

the New Testament fully without understanding the Old Testament. It is also true that they both hang together as far as their truth is concerned. Attempts have been made to ~~dissect~~ ^{cast} the Old Testament and yet to maintain the entire truth of the New Testament, but such attempts have always proven futile. If the Old Testament should fall, the New Testament must inevitably fall also; the two are inseparably bound together. In the Old Testament we have the origins of everything; the fundamental principals all rest back there. Consequently, if one is to understand the Bible, he must give a good bit of his time to understanding correctly the Old Testament.

A hundred years ago, the Old Testament was a book which stood by itself. It was the only record we had of the events that occurred at the time with which it deals. Today it no longer stands alone. The individuals and the places referred to in it also occur in many other documents. We have light from many sources thrown on these. The Old Testament is not now something standing alone, but is something which takes its part in our knowledge of the ancient world. The Old Testament is not a book of history. In saying that, I should make clear just what I mean. The Old Testament is not primarily a book of history, nor a book of science. It was written in order to tell of God's revelations of himself to mankind and to show how he prepared the way for the coming of his Son into the world. This is the purpose which ~~occurs~~ ^{runs} all through its pages. These events occurred in a historical world and also in a world in which scientific ~~purpose~~ ^{laws} existed. Wherever the Bible teaches of history or of science, it is certain to be correct in its statements about them; but it makes no attempt to give us a full account of science or of history. We do not have in it sufficient data to enable us to write a book of science or to write a complete history. The Old