

that would be the attitude today. He could have said, all those books which are written by apostles or under definite apostolic sanction you are to accept, the Lord could have made such a statement and settled it. But we don't know.

6. (3/4)

...I think he uses the figure of a broad river which gives us the general tone and stream of the attitude of the early church. They accepted these books. The Council of Nicea, later. Arguments on both sides. There was no question of an acceptance of a book, they debated about the book but they appealed to it as scripture. The ~~point~~ point is that there are incidental (1 1/4) ^{evidence} like that all the way along, and it is never a thing that is hotly debated. It is to be inferred that their general attitude was toward unanimity, these are the books. (MacRae: that's right.) And it is not a debate about individual books, it is a question of (1 1/2) ^{scripture} like the ^{teaching} of Christ in the Pauline Epistles. an accepted fact, and it's the same idea as (1 3/4) So that, since it was not a point of hot debate at any particular point the evidence hasn't been reproduced and retained. We have more or less incidental evidence which gains its strength from the fact that it must be representative of a vast general attitude of the church.

MacRae: But we do not have evidence that the people in the Nicene Age were tremendously interested in tracing back into ~~the~~ all the historical evidence they could find in order to prove whether or not there was an apostolic connection of the individual books.

Student: No, they accepted them as scripture and appealed to them as such.

MacRae: And if they happened to have a tradition of some apostle having a connection with a book, naturally they gave that as something (2 1/2)