

Allegorization is not proper: Calvin was right, there is only one intended meaning to any passage of Scripture. You have to get at it.

Barnes --- The Bible will not stand the test of really scholarly investigation. This is view among the orthodox. (Wilson says "no".)

The books were dictated by God, and which books are in the canon also was dictated by God. (cf line 17, p. 147)(also, p. 176).

The incredible, preposterous, impossible statements of the Bible are all "explained away" by the orthodox, but not satisfactorily to any scholar worth his salt.

There are only 2 possible alternatives compatible with elementary logic: we can reject both the Bible and the biblical God, or we may accept them both. While both solutions accord with logic, it is obvious that only the former can be squared with scholarship

Warfield --- See article on INSPIRATION.

Bready -- "England Before and After Wesley" gives the lie to ~~Nietzsch~~ and Barnes who would tellus that "there cannot be the slightest doubt that ((Biblical)) religion in the past has produced more suffering and misery than it has ever relieved or eliminated."

(Free) -- Quotes neo-orthodox view on "inspiration".

(Smith) -- Quotes Hoyle that Barthianism is largely a product of Kant's old, old philosophy. Thus Modernism is nothing new. See Rian.

Lewis -- Drew Seminary prof. expresses neo-orthox views.

Christian Life -- An "evangelical" magazine says that conservatives say "doctrine of inspiration" must be 're-thought'." Why must it be?