

the majority of the field. Why not adopt it as a part of its historical process, that is , on the whole, to us.

Dr. McRae: Well simply that to me it weakens it rather than strengthens it. Because it doesn't apply to all of them. I would say that the Lord doubtless initiated the movement of accepting to this end, with definite attitudes (6) and that without them it never would have been done. And that the apostles gave a forward push to the right attitude toward it on every opportunity they could. But when out of 8 N.T. writers, without--I may be wrong here, this is just a rough off-hand approximation, I may be right, but there are 8 main N.T. writers, and one book which we're not sure who wrote. And of these 8 main N.T. writers, 3 of them are in the original group of the apostles. 1 of them is a man whom we fully believe was added to the group of apostles, though not originally named. And the other 4 are not named as apostles, and 1 book we're not sure who wrote it. It makes actually only half the books written by apostles, and regarding the other four or five, we just have no complete evidence of apostolic (7) So that the apostolic attitude was a tremendous help in the securing the acceptance of the church of the fact that there were new books which were inspired as the O.T. was. And in securing the approbation of certain ones of them, I think it is undoubtedly a fact, and certainly a very vital fact. But that the church was put in a position where they could use, where they could say this is not a book which is inspired because no apostle had any connection with it, that I don't (7 1/2)

Student: I wasn't speaking to that point. I was well persuaded of your general point of view that the result of the total historical process was adopted, but it seems to me inapplicable, that if you're going to say, well here's part of the process. The absolutely clear connection of some of the apostles with some of the books.

Dr. McRae: That's right.