

New Testament or the Old Testament to suggest that any of the Old Testament prophets were infallible in all their utterances. It seems quite clear that God revealed much to them and that which He revealed was authoritative and true. When they spoke on their own authority they might speak that which ~~is~~ was true or they might speak that which was false. But when God inspired them for the writing of books which were intended to be part of His inspired Word these words became part of the Scriptures which Christ and the Apostles accepted as supremely authoritative.

The problem is, of course, greatly increased by recognition of the fact that all through the Old Testament times there were great numbers of false prophets. In Jeremiah 28 we read about Hananiah, the son of Azur the prophet and the words quoted from him sound very much like the words which we find from other prophets in other parts of the Old Testament. However, Jeremiah declares that this man is a false prophet and that God's will is the exact opposite of what Hananiah has declared. Jeremiah also points out that there were prophets among the people in the Exile and that these prophets were speaking what was false and not speaking from God. How was one to decide between Jeremiah and Hananiah? How was one to know which of them was authoritative and which was not? We certainly are not in a position to do so at all. We have to rest our recognition of which were true prophets and which were false upon the book which the Jews at the time of Christ accepted as inspired and authoritative. Christ approved the attitude of the Jews toward these books. We have no evidence whatever that He thought that everything that these men had said would be free from error or that these men had any authority in themselves except in so far as they were doing one of two things -- quoting directly that which God had revealed to them or writing something down in those books which God inspired them to write as part of the inspired Word of God.