

7) Gal. 1, 20.

thee;''<sup>1)</sup> and St. John: ''These things write we unto you;''<sup>2)</sup> ''These things write I unto you;''<sup>3)</sup> ''I write unto you fathers, . . . I write unto you, young men, . . . I write unto you, little children.''<sup>4)</sup> Our Savior says: ''Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for *he* wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writing'' etc.<sup>5)</sup> ''In them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias;''<sup>6)</sup> ''Well did Esaias prophesy of you;''<sup>7)</sup> ''David himself said in the book of Psalms.'' <sup>8)</sup>

But then we have other texts, which say that Mic. 5, 2 was ''written *by* the prophet,''<sup>9)</sup> texts which were ''spoken *by* Jeremy the prophet,''<sup>10)</sup> ''*by* Esaias the prophet,''<sup>11)</sup> ''*by* Daniel the prophet,''<sup>12)</sup> ''*by* Jeremy the prophet,''<sup>13)</sup> ''*by* the prophet Joel.'' <sup>14)</sup> In all these cases and many others the Greek word is *διὰ*, never in a single instance *ὑπὸ*. And *διὰ* here indicates an intermediate agency, an instrument or organ, of an original cause or source. For both the principal cause and the medium are named, the one with *ὑπὸ* and the other with *διὰ*, when we read: ''Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken *of* the Lord *by* the prophet.'' <sup>15)</sup> *God* was the *speaker*, the *prophet* was his *organ of speech*, the mouth of the Lord, whereby the *Lord* spoke. Thus also the disciples of Jerusalem say: ''Lord, thou art *God* . . . who *by* the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why do the heathen rage?'' <sup>16)</sup> And St. Peter said: ''Men and brethren, this *scripture* must needs have been fulfilled which the *Holy Ghost* *by* the mouth of David spake before;'' <sup>17)</sup> and Paul: ''Well spake the *Holy Ghost* *by* Esaias the prophet;'' <sup>18)</sup> and ''the sweet psalmist of Israel said, The Spirit of the *Lord* spake *by* me, *his* word was in

1) 1 Tim. 3, 14.

4) 1. c. v. 13.

7) Ibid. 15, 7.

10) Matt. 2, 17.

13) Matt. 27, 9.

15) Matt. 1, 22: τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.

16) Acts 4, 25.

2) 1 John 1, 4.

5) John 5, 46 f.

8) Luke 20, 42.

11) Matt. 8, 17; 12, 17.

14) Acts 2, 16.

17) Acts 1, 16.

3) 1 John 2, 1.

6) Matt. 13, 14.

9) Matt. 2, 5.

12) Matt. 24, 15.

18) Acts 28, 25.

my tongue.”<sup>1)</sup> And what is thus said of several holy writers, is said of all the “prophets” in the “holy scriptures,” when St. Paul says: “Which *he* (God) had promised *by* his prophets in the holy scriptures.”<sup>2)</sup> And thus the doctrine and faith of the Christian church as expressed in the Nicene creed saying, “*who* spake *by* the prophets,”<sup>3)</sup> is the doctrine of Scripture on the authorship of the Bible and the relation between the author proper and the penmen whom he employed. It was not an untruth when the amanuensis of Paul wrote: “I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle,”<sup>4)</sup> although he wrote an epistle of “Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ;”<sup>5)</sup> and with equal truth, though still in another sense, could Paul say: “I wrote to you in an epistle,” although the real author of that epistle was not Paul, the servant, but the Lord whom Paul served and who *by* him spoke not the word of men, but *in truth the word of God.*<sup>6)</sup>

Here, however, a querist may come in for an argument, and if he be of a certain familiar stripe, he will propose such questions as these:

“Do you not hold Luther’s Bible and the English Bible to be the word of God? Do you not, when you preach a sermon, claim for that sermon that the hearers should receive it as the word of God, or for yourself that they should consider you a messenger of God by whom God would speak to them? Is not the Small Catechism the word of God? And do you claim that Luther was under divine inspiration when he translated the Bible or wrote the Catechism, and do *you* claim to be inspired when you preach?” Now, if the argument which lies in these questions has any point at all, it can only be this, that if Luther could write and we can preach the word of God without being under divine inspiration, the apostles and prophets may likewise without being under divine inspiration have written what they wrote; a

1) 2 Sam. 23, 2.

2) Rom. 1, 2.

3) ὁ λαλήσας διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

4) Rom. 16, 22: Εγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν.

5) Rom. 1, 1.

6) 1 Thess. 2, 13.

point which the querist would hardly be willing to make and which even Dr. Briggs and the like of him would not countenance as it stands. But he who proves too much proves nothing. By the way, we are quite accustomed to encounter arguments of this caliber; logic is by no means the strong side of the assailants of scriptural positions. But we will not on that account herewith drop the line of inquiry introduced by the questioner, lest we should seem to go out of the way of a dilemma or what was intended as such. The matter is in fact very simple and so far from being an unanswerable objection to our doctrine, that it rather serves to confirm it. *We* can preach the word of God though we are not under divine inspiration, because Moses and the Prophets, the Evangelists and Apostles recorded the word of God under and by divine inspiration. The Small Catechism is the word of God because it is taken from the Bible,<sup>1)</sup> and the Bible is the word of God because it is given by inspiration of God. Luther's Bible and the English Bible are the word of God because and inasmuch as the translators have taken what was in the mind of God from where it was laid down by inspiration, and have exhibited it in their vernacular by translation.

But our questioner is ready for another effort. He will say: "Do you not concede that the Bible has a divine side and a human side?"

We answer, "No; the Bible is simply the word of *God*."

"Very well," he continues; "but did you not say that your sermons are the word of God? And do you not concede that your sermons have a human side?"

Certainly, we answer; but that human side is not the word of God. It may be the human vehicle to bring the word of God in our sermon near the hearer, as, f. ex., a

---

1) Cf. "Short Exposition," QUARTERLY p. 43: Quest. 4. Whence has Luther taken this doctrine? Ans. From the Holy Scripture or the Bible.



figure of speech, a simile or parable, or some other contrivance of our own, and the hearer is free to set down as *not* to the point the words or figures or exemplifications we may have chosen. In short, whatever is of our own or any man's making is human and is not the word of God, unless God have made it his own, as in the case of the Septuagint version where it is employed in the New Testament. And here, then, is the difference between an orthodox sermon or the English Bible and the Scriptures in their original tongues and form. An English sermon is the word of God as to its contents, inasmuch as the statements, the thoughts and sentiments, are taken, directly or indirectly, from the Scriptures, while the form of utterance is human, though it be in good keeping with the word of God. Not so with the Scriptures. They are as to form and substance, the thoughts and their utterance, the word of God, given by divine inspiration.

When on the day of Pentecost the apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost, they spoke "as the Spirit gave them utterance,"<sup>1)</sup> when they spoke "the wonderful works of God."<sup>2)</sup> To his disciples Christ gave the comforting assurance: "When they deliver you up, take no thought *how* or *what* ye shall speak;<sup>3)</sup> for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak;"<sup>4)</sup> not only the substance, but also the form of utterance should be *given* them; neither the one nor the other should be of their own, but a gift from without, from above; "for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost," says the Savior.<sup>5)</sup> Thus also the inspiration of Scripture, in which "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,"<sup>6)</sup> did not extend only to every thought, but also to the words, and not only to the choice of words, but also to the forms of words. St. Paul

---

1) Acts 2, 4.

3) πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε.

5) Mark 13, 11.

2) Acts 2, 11.

4) Matt. 10, 19.

6) 2 Pet. 1, 21.

bases an argument on the fact that in Gen. 22, 18 the singular, not the plural form of the word עֲרֵב, *seed*, is used. "He saith not, And to thy *seeds*, as of many, but as of one, And to thy *seed*, which is Christ."<sup>1)</sup> Likewise Christ argues from the single word אֱלֹהִים, *Gods*, Ps. 82, 6; and terms this word "*Scripture*," which "cannot be broken," since it is "the word of God."<sup>2)</sup> That David "in spirit" applies the word "*Lord*" to Christ, Ps. 110, 1, is also made the basis of an argument,<sup>3)</sup> and the same word as recorded from the mouth of Sara, Gen. 18, 12, who is on that account held up as a model to her daughters by the apostle.<sup>4)</sup> Paul, the "apostle of the Gentiles," makes his point, "that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy," by quoting a number of texts in which the word "*Gentiles*" occurs.<sup>5)</sup> Similar instances of arguments based upon single words quoted from the Old Testament Scripture we have in Heb. 4, 7; 7, 20 f.; 8, 8; 13; 12, 26 f. And St. Paul even shows from the word אֲרָבָה, *thou hast ascended*, Ps. 68, 18., that the Lord there addressed is not the Father, but the Son, God who in Christ had previously descended, humiliated himself, before he "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things."<sup>6)</sup> If interpretation is the art or process "of finding out the true sense of any form of words, that is, the sense which their author intended to convey,"<sup>7)</sup> such exquisite specimens of apostolical exegesis as we have them in Gal. 3, 16 and Eph. 4, 8. 9 most certainly indicate that the Author of Scripture intended to convey a certain sense by certain *words* and *forms of words* deliberately chosen for their intended purpose.

1) Gal. 3, 16; οὐ λέγει· Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς. Καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὡς ἔστι Χριστός.

2) John 10, 34 f.

3) Matt. 22, 43 f.

4) 1 Pet. 3, 6.

5) Rom. 15, 9—12; coll. 2 Sam. 22, 50; Ps. 18, 50; Deut. 32, 43; Ps. 117, 1; Is. 11, 1. 10.

6) Eph. 4, 8—10.

7) Lieber, *Legal and Political Hermeneutics*, III ed., p. 11.

Viewed in the light of Scripture as we have hitherto turned it on the subject before us, such distinctions as that quoted by Dr. Briggs from a manuscript of Prof. H. B. Smith, who says that "Inspiration is plenary—not verbal"<sup>1)</sup>, must appear utterly untenable. And while the doctrine of the divine inspiration of Scripture is wholly an article of faith, based upon Scripture itself, yet it is equally true that under certain suppositions the denial of the verbal inspiration of Scripture is preposterous even in the forum of reason and common sense. In his inaugural "declaration," Dr. Briggs professed to believe the Scriptures "the infallible rule of faith and practice."<sup>2)</sup> And speaking of his inaugural address he says: "The whole intent of my discourse was to exalt the authority of Holy Scripture by showing that its essential contents, as they appear in the discipline of Biblical Theology, evince divine authority. I endeavored to remove the obstacles to divine authority set up by some dogmaticians of modern times, in order to get at the real divine authority lodged in the teachings of Scripture, that I might show that Holy Scripture is indeed the infallible rule of faith and practice."<sup>3)</sup> And now, among the "obstacles" he endeavors to remove, we find precisely that of Verbal Inspiration. He says, "The second barrier, keeping men from the Bible, is the dogma of *verbal inspiration*."<sup>4)</sup> By denying its verbal inspiration he would establish or exalt the authority of Scripture, by which it is the infallible rule of faith and practice. It is not probable that the Doctor would be willing to trust his temporal affairs to such principles and practice. He would, most likely, decline to place his signature to a contract and thereby make it binding, unless he knew what the contract said and in what terms. Such, at least, is very properly the rule among business men, and a general suspension of this rule would

---

1) Briggs, *Authority of Holy Scripture*, p. 92.

2) *Ibid.* p. 10.

3) *Ibid.* p. 86.

4) *Ibid.* p. 31.

lead to a general confusion in the business world and very largely to a suspension of business itself. A man may leave the wording of his will and testament to his lawyer, but not because he considered the words or forms of words of minor importance, but for the very reason that he would make sure of having the document in such words as shall clearly and definitely express what the will should say, and he is not supposed to authenticate the instrument by his signature without such assurance. Says a prominent jurist: "A testator, even though ignorant of the language in which the will is expressed, should feel assured that the *language used*<sup>1)</sup> expresses his intentions rightly, and where doubt is entertained on this point, the correctness and *bona fides*<sup>2)</sup> of the translation should be satisfactorily established in probate."<sup>3)</sup> And: "The civil law required that the written will of a blind person should be read over to him and approved by him in presence of the subscribing witnesses. Our common law lays down no such imperative rule; but with regard to both blind and illiterate, and all who cannot read what is written out as their will, requires satisfactory proof of some kind to the effect that the testator knew and approved of the contents of the will which was executed as his own. Such a will may be read over to the testator before signing, apart from his witnesses; or it may be shown that the contents were correctly made known to him without any formal reading at all; *provided* it appear, on the whole, that the instrument *as drawn up* and executed, constituted his own testamentary disposition as intended by him. *Less than this, however, is unacceptable*; and where the will, without being read over or examined, is signed by the testator upon an assurance that it has been *prepared according to his instructions*, when in point of fact it has

---

1) The Italics here and below, unless otherwise noticed, are our own.

2) Author's Italics.

3) Schouler, Law of Wills, II ed. § 259.

not been, probate should be refused. Corresponding considerations may apply to the wills of those who are deaf, but not blind; and a testator of this latter description would fitly assure himself that the instrument<sup>1)</sup> is correct by *reading it over* instead of having it read to him; and here, once more, the controlling question would be whether the instrument in question embraced his testamentary intentions."<sup>2)</sup>

Or how do our legislative assemblies proceed when about to establish a law, a "rule of practice" for which not even infallibility, but only binding authoritativeness is claimed? Do they agree to establish a law, say, to prohibit the sale of intoxicants to minors, or to impose a tax of 20 *per cent. ad valorem* on imported books, and then leave it to the clerk to formulate and publish the law and enter it on the Session Acts and the Revised Statutes? No; the draft of the Bill being carefully prepared, the Bill is introduced and heard by the assembly in "first reading"; then, on another day, in "second reading"; then it goes to a committee, there to be most carefully looked into; then it is reported, heard in "third reading," is open for discussion, and is finally rejected or, with or without alterations, adopted and thus made a law, an authoritative rule of practice. And even with all these precautions, the law may miscarry in its application because of a lack of exactness in its terms, an improper choice or arrangement of words, and a future legislative body may have to go to work and try to do better.

And here we have the book of God,<sup>3)</sup> wherein God would infallibly and with divine authority tell us what to believe in matters of faith, what to do and what to forbear in matters of life and practice, what to reject as error or falsehood, and we are told by our neologists that to exalt the authority of this book we must deny its verbal inspira-

---

1) which is the *written* document. A. G.

2) *Ibid.* § 317.

3) Briggs l. c. p. 29.

tion, that "the divine authority is not in the style or in the words, but in the concept."<sup>1)</sup> This is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural and untheological. There is consistency in the denial of both verbal and real inspiration, the divine authoritativeness of the Bible, its claim to being called the book of God or the word of God and an infallible rule of faith and practice. But the position of such as Prof. H. B. Smith and Dr. Briggs is simply an untenable position of men who do not connect any definite sense with their own words, who speak of a book of God which is in their own mind no longer a book of God, of plenary inspiration which is neither plenary nor inspiration, of an infallible rule which is to them neither infallible nor a rule.

To us, the Bible is a rule, and not only *a* rule, but *the* rule of all doctrine and practice, of divine authority, of unquestioned infallibility, from which there is no appeal, while to it appeal must be granted from all preaching and teaching in spiritual things, all versions and expositions, all creeds and confessions, orthodox as well as heterodox, ancient as well as modern, because in Scripture, and only in Scripture, we have the things of the Spirit of God, uttered and spoken in the words of the Holy Ghost.<sup>2)</sup>

A. G.

---

1) Briggs, *ibid.* p. 32.

2) 1 Cor. 2, 13.

(*To be continued.*)

---