

There were other prophets like Elijah who gave messages from God but didn't write them down. But God led certain ones. But what you pictured may be the case in some cases, but certainly not in all. But at least when Isaiah's book was finished there were at least some who said, This is God's authority for us. In the course of the centuries, in the providence of God they all agreed that this was one of the books God had given them.

Q uestion: (indistinct)

Answer: I would say that the godly people, God by His Spirit led them to be sure which were the true books. But then, with other people God worked providentially so that any opposition to any particular book would have quited down and disappeared. Here would be some great leader perhaps in Isarael who would say that book of Esther doesn't belong in Scripture at all; we should not pay attention to it. And then in the providence of God something happens in the man's family, some accident, some tragedy, and the man looses his influence. God works so often in a mysterious way. This is an act of His providence, not an act of His giving divine wisdom, as far as any evidence goes to any individual or any group of individuals.

He might have chosen to do it the latter way, but we have no evidence He did. None whatever. All we know is the results. There was this remarkable agreement and it would seem most likely that what might appear to us to be an accident was God's providence working.

Unless there is something more directly on this point, let's go on to Number 3. What about the NT? That is not within our immediate field but I do think it is important to mention, because most of the conservative books impress me as being very inconsistent. Most of the conservative books flatly say we accept the OT because of the authority of Christ; He set the seal of His approval upon those books which the Jews accepted as God's Word. But then they go on and say in the case of the NT "apostolicity determines canonicity." ~~That's~~ That's what they say. That statement has been repeated over and over in conservative books.

Since there is at present no great argument in the Christian church about what books belong in the NT, I see no need of making a big stirr of trying to confute this. Today there is no big argument. Today there are people who accept the Bible, and there are people who reject the Bible. The liberals take the attitude the church ~~has~~ has put it in, and the church cantake out what it wants. But they are not actually openly propagandizing to add Cox's Secular City to the NT, or to drop out the book of John or anything like that. There's no such present propaganda active.

So that if other people, even in our same faculty, say apostolicity determines canonicity (fine Christian leaders say that) -- I don't see any need of making a big stirr about that. or trying to prove it wrong. But I do feel that if one of these days the movement ~~twists~~ twists around to such a point that we again have large numbers of people who ~~feel~~ feel it is tremendously important that we know what the right books are in the N.T. and some are saying, How do you know this book belongs in the MT?