

Student: They were a large part of the historical process?"

Oh, absolutely.

Student: Then that accounts for the consideration that the early ages of the church might well have had objective historical evidence, aside from the direct relationship of the apostles, which we don't have." ~~That is~~

That is possible, but hardly to be assumed in an article of faith.

Student: I'm just speaking to the point of endorsing a general historical process, which arrived at a decision, and you ask, well what are the elements of the process? What happened? And from our position, we would be more anxious to say that they had some kind of objective historical evidence further than the ~~fact~~ fact that they read the books. I would say that they, the O.T. people read the books, considering them as the books which a prophet had written, men of God approved for the purpose, had written them. The N.T. people read the books, considering the same thing. They had some books written which were not written by men of that type. They had other books which were. In connection with some of the books which were, they had a definite attitude of some of the apostles, which had strengthened them, which had directed ~~corrected~~ them to give such attention to these books. That there was such an apostolic confirmation of every one of the books of the N.T. is something of which we have no evidence.

Student: I wasn't attempting to establish that, but a definite apostolic association is clear within the N.T. in the majority of cases. That book, The Pauline Epistles, the Apocalypse, the one where the writer is definitely named, they are, we find them close within the apostolic circle.

Another student: Dr. McRae, if you go out on a limb too far on that and then data is found that Hebrews, for instance, is not written by an apostle--

Student: That doesn't bother me, that's not the point that I'm speaking to. I'm saying that this other is a clear, definite piece of evidence and it covers