

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

have behaved to one another. The principle of heredity has involved the whole human race in the miseries of sin and death.

Shall the efficacy of that higher and more spiritual heredity which comes from the fact that Christ is the Second Adam, the second Head of the whole human race, be less extensive?

It is the privilege of the converted Christian to enter at once, even in this life, into the kingdom of God, and it will be well for him if he continues faithful to the end. For there is great reason to fear that many of us Christians may be like those who thought they were safe because they were the children of Abraham. We must not trust to our mere spiritual heredity as the children of Christ, for the words of Jesus are full of warning: "I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down . . . in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness" (St. Matt. viii. 11). We shall be wise, therefore, to listen to the words of the Baptist: "Begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (St. Luke iii. 8).

Let us not begin to say within ourselves, "We are quite safe, being the spiritual children of the Second Adam"; for God, we may be sure, will raise up many children of the Second Adam out of those millions who, without any fault of their own, and often from the neglect of the Christian Church, have lived in ignorance of Him who is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."

E. HUNTINGFORD.

ART. V.—THE PROCESS OF INSPIRATION.

"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16). In this pregnant word of St. Paul there are indicated two lines of inquiry: first, as to the process, "given by inspiration," and, secondly, as to the product, "all Scripture," which we receive as God's Word written, the supreme and infallible rule of faith. In this paper I propose briefly to discuss the process, "given by inspiration." What is inspiration?

1. REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

We must at the outset carefully distinguish between inspiration and revelation. The Bible is inspired; it contains a revelation. All is not revealed, but all is inspired. Revela-

tion, in its broadest sense, includes every manifestation of God to the perception and consciousness of man. God is self-manifested in the natural order of things, in the works of creation, in the processes of providence, and in the constitution of man's mind. Whatever might have been the case had the course of man's development been unbroken by sin, it is only too plain that, on account of human blindness and self-will, this general revelation is altogether inadequate. It fails, above all, in this, that it provides no pardon for the guilty, no recovery for the lost. Hence the necessity for that special revelation of which we have the record in the Holy Scriptures. When we speak of revelation without qualification, it is this special and written revelation which is meant. It is a self-manifestation of God as the God of grace. He reveals Himself by entering into relations with men. He enters into their life, calls them into fellowship with Himself, sends to them messages and promises and tokens from Himself, and condescends to a wonderful familiarity of intercourse with them. "In many parts and in many modes God spake unto the fathers in the prophets." It was a fragmentary and preliminary revelation of which the Old Testament is the record, the whole being preparatory to the supreme and complete self-revelation of God in His Son, which is recorded by chosen witnesses, Apostles, evangelists, and teachers in the New Testament. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the great exegete and interpreter of God. He is the outshining of His glory and the express Image of His substance, the visible Image of the invisible God. "He that hath seen Me," He declared, "hath seen the Father." "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Truth is the self-revelation of God. Grace is the self-giving of God. God revealed Himself by giving Himself. God is love. Love is self-sacrifice. Hence the gift of the only-begotten Son in the Incarnation and Atonement becomes the highest revelation of God. Through it God is revealed as He was not and could not be otherwise. In it not only is Divine wisdom displayed, but Divine power is manifested—power to forgive and heal, and restore fallen man to fellowship with the eternal Father. This revelation took the form of a historical movement which culminated in the coming of Jesus Christ. In it God dealt with men in the concrete, in the facts and transactions of life. He taught them through events. He did not reveal Himself in abstractions and general principles, but He manifested Himself in actual contact with men as One with whom they could become acquainted; He makes Himself personally known to men in a long succession of dealings with them, accompanied by His enlightening Word, unfolding His mind and purpose, while

men are brought into contact with Him on all sides of their being.

Such a historical revelation implies progress, growth, development. It began with primary truths conveyed in an elementary way through concrete examples. Gradually it became enlarged in its scope and more advanced and spiritual in its methods. The character of God is revealed, not abstractly, but in definite transactions which bring Him near to men, and which manifest His interest in them, and set forth His will for them. Thus His attributes of truth, faithfulness, power, mercy, were practically unfolded, and man learned what God is. So the evil of sin was brought out by the experience of its evil consequences, and in the Levitical system by the way in which men were compelled to approach God and to deal with Him about it. In like manner the coming Deliverer was set forth, point by point, in types and promises, and the outline gradually expanded and filled up. That which the Old Testament foreshadowed is realized and fulfilled in Him whose advent and life and teaching, as recorded by evangelists and illustrated and applied by Apostles, make up the substance and contents of the New Testament.

It is at once apparent that the record of such a revelation must contain the historical environment in which the revelation was presented. Besides the truths of natural religion, it must include many facts and truths which come within the ken of ordinary human intelligence, and which form no part of the revelation itself. Strictly speaking, revelation is the communication of truths concerning the Divine nature and the kingdom of God which could not otherwise be known. It is an *apokalupsis*—an unveiling of that which already exists in the world of unseen realities and in the Divine will and purpose, and which man could only know as God is pleased to disclose it.

Inspiration is that Divine influence by virtue of which inspired men were enabled to speak and to write truthfully and authoritatively both the truths given by revelation and other truths and facts relating to the kingdom of God, not forming part of the revelation, but constituting its necessary environment.

2. THE DIVINE AND HUMAN ELEMENTS.

“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God” (2 Tim. iii. 16). The reading of the Revised Version leaves the meaning of the passage unchanged: “Every Scripture inspired by God”—that is, “inasmuch as it is inspired by God”—“is profitable.” This statement does not distinguish between inspired Scripture and uninspired Scripture. The Jews of

our Lord's day believed, and our Lord Himself and His Apostles believed, that every part and portion of the Old Testament Scriptures was Divinely inspired. They could not conceive of uninspired Scripture, and the predicate is evidently applied to everything known and accepted as Scripture.

The Greek is equally susceptible of both renderings. The singular *ἡ γραφή* is frequently used to denote the Scriptures as a whole. Cremer gives at least ten instances of this use. While in most of these passages the article is added, there are several in which it is wanting; for example, in 1 Pet. ii. 6, on which Dr. Bigg¹ observes "that *γραφὴ* drops the article here just as Scripture does in English"—"there is contained in Scripture"; then follows, not a single quotation, but a cento of quotations, from the Old Testament. A similar use of *γραφὴ* without the article is found in 2 Pet. i. 20. *Τραφή* had come to have the force of a proper name, and as such may omit the article. Instead, therefore, of translating *πάσα* by "every," the force of the verse is more accurately given by "all" or "whole," as in all the English versions prior to the Revised Version, from Wycliffe downwards. Thus, in the Genevan it is rendered: "The whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God." It is of this version that Archbishop Trench affirms that in not a few instances it was "the first to seize the exact meaning which all the preceding versions had missed." Grimm gives it the same rendering, and states it to be nearly equivalent to *ὅσα προεγράφη* in Rom. xv. 4. He classifies it with collective terms such as "the whole house of Israel" (Acts ii. 36) and "the whole creation" (Col. i. 15).

If the term "Scripture" be uniformly and explicitly applied in the New Testament to the sacred writings, as without doubt it is, it makes little difference whether we read "every Scripture"—every part and portion of the inspired writings—or "all Scripture"—the whole sacred volume. All Scripture is *θεόπνευστος* because it is produced by the creative breath of the Almighty.² It does not, says Professor Warfield, express

¹ "Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude," p. 130.

² The significant word is *θεόπνευστος*, which, according to all authorities, means "God inspired," "inbreathed of God," "Divinely inspired" (compare the New Testament Lexicons of Robinson and Thayer-Grimm). Cremer, in the second edition of his "Biblico-Theological Dictionary of the New Testament," follows the other authorities, and renders "prompted by God," "Divinely inspired." But in his third edition he adopts a new view of the meaning of the word, according to which it defines Scripture, not according to its origin, but according to its form—not as "inspired of God," but as "inspiring its readers." Professor B. B. Warfield, in an exhaustive examination into the use of the word both in profane and ecclesiastical Greek, has conclusively shown that this new

a breathing into the Scriptures by God, but the production of the Scriptures by the creative activity of God the Holy Spirit. "Men spoke (not by their own will), but as they were moved (carried along, *φερόμενοι*) by the Holy Ghost." Even if, with Bishop Ellicott,¹ we adopt the rendering of the Revised Version, yet, as he observes, "it certainly seems definitely to *imply* (in the other version it is formally *enunciated*) the vital truth that every separate portion of the Holy Book is inspired, and forms a living portion of a living and organic whole."

"God," says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "spoke unto the fathers by (in) the prophets." Inspiration, then, implies a co-operation of the Divine Revealer with the human instrument. It is the contact and influence of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit. The process lies beneath the consciousness. We cannot explain the mode of the Divine working, but we know its results. We can have no just conception of inspiration unless we take adequate account of the two factors. There is a striking analogy here between the constitution of the Scriptures and the constitution of the person of our blessed Lord. From a mistaken

view is absolutely without support. (See the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1900.)

"Since the breath of God is everywhere identified with His presence, the epithet as applied to the Scriptures can only mean that, written by holy men of old, borne on by the Holy Spirit, every Scripture has the presence and operation of God indissolubly connected with it." (Lilley, "The Pastoral Epistles," p. 210.)

¹ Bishop Ellicott, in his "Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles," discusses at some length the question whether *θεόπνευστος* is used as a qualifying adjective or a predicate. The reasons he alleges in favour of the former seem singularly inconclusive. For example, he says that if the *καί* be merely taken as copulative, and not as ascensive, there will be associated "two predicates of Scripture, one relating to its essential character and the other to its practical applicabilities, which appear scarcely homogeneous." But I fail to see any incongruity between the inspiration and the profitableness of the Scriptures. Surely the two stand together. Their pre-eminent profitableness is at once the result and the proof of their inspiration.

Another reason he gives is to the effect that there is nothing in the text or in connection with Timothy, so far as appears, which seems to require a distinct statement of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Now, this is purely a matter of opinion. Such an explicit statement would strengthen Timothy's faith in the Scriptures, in which he had been nurtured, as St. Paul had just noted, and, in any case, we do not require to limit the purpose of the inspired epistles to the immediate requirements of Timothy. In these letters the outlook goes far beyond the environment of the writer and his son in the faith. Again, the suggestion that the word "Scripture" by itself is rather indefinite, and requires some qualifying epithet, is not borne out by the usage of the New Testament, and is opposed to the explicit reference to the Old Testament in the preceding verses.

reverence, His Divine nature has sometimes been so viewed and its relation to His humanity so explained as to virtually evacuate the Incarnation and divest His human nature of all reality, removing Him far from human sympathy and kinship, and thus contributing to the exaltation of a human creature—the mother of His humanity—to take His place as mediator and nearest of kin to us. This ignoring of the human nature worked almost as disastrously to Christianity as the opposite humanitarian tendency, which denied or detracted from the reality of His Godhead.

In the case of the Scriptures, we suffer most to-day from the belittling of the Divine element in them—the tendency to view and treat them as mere literature, perhaps the purest and most exalted in their ethical and religious contents, but still differing, only in degree, not in nature, from kindred productions of human genius and expressions of human thought and feeling. Yet we must not forget that this is partly a reaction against an opposite tendency, which so exalted the Divine in the Scriptures as to ignore their genuine human character and to deprive them of those human characteristics and limitations in which the personality of the writers finds expression.

1. We must, on the one hand, most strongly emphasize, most resolutely maintain, *the Divine origin and character of these sacred writings*. God “spake by the prophets” (Heb. i. 1), and, more than that, St. Paul declares (Rom. i. 2) that God spake “through the prophets *in the Holy Scriptures*.” Thus it is not only affirmed that the prophets spoke, but that they also wrote, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The limits of this brief paper do not admit of an exhaustive consideration of the Biblical teaching upon this subject. But it is self-evident that it is to the Bible itself we must go for a Biblical doctrine of inspiration; and there can be little doubt as to what it claims and affirms in regard to the Divine sanction and origin of its contents. The Jews contemporary with our Lord and with the writers of the New Testament held explicitly the Divine origin of every word of the Old Testament. It was affirmed—*e.g.*, by Philo, who set forth an elaborate theory of inspiration—that every portion of every book was written under Divine inspiration, and that knowledge of all matters which could not naturally be acquired by the prophets was communicated to them by direct revelation from God. Our Lord and His Apostles employed the same terms and expressions in regard to the Old Testament which were in contemporary use. “We find,” says Rothe, “in the New Testament authors the same theoretical view of the Old

Testament and the same practice as to its use as among the Jews of the time in general." Again he says: "Our authors (of the New Testament) look upon the words of the Old Testament as immediate words of God, and adduce them expressly as such, even those of them which are not at all related as direct sayings of God. They see nothing at all in the sacred volume which is simply the word of its human author, and not, at the same time, the very word of God Himself. In all that stands 'written,' God Himself speaks to them, and so entirely are they habituated to think only of this that they receive the sacred Word, written itself as such, as God's Word, and hear God speaking in it immediately, without any thought of the human persons who appear in it as speaking and acting." He adds that they "refer the prophetic inspiration also to the *actus scribendi* of the Biblical authors. The whole style and method of their treatment of the Old Testament text manifestly presupposes in them this view of the matter, which was at the time the usual one in the Jewish schools." In his "Dogmatik," Tholuck states that the application of the Old Testament made in the Epistle to the Hebrews "rests on the strictest view of inspiration, since passages where God is not the speaker are cited as words of God or of the Holy Ghost." And he refers to Heb. i. 6-8; iii. 7; iv. 4, 7; vii. 21; x. 15. Pfeiderer ("Paulinism," I., 88) admits that St. Paul "fully shared the assumption of his opponents—namely, the irrefragable authority of the letter as the immediately revealed Word of God." In like manner, Archdeacon Farrar ("Life of St. Paul," 28) says that St. Paul "shared, doubtless, in the views of the later Jewish schools—the Tanaim and Amoraim—on the nature of inspiration. These views, which we find also in Philo, made the words of Scripture coextensive and identical with the words of God." Surely this is conclusive as to the New Testament doctrine of inspiration, as based upon the exegetical study of the New Testament by those who themselves do not accept this view. The plenary theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures was the theory of our Lord Himself and His Apostles, as men of all schools admit. The New Testament unmistakably teaches this doctrine; and if its teaching is not trustworthy in this regard, can it be trustworthy in any other? To question it is to overturn the foundations of the Christian faith. How, then, do those who adopt a lower view of inspiration than that of the New Testament justify their position?

Some assert as to our Lord that He really shared the view of His contemporaries, but that in this He displayed that fallibility and ignorance which constituted a portion of His humiliation in becoming man. If so, then Christ was not free

from error, and error affecting the very mission He came to discharge. He came to reveal the Father, and He claims to know the things of the Father, the whole compass and contents of the Father's will and character; and yet He is supposed ignorantly to ascribe to the Father what He never gave. Then, too, if Christ is not free from error, how can He be free from sin? The two are bound up together, as Gretillat observes ("Exposé de Théol. Syst.," iv. 288), "by reason of the relation which unites the intelligence with the will." Such a Christ as this theory would require is thereby proved absolutely incompetent for His work.

Others argue that our Lord did not share the views of His contemporaries, but spoke as He did by way of accommodation to Jewish prejudices. Was our Lord accustomed thus to defer to prejudice? The whole story of His lifelong conflict disproves this. Had He deferred a little to Jewish prejudice, He would not have been rejected and crucified by His own people. Our Lord's accommodation of His teaching to the capacity of His hearers, the method of the wise teacher, is not to be confounded with such a concession to, and adoption of, fundamental error as such a view as this asserts.

But another and equally formidable difficulty still remains. If our Lord did not share the views of His contemporaries, His Apostles did, and the advocates of this accommodation theory do not hesitate to assert this divergence between Him and them. But in discrediting the Apostles, they discredit Christ Himself; for He conveyed His authority to them. He not only accredited them as His agents and representatives, but He gave them the promise of His Spirit to lead them into all the truth; and certainly He did not exclude this primary truth as to the foundations of revelation, and the very source of the message they were to bear. The authority of the Spirit is His own authority; the teaching of the Spirit He identifies with His own teaching (John xvi. 12-18).

Some seek relief here by drawing a distinction between the views of the Apostles and their dogmatic teaching. They admit that the Apostles, notably St. Paul, did hold this plenary view of inspiration, but they assert that they did not dogmatically affirm it. Now, no doubt such a distinction might be made between the moral and spiritual truth taught by an Apostle and views he might hold as to questions relating to the science of his day—the extent and form of the world, and suchlike. But no such distinction can be drawn here, for the matter in question is a fundamental one, which underlies the whole of St. Paul's teaching. It is not merely expressed in isolated utterances, but it gives form and colour to all his teaching as to the Old Testament, the origin and

mission of Christ, and the work of redemption. If St. Paul be discredited in regard to these fundamental conceptions, what becomes of his trustworthiness as an inspired teacher generally? If he is in error here, he may be in error anywhere and everywhere.

Such, then, is the Divine origin of this wonderful book, or rather *Bibliotheca Sacra*. It is not a collection of miscellaneous literature, but a concrete organism, a living unity, in which each book and portion has its place; many members, but one body, pervaded by one spirit, having one object, setting forth one Divine-human Mediator and stamped with one authority: it is the Word of God.

2. On the other hand, we must with equal emphasis and distinctness affirm *the human character* of the sacred Scriptures. God in them speaks to men by the ministry of men. Sometimes the Divine element has been insisted upon to the depreciation or even the virtual obliteration of the human element. A mechanical theory of inspiration has been held in which the writers are reduced to mere automata, amanuenses writing at the dictation of the Spirit. Such a theory overlooks the most significant phenomena of the sacred volume. It is unable to account for the marked differences in style and method, and the distinctive characteristics of each writer impressed upon his own productions. It fails to appreciate or to utilize the designed diversity and manifoldness of teaching which is secured by a method which enshrines the Divine revelation in a wonderful variety of human gifts and experiences, and which thus secures for the Word of God its affluent many-sidedness, and its adaptation to the innumerable moods and wants of men, with all their differences of circumstance and of character.

The Divine influence does not obliterate the individuality of its instruments. It does not destroy personality, but strengthens, illumines, transforms it. The supernatural enters into the revolving cycles of the natural, so to speak, tangentially, so as not to oppose or confuse their motions, but to accelerate them, and impart the new and stronger impulses of a fresh Divine force and reinvigorating energy.

Inspiration implies a co-operation of the Divine with the human spirit. This co-operation is one of a series, and constitutes, I think we may say, the climax of that series. There is, first of all, that co-operation by which all life is sustained. God is neither to be confounded with the universe, after the fashion of the pantheist; nor, with the deist, is He to be relegated to some far-off remoteness, whence He regards His creatures with distant unconcern. While He abides in the marvellous transcendence of His holiness and might, exalted

far above the universe, yet is He at the same time immanent in it. For by Him it consists. No creature lives apart from Him. In Him we live, and move, and have our being. And still more vividly this immanence appears in the intellectual and moral life of man. Our reason is the reflection of the one Supreme Reason, and the gifts of genius the bestowal of His Spirit. His beneficent activities control and condition the workings of the human mind. Rising still higher, to the spiritual life of the Christian, we know that it is by His "holy inspiration we think those things that be good, and by His merciful guidance we perform the same." For, as St. Paul affirms, He effecteth in us both our willing and our working (Phil. ii. 13). Reaching beyond all these, and including them all, there is, for a special work and purpose, a very special Divine co-operation with chosen and prepared human instruments, which we call "inspiration" in its highest and strictest sense. In general the higher has, as I said, included the lower. It is true that God has occasionally dispensed with some of these. He could work altogether upon the basis of the lowest form of His Divine immanence, and make the dumb beast, as it were phonographically, give utterance to His rebukes. He could, upon the basis of a higher and intellectual immanence, make ungodly men, like Balaam and Caiaphas, the proclaimers of His Divine purpose. But ordinarily His spokesmen were prepared both intellectually and spiritually. The Divine co-operation runs through and calls into action the whole scope of their personality, and utilizes all their gifts and experience, whether it be the eloquence and lofty statesmanship of an Isaiah, the sharp-sighted shrewdness and bold energy of a St. Peter, the contemplative wisdom and sacred simplicity of a St. John, or the profound intellect and wonderful spiritual experiences of a St. Paul. In the case of the last-named Apostle, who can doubt but that he was fitted for his great work, not only by his intellectual gifts, but also by the extraordinary vicissitudes of experience and conflict through which he passed—from the proud self-confidence of a Pharisee into the humble faith of a disciple of the Crucified? It is significant that this converted Pharisee should have become the chosen champion of the truth and liberty of the Gospel, and the chief expounder of God's way of salvation by the righteousness of faith.

The Divine operation would necessarily manifest itself in various forms—*e.g.*, in illumination and enlightenment, communicating truth not discernible by man; in gifts of wisdom, logically developing truth, imparting a right judgment in all things, restraining from error; in invigoration of memory, securing accuracy in testimony, but working in accordance

with the laws of evidence, preserving the independence of the witnesses, and affording that diversity of individual testimony which is a mark of truth and genuineness; in editorial co-operation, securing discrimination in the use of pre-existing material, and guiding the writer in such work as St. Luke describes, when he traced down accurately the course of the events he was about to narrate; and in the suggestion of apt and fit words wherever needful for the more complete and accurate setting forth of revealed truth. For there is an inherent connection between word and thought, so that, as Beck observes, "this coalescence of the word with the thing, of the *continenens* with the contents, in the one product of the revealing Spirit, lies in the nature of the case." In these and in other ways, which no analysis can completely distinguish, the inspiring Spirit wrought in and with the prophets and teachers, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Such, then, so far as we can follow it, is the process by which this Divine-human book has been produced. It is a truly human book, subject to all the laws which govern human language and literature—its words to be understood in their plain grammatical sense, and its contents to be studied and interpreted in accordance with the laws of thought and language, and by the methods used in all such studies. Those who forget or ignore this side of the truth run into all the follies of fanaticism and the absurdities of arbitrary interpretation; their piety, however sincere, becomes dwarfed and distorted, and degenerates into a weak pietism, and they fail to find and appropriate the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which disclose themselves only to the wise and patient searcher. It is, at the same time, a truly Divine book, the work of the Spirit, only to be rightly understood and truly appropriated by spiritual men. The guidance and enlightenment of the Holy Spirit is essential to the right understanding of revealed truth. Without it the most learned scholar will understand far less of the real meaning and power of the truth than the humble Christian who sits daily at the feet of Christ and drinks in the lessons of heavenly wisdom.

J. P. SHERATON.

