

W 31
136

ON

THE WORD OF GOD;

AND ON

THE SCIENCE

OF

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN NATURAL AND
SPIRITUAL THINGS,

ACCORDING TO WHICH IT IS WRITTEN,

AND

BY MEANS OF WHICH ITS INTERNAL OR SPIRITUAL
SENSE MAY BE UNFOLDED.

LONDON:

*Published by the Missionary and Tract Society of the
New Jerusalem Church;*

SOLD AT THEIR DEPOSITORY BY
WILLIAM NEWBERY No. 6, KING STREET,
HOLBORN.

ON THE WORD OF GOD,

&c. &c.

To form an accurate opinion, and to entertain a just estimation of the Word of God,—the Revelation of the Divine Will and Wisdom to mankind, must be an object most interesting to every truly rational and well disposed mind. Now if a *man* writes a book, we expect to find in it the plainest evidence of his wisdom, knowledge, and mental attainments; if, then, we believe that the Lord God Almighty is the Author of his written Word, should we not infer that such as **HE** is, such **HIS BOOK** must be? Should we not conclude that such a book, like its Author, must, as to its contents, be infinite and divine? Should we not expect to see the glories of Eternal Wisdom shine forth from every page? Every thinking person must answer these questions in the affirmative.

The Deist will readily enough admit, that a book that is really communicated by divine inspiration ought to answer to the character just described; but he will declare that he can discover no traces of such a character in the book called the Bible. He will affirm that such a character as this can by no means belong to a book in which there are many statements contradictory to each other; many that are contradictory to reason and science; many that are contradictory to just morality, and the greater part of which book, moreover, is occupied with matters of an indifferent nature, unworthy of the concern of an Infinite Being. To these four heads may all the classes of infidel objections to the Scriptures be reduced.

Some of the objections have, undoubtedly, been refuted by Christian advocates, but a part of them have never been adequately met; because the generality of *modern* defenders of the Scriptures had not those just ideas respecting their true nature and design, which were entertained in the *primitive* ages, and which alone can meet every objection fully and without reserve. It is, indeed, a fact, that while the attacks upon the credibility of the Christian Revelation were never so unremitting and daring, the cause has been half betrayed by its advocates, in consequence of the lax notions which they inculcate respecting the nature of Scriptural Inspiration. Thus, for instance, bishop Tomline, in his "Elements of Christian Theology," informs young clergymen, that "when it is said that the Sacred Scriptures are divinely inspired, we are not to understand that God suggested every word or dictated every expression:" "nor is it to be supposed that they were inspired in *every fact* which they related, or in *every precept* which they delivered!" Again: "Though it is evident that the sacred historians *sometimes* wrote under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it does not follow that they derived from the Revelation the knowledge of those things which might be collected from the *common* sources of human intelligence. It is sufficient to believe, that by the general superintendence of the Holy Spirit they were directed in the choice of their materials—enlightened to judge of the truth and importance of those accounts from which they borrowed their information, and prevented from recording any material error." Such are the sentiments concerning inspiration, which are generally received as orthodox, and which are subscribed to by Bishops Law, Watson, and Marsh. And what reply does the Deist make to such almost infidel statements? He exultingly exclaims,— "You are admitting as fast as you can, that we are in the right. If you who view the subject through the prejudices of your profession, are constrained to give up half of what we demand, unbiassed persons will argue from your