"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

Beloved Pastors,

Why are we uncomfortable teaching on inerrancy? The belief the *copy* of the Word of God is 100% pure; perfect. The following verses allow no room for private interpretation:¹

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." ²

God gives His definition of pure; "purified seven times...preserve for ever". Throughout scripture seven represents completeness, perfection.³ The purpose of this paper is to answer the question why we're reluctant to preach on the doctrine of inerrancy. When is the last time we preached on the subject? Perhaps these feelings capture our sentiments of why the 'fuss':

- 1. The discussion is a 'tempest in a tea pot';
- 2. The matter distracts from our mission;
- 3. The argument portrays an undesirable image;
- 4. The debate has produced 'inerrancy fatigue';
- 5. The subject is the domain of the scholar;
- 6. The doctrine has been addressed in the Chicago Statement;
- 7. The issue was resolved in the Conservative Insurgence;
- 8. The principle is not taught in scripture.

We may distill the above objections into four reasons we're apprehensive to speak on inerrancy:

- 1. We desire to shun the controversy: points 1 thru 4;
- 2. We feel unqualified to discuss the subject: point 5;
- 3. We believe the issue has been dealt with: points 6 & 7;
- 4. We hold the principle is not taught in scripture: point 8.

The focus of this presentation addresses the first reason given; 'we desire to shun the controversy'. The other three points are dealt with in separate papers by *Standard Bearers*.⁴ Before we begin, it may be helpful to preface our discussion with a look at the concept of preaching; which the world considers foolishness:

"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." ⁵

_

¹ 2Peter 1:20; "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation."

² Psalms 12:6-7; For proof texts that God promised to preserve is Word 100% pure, see the *Standard Bearers* paper; God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ *Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God* (pages 6-9).

³ Creation: Genesis 2:2 (see Hebrews 4:4); Passover: Exodus 12:15 (see 1Cr 5:6-7); Candle Stick: Exodus 25:37,39-40 (see John 9:5); Leviticus 23:6-8; Holy Spirit: Zechariah 4:10 (see Revelation 4:5); Holiness: Matthew 18:21; Wickedness: Luke 11:26; Word of God: Psalms 12:6-7. See Dr Floyd Jones illustration of the Golden Candlestick (Menorah).

⁴ Reason #2; 'We feel unqualified to discuss the subject', is addressed in; *Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic ~ Believing or Neutral to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification*; Reason #3; 'We believe the issue has been dealt with', is addressed in; *Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation ~ The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement*; Reason #4; 'We hold the principle is not taught in scripture, is addressed in; *God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God.*

⁵ 1Corinthians 1:21

Preaching appears foolish; stupid for two reasons:

- 1. We present truths the mind cannot comprehend.
- 2. We declare truths we cannot prove.

We would all agree, it seems irrational to ask someone to believe what they can not understand and we could not demonstrate. This is exactly what Jesus did with Nicodemus.

1. Presented a truth that the mind of Nicodemus could not comprehend:

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" 6

2. Declared a truth which Jesus could not demonstrate to Nicodemus:

"Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." 7

Nicodemus was at a loss, Jesus absolutely 'blew his mind' as we observe in his reply; "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, how can these things be? 8 This is preaching. Declaring truths the mind cannot comprehend and we cannot prove, hence it's appears foolish; stupid. If the message we're called to preach looks foolish; then how must the messenger appear?

This creates a challenge for us; particularly if we desire to be esteemed wise, while called to preach a 'foolish' message. If our aspirations and message are to come into harmony, something has to yield, what's the solution? Well, we can either; alter the message⁹ and make it appealing,¹⁰ thereby remove the offense or change our affections;¹¹ so the praise of God eclipses the praise of *man*. Which will it be?

This brings us to the cardinal principle of faithful and effective preaching. The truths of scripture are believed by the agency of the Holy Spirit bearing witness to the heart (spirit), not the mind of the hearers; God's truths are spiritually discerned:

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." ¹²

So Jesus declared to a 'natural man', things he could not know and what could not be demonstrated:

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

⁷ John 3:7-8

⁶ John 3:3-4

⁸ John 3:9-10

⁹ Isaiah 8:14; Romans 9:33; 1Peter 2:8

 $^{^{10}}$ 2Timothy 4:3; 1Pete 5:2;

 $^{^{11}}$ Colossians 3:2

¹² 1Corinthians 2:14; see Isaiah 6:9-10; Matthew 13:11-15; Act 28:27

This is faithful, effective preaching. God likens preaching to casting the good seed of His Word, which inextricably produces fruit; just as the seed of the sower, ¹³ therefore we can labor in hope:

"This is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." 14

God has ordained that by the "foolishness of preaching", the Holy Spirit enlightens the hearts of the hearers to the truths of our words; which are actually His words spoken through us. This anointing of the Holy Spirit as we faithfully preach the Word of God is revealed in these intertwining scriptures:

- "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him;" 15
- "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" 16
- "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" 17

In Nicodemus' encounter with Jesus, we're given a front row seat to observe this process of the Holy Spirit in the life of a 'natural man'. The planting of the good seed of the Word of God by faithful preaching, its germination by the water of the Holy Spirit ¹⁸ and coming to fruition in the saving faith of Dr. Nicodemus, as evidenced by his works. ¹⁹ The one who once was afraid to be seen with Jesus in the day, now openly pays for his memorial service, now that's bold:

"And there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury." ²⁰

How then does preaching apply to inerrancy? It does in that, all Satan need do to 'kill a doctrine' is to steal the seed from the ground;²¹ are better yet, cause it not to be cast at all. Which would be the most strategic, the former or latter; to steal the seed or keep it from being cast? No doubt the latter, it's more effective to stop the preaching before it begins; to kill the message by killing the messenger before he can cast the seed, hence the blood of the martyrs; like Stephen.²²

Satan's goal is to stop the preaching; ²³ thereby destroy the faith and abundant life ²⁴ it brings in the heart of the 'hearer'. ²⁵ While Satan may not kill us, he will certainly try to 'scare us to death' to in order to shut our mouths and stop preaching:

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." 26

¹⁴ 1Corinthians 9:10

¹³ Matthew 13:23

¹⁵ Hebrews 11:6

¹⁶ Romans 10:17; see Matthew 4:4

¹⁷ Romans 10:14-15

¹⁸ John 7:50-52 - "Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth? They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet."

¹⁹ James 2:18 – "Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works."

²⁰ John 19:39-40

²¹ Matthew 13:19

²² Hebrews 11:33-40 – The 'Hall of Faith'. "Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions".

²³ Acts 5:40

²⁴ John 10:10-13

²⁵ Observe the progression: Satan *steals* the good <u>seed</u>, and *kills* the <u>light</u> of God's Word to our path, so we're destroyed when we <u>ship</u> wreck in the dark.

So what does it mean to be sifted as wheat?

It's to be separated from the truths of our faith by adversity. To be so threshed, that our confidence is *'blown away'*; like the husk separated from the kernel of sifted wheat. For Preachers, it's for Satan to so intimidate us that we deny the truths were called to preach:

"I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me." ²⁷

It's a challenge we must all overcome; remember the refrain of Jesus in Revelation:

"Him that overcometh will I...".28

It's a test Apostle Peter initially failed:

"Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew". 29

However, later Peter overcame, and was no longer intimidated into silence:

"And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word". ³⁰

This brings us to our central point, what's the threshing instrument of choice for Satan which stops us from preaching the truths of the Word of God, for instance; like the doctrines on family or inerrancy? The answer is the *fear of man*, or the opposite side of the coin; the *praise of man*':

"As the fining pot for silver, and the furnace for gold; so is a man to his praise." 31

Why is this so? Why does what others think of us have more influence at times than pleasing God? The same reason Adam chose Eve over God. For a moment, let's put ourselves in Adam's shoes and suppose God said to him, "Adam, you can have my fellowship, or Eve's, which will it be? What would have been our answer?

We know Adam's choice, and the rest is history; "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." ³² God informs us Adam was not deceived; ³³ but ate with knowledge, why? The answer can be found in the lyrics of one of the most popular songs of our generation, 'Without You', when the singer echoes the cry of darken humanity; "I cant live, if living is without you, can't live, I can't live anymore". Beatle Paul McCartney once described this ballad as "...the killer song of all time;" and was he right! This craving is still alive in the descendants of Adam. ³⁴

²⁶ Luke 22:31

²⁷ Luke 22:34

²⁸ Revelation 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21

²⁹ Matthew 26:74

³⁰ Acts 4:29, see Acts 9:1

³¹ Proverbs 27:21

³² Romans 5:19

³³ 1Timothy 2:14 – "And Adam was not deceived,"

³⁴ There is a Christian song of our generation which make similar appear to this appetite, popularized by Debbie Boone called: *You Light Up My Life*'. The words are contained in the last lyrics which say; *"It can't be wrong when it feels so right"*; Adam could have just as easily sang these verses to Eve. These are called 'cross-over' song with lyrics which appeal to our natural appetites to broaden the songs acceptance, in the name of evangelism. The problem is, it reaffirms what we're told by God to cast down; 2Corinthians 10:5.

Our desire for acceptance; like food and our sexual drive are God-given appetites. These betters our lives when used as designed, and the absence of which is analogous to an infant's 'failure to thrive', it is not natural. However, when turned on their heads these passions become very destructive. Let's focus on peer pressure; the desire to be accepted by our: family, friends, neighbors, colleagues, co-workers, community and God. To yearn to be in the good graces of them is natural, God-given and to be commended. However, peer pressure is a two-edged sword, and can either work for or against us, depending on the *norm* to which we are conforming.

If the norm of society is a God-centered value system, peer pressure works as God designed. If not, this subtle power is turned in on us; and like our adolescent children, we conform to our culture for approval without even realizing. This is the background of the admonition by Apostle Paul:

"And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." 35

Here's where the 'rubber meets the road' with preaching and peer pressure. Particularly, in days like today; as in the days of Isaiah, when evil is called good and good evil:

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! ³⁶

This is when the Preacher must preach; standing alone for God if need be, when the world is upside down.

The word "preach" is perhaps not adequately appreciated and applied under these circumstances. Although it includes teaching, the Biblical meaning encompasses more and is exemplified in Apostle Paul's instruction to the young Pastor Timothy:

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." 37

The aged warrior was passing the baton to his apprentice, "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand". The Apostle distills for this Pastor the essence of the ministry to which they had been called; preach the Word! What was the Holy Spirit communicating through the Apostle Paul?

Have you ever been told; "Don't preach to me?" What did they mean? They're saying; "stop telling me what I do not want to hear." What do we do? Well, it depends. First and foremost, we must seek the mind of the Holy Spirit, our Teacher and Guide.³⁸ The scripture gives us many instances where Preachers were told, "don't preach to me", and were censored before they came to the conclusion of their preaching:

- 1. Jesus' first sermon was stopped when they grabbed him and sought to throw Him off a cliff; "Filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill." 39
- 2. Stephen's discourse was cut-off as they 'stopped their ears' and dragged him out of town to stone; 40

³⁶ Isaiah 5:20

³⁵ Roman 12:2

^{37 1}Timothy 2:2

³⁸ John 16:13

³⁹ Luke 4:28-29

⁴⁰ Acts 7:57

- 3. The Apostles preaching was interrupted when they were arrested and beaten for not heeding the warning to stop preaching: "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name?" 41
- 4. Apostle John was banished to a remote and desolate island for preaching what others did not want to hear, "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." 42

Preaching is more than just teaching. The real work of Biblical preaching is proclaiming what someone may never have heard *nor* wants to hear. Biblical preaching does not self-censor due to political correctness; either by the standards of our culture or religious convention, otherwise we would have never heard of Martin Luther.⁴³

While Biblical preaching has always been vulnerable to being characterized as; misguided insurrectionists;⁴⁴ ill-spirited sectarians⁴⁵ or wide-eyed kooks;⁴⁶ its motivation is the Fear of the *Lord* as opposed to the fear of *man*; as the Apostles confessed, "We ought to obey God rather than men".

As Preachers, we're called to do God's bidding when no one else will speak in His name for *fear of man*. To own His cause; even at the expense our reputation, wealth and even health:

"And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death." 47

By God's design, the preached Word is a powerful instrument when ministered under the anointing of the Holy Spirit:

"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." 48

The one thing required is a willing vessel like Isaiah, who when the Holy Spirits calls, says; "Here am I; send me", ⁴⁹ and faithfully sows the good seed of the Word of God, only to be sawed asunder for preaching what others didn't want to hear; They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented." ⁵⁰

So what's the hindrance to Biblical preaching? In one word, loss! All losses can be distilled into two categories:

- 1. Loss of acceptance and;
- 2. Loss of security.

42 Revelation 1:9

⁴¹ Acts 5:28,40

⁴³ Here I Stand, I Can Do Not Other, a must see short video clip of Martin Luther at the Diet of Worms.

⁴⁴ Luke 23:2; Acts 25:8; see Exodus 23:2

⁴⁵ Acts 5:36-37

⁴⁶ Matthew 9:34; John 10:20; Acts 26:24

⁴⁷ Revelation 12:11

⁴⁸ Isaiah 55:11

⁴⁹ Isaiah 6:8

⁵⁰ Hebrews 11:37

We must die to our control over either and say with Apostle Paul:

"Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: every where and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." ⁵¹

To the degree we allow this to happen will be our freedom to preach Biblically:

"No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit 52 for the kingdom of God." 53

Why is the person looking backward, of whom Jesus speaks? He counting his losses; what he's going to leave behind if he obeys. There is no consolation to be found in man for this decision, only in God; as Apostle John said of our Lord, "Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men".⁵⁴ The source of our fear and hurt is failed expectations in looking to man and not God; falsely believing they are the source of our success, acceptance and security; a deception which we must die to, in order to preach faithfully.

Like Apostle Paul, our motivation can only be found in God:

"I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ." 55

He was not looking backward and wringing his hands, fretting over what he gave up, rather looking forward to what he had gained:

"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." 56

Oh beloved Pastors, are we dead to the *praise of man* and alive to the *praise of God*? How can we know? It's revealed in how we treat the Word of God; are we ashamed to own His claims or not. The only one of the seven churches of Revelation for which Jesus had no reproof was the church at Philadelphia. Moreover, four times Jesus uses the word of exclamation; *behold* to precede a promise to this church. ⁵⁷ Why no reproof along with His precious promises? Because they wholly owned Him, as evidenced by wholly owning His Word:

"I know thy works: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name." 58

Why did Jesus say they had "little strength"? He tells us that they; "hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name". Dear saints, observe they had spent their all for Jesus: poured out their reputation, wealth and health at His feet; they went "unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach", 59 when they could have done otherwise. Whose 'camp' is it we're serving; ours or The Lord's? It is reflected in how we own His

⁵¹ Philippians 4:11-13

⁵² This is not referring to the certainty of our salvation but the effectiveness of our service; Matthew 5:13.

⁵³ Luke 9:62

⁵⁴ John 2:24

⁵⁵ Philippians 3:8

⁵⁶ Philippians 3:10

⁵⁷ Revelation 3:8, 9, 11

 $^{^{58}}$ Revelation 3:17-18

⁵⁹ Hebrews 13:13

Word. Observe dear Pastors, Jesus equates our not owing His Word equivalent to denying His name; who He is; what He stands for! This brings us to a word for our generation.

A revival of the *Word* of God precedes a revival of the *people* of God:

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." 60

This is the example of the reformations in the days of King Josiah and Martin Luther; "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition." ⁶¹ Revival is the work of God, in response to faithful preaching; "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." ⁶² The Holy Spirit anoints the Word of God, not the word of man. Jonah was biased and almost did not preach; because he feared man as we do today. What should we do?

It's time for a call to repentance for being ashamed to own the truths of the Word of God before an adulterous generation for *fear of man*. What have we come to if we're ashamed to own what the Holy Scripture and our fathers gave witness to; that the *copy* of the Word of God they 'handed down unto us' is 100% pure, inerrant? God says in which case, we've come to nothing:

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Have we lost the Fear of the Lord? 63

Are we at the point where we fear offending man more than we do God. This is well stated by Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of Far East Bible College in his essay entitled; 'Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology', when he says:

"Textual criticism introduced by Princeton Seminary is the Trojan horse in Reformed, evangelical, and fundamentalist Bibliology today. No Reformed, evangelical or fundamentalist "scholar," without wanting to look stupid or foolish, would dare affirm without equivocation that the Bible in our hands today is infallible and inerrant, without any mistake. This is the tragedy of compromise. ⁶⁴

Is there any Preacher left in us?

Or, has Satan thoroughly 'sifted' it out by threshing us with the *fear of man*? To be so covetous of the *praise of man* that we do not own God's Word must grieve the Holy Spirit; the *Author, Superintendent* and *Teacher* of the Word. Perhaps we should contemplate the question posed by Isaac Watts in his hymn when he penned these lyrics; "Must I be carried to the skies, on flowery beds of ease, while others fought to win the prize, and sailed through bloody seas?" ⁶⁵

Whether from ignorance or fear, the Biblical and historical doctrine of Inerrancy has been rejected by Pastors; this fact is *irrefutable*. The doctrine which teaches we possess the 100% pure, *copy* of the Word of God in our hands. Which God gave 100% pure by Divine *Inspiration*, keeps it so by Divine

61 1Corinthians 10:11

 $^{^{60}}$ Roman 10:17

⁶² Jonah 3:4

 $^{^{63}}$ See Standard Bearer paper, The Fear of The Lord: Restoring the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy \sim The Fear of Man verses the Fear of the Lord.

⁶⁴ Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of Far East Bible College entitled; 'Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology',

⁶⁵ Hymn, *Am I a Solider of the Cross*, by Isaac Watts published 1721. He wrote this hymn in conjunction with a sermon he was giving on 1Corinthians 16:13

Preservation and makes it known to the saints by Divine Identification through their witness, as is memorialized in their Confessions of Faith.

We've exchanged it for one which is more appealing to the hearers, but detrimental to their faith. Given our error, what are we to do? The answer is to acknowledge our sin and once again uncompromisingly preach, without *fear of man*! Our Chief Shepherd warns us that we cannot preach with one eye on the *gallery* and the other on *God*, it's impossible:

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." 66

It's evident we have done this, in that we hold to the eclectic⁶⁷ text of *naturalist* textual criticism, while despising the *copy* of the Word of God 'handed down unto us' by the witness of Holy Scripture and the saints.

Why, because we are biased to the *praise of man*. Who demand we give them a scientific explanation for how we know we possess the 100% pure *copy* of the *original* text of the Word of God, not content with what God has said. Therefore, we seek a Bible we can believe, rather than believing the Bible we hold. Perhaps more accurately, we want a Bible our peers can believe so do we do not have to experience their rejection and subsequent loss.

This demand for scientific evidence⁶⁸ rather that *believing* the Word of God is well noted by Dr. Edward F. Hills ⁶⁹ when he states (emphasis mine):

"Why should we Christians study the New Testament text from a neutral point of view rather than from a believing point of view? ⁷⁰ The answer usually given is that we should do this for the sake of unbelievers. We must start with the neutral point of view in order that later we may convert unbelievers to the orthodox, believing point of view. Sir Frederic Kenyon expressed himself to this effect as follows:

It is important to recognize from the first that the problem is essentially the same, whether we are dealing with sacred or secular literature, although the difficulty of solving it, and likewise the issues depending on it are very different. It is important, if for no other reason, because it is only in this way that we can meet the hostile critics of the New Testament with arguments, the force of which they admit. If we assume from the first the supernatural character of these books and maintain that this affects the manner in which their text has come down to us, we can never convince those who start with a denial of that supernatural character. We treat them at first like any other books, in order to show at last that they are above and beyond all other books."

67

⁶⁶ Matthew 6:24

⁶⁸ The identity of the Divinely Preserved text of the Word of God can stand up to the scrutiny of empirical science, as opposed to the theoretical oppositions of the 'pseudo-science' of naturalistic textual criticism; science, "falsely so called", 1Timothy 6:20. See the book by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, Ph.D., Th.D.; Which Version is the Bible?, Chapter 7, under the heading; "Is Naturalistic Text Criticism Scientific?

⁶⁹ Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript*, Chapter 4 (3)(g) 'New Testament Textual Criticism and Evangelism' (h) and 'Believing Bible Study on the Graduate Level-Christ and Grammar'. Edward Freer Hills (1912-1981) was a respected Presbyterian scholar. Graduate of Yale University and earned the Th.B. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary, Th.M. degree from Columbia Theological Seminary. After doing doctoral work at the University of Chicago in New Testament textual criticism, he completed his program at Harvard, earning the Th.D. in this field. In 1956 he published *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript*, which devastated the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure.

⁷⁰ See Standard Bearer paper; Textual Criticism 101 Theological Faith Based versus Naturalistic Rationalistic ~ Believing or Neutral ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

For fear of man or the praise of man, we no longer preach the politically incorrect truths; like family and inerrancy, while the Word of God continues to be denigrated and our families disintegrate.

In the midst of this 'post-Christian' culture, where are the Preachers, the good Shepherds who will not flee in the face of threatening loss? ⁷¹ Who will preach the truths of God's Word, whether or not people want to hear? Anyone can preach a good word, but only a Preacher will bring an unpopular one. How much more must our families, churches and nation loose? Are we heading in the direction of the people in the days of Isaiah when God testified of His people?

"Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever: That this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the LORD: Which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits: Get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us." ⁷²

I have a question.

Would we dare claim that God did not keep His promise to preserve the above memorial as He stated He would; "for the time to come for ever and ever"? Of course not, the fact that we have it to read is evidence of His divine preservation. So why do we stumble at His promise when He says he will preserve *all* His Words for ever and ever:

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." ⁷³

Are we really prepared to say God can be trusted to save a *paragraph* but not a *book;* or *one* book but not *two*; or *two* but the *sixty-six* of the Bible? This unbelief defies the witness of scripture, the saints, common sense and the logic of faith. Think how our 'witness' or lack of is an affront to God. ⁷⁴. We publish to the world our God is good for 99%, but unable to 'carry the ball' the distance; just one more foot across the goal line to perfection.

Are we denying His name? To deny one's word is to deny their name; hence the transposable axioms, 'their word is good' or 'they have a good name'. Perhaps we ought to heed the counsel of Apostle Paul when he said, "let God be true, but every man a liar." ⁷⁵

God said the faithful saints at Philadelphia owned His *word* and thereby His *name*; "and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name." ⁷⁶ I think it would be timely to let God speak for Himself as to what He is able to do. Let's listen through the mouth of His *faithful* Preachers:

Preacher Jeremiah, what does God say?

"Ah Lord GOD! behold, thou hast made the heaven and the earth by thy great power and stretched out arm, and there is nothing too hard for thee:" 77

⁷¹ Consider the example of King David: "And David said unto Saul, Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock: And I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth: and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him, and slew him." (1Samuel 17:34-35)

⁷² Isaiah 30:8

⁷³ Psalms 12:6-7

⁷⁴ Matthew 5:13

 $^{^{75}}$ Romans 3:4

 $^{^{76}}$ Revelation 3:8

⁷⁷ Jeremiah 32:17

• Preacher Isaiah, what does God say?

"For the LORD of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" 78

• Preacher Moses, what does God say?

"And the LORD said unto Moses, Is the LORD'S hand waxed short? thou shalt see now whether my word shall come to pass unto thee or not." 79

What should we do?

We need to repent of our unbelief which we're *exporting* around the world! We've done to the doctrine of inerrancy what we're now doing with Creation as recorded in Genesis 1, as evidenced in the young-earth or old-earth debate. We're overthrowing the Word of God in the name of science; "falsely so called":

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called." 80

Is not this the natural progression of our unbelief; first the dethroning of the inerrancy of the Word, then the casting down of the truths it contains; "Hath God said"? 81 This is reflected in rejecting a plain, literal reading of Genesis 1.

We've gone the way of Cain,⁸² who in spite of God's counsel to the contrary; thought his way was better and reaped the reward thereof. Would we not agree that teaching the *copy* of the Word of God is not 100% pure is error? God says His Word is perfect:

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times".

He promises to preserve His Word forever:

"Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever," 83

If God tells us not to alter His Word, does not that pre-suppose there's a fixed Word not to alter? Are we prepared to call God a liar and alter His Word, when He warns us not to, and says He will judge those who do? ⁸⁴ Have we lost the *fear of the Lord*? Are we becoming partakers of other men sins:

"Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins; keep thyself pure," 85

Then why do we readily 'lay hands' on the eclectic text of naturalist textual criticism, and not on the copy of the Word of God 'handed down unto us' by the witness of Holy Scripture and the saints? Why do we embrace this error when commanded by God to reject unsound doctrine:

"Avoiding profane vain babblings and opposition of science"?

⁷⁹ Numbers 11:23

⁷⁸ Isaiah 14:27

^{80 1}Timothy 6:20

⁸¹ Genesis 3:1

⁸² Jude 1:11

⁸³ Psalms 12:6-7

⁸⁴ Three times God warns that there would be a curse on anyone who added, subtracted or altered in any way the His Word: Deuteronomy 4:1-2; Proverbs 30:5-6 (see Psalms 12:6-7); Revelation 22:18-19. See End Notes #1 on page 17: Three Divine Warnings NOT to Alter the Word of God; and End Note #2 on page 18: Do the Math Principle.

^{85 2}John 1:11; 1Timothy 5:22

Do we consider feeding this false doctrine to God's sheep doing the work of a good shepherd, for which we will be commended by The Chief Shepherd, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"? ⁸⁶ Are we trading our eternal reward of a "crown of glory that fadeth not away", ⁸⁷ for the fading praise of man:

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown."

Let us close. The baby-boomers, our generation, have sown the wind and are reaping the whirlwind.⁸⁸ We sought to feather our nests and secure our future at the expense of family and the Word of God; and our Watchmen were asleep; silent through ignorance or *fear of man*. Now we find ourselves approaching our 'golden years' less secure: our finances, families, churches and nation being threatened as ever before. What must we do?

Preachers, let's once again fulfill our divine call and set our mouths to the trumpet. Believing by the power of the Holy Spirit, God will quicken these truths to the hearts of those whom He has given us to lead to good pasture, and will deliver us:

"And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpiller, and the palmerworm, my great army which I sent among you." 89

God says; "Iron sharpeneth iron". ⁹⁰ May we be encouraged by the Trinitarian Bible Society in their lone witness to the inerrancy of the copy of the Word of God found in the Preface to their Statement of Doctrine of the Holy Scripture when they state:

"Today, as has been stated, things are very different. The doctrine of Scripture has been, and is being, assailed on every side: not least from within many branches (including those taking the name of 'evangelical' and 'reformed') of the so-called 'Christian Church' of our day. The Committee, therefore, considers it necessary for the Society clearly and unambiguously to state where it stands on this most fundamental of all doctrines. These documents do not contain anything that is novel but simply summarize the historical position of the Society."

It continues with an unqualified affirmation to identity of the *copy* of the text of the preserved Word of God, and illustrates the Biblical and historical doctrine of Inerrancy; which embraces Divine *Inspiration*, Divine *Preservation* and Divine *Identification*.

"The Trinitarian Bible Society maintains that the providentially preserved true and authentic text is to be found in the Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek Received Texts. In so doing, it follows the historic, orthodox Protestant position of acknowledging as Holy Scripture the Hebrew and Greek texts consistently accessible to and preserved among the people of God in all ages. These texts had remained in common use in different parts of the world for more than fifteen centuries and they faithfully represent the texts used in New Testament times.⁹¹

They give a faithful witness to the text the saints identified in their Confessions as the fulfillment of God's promise to the Divine Preservation of His Word, forever; "Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." 92 This is the God-honored text of the great revivals.

88 Hosea 8:7

⁸⁶ Matthew 25:21

^{87 1}Peter 5:4

⁸⁹ Joel 2:25

 $^{^{90}}$ Proverbs 27:17

⁹¹ Preface: 1[7]-Note 1.

⁹² Psalms 12:7; For a study of the proof texts for Divine Preservation, see Standard Bearers paper; God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God, pages 6-9.

Are we really prepared to go against, "so great a cloud of witnesses", 93 upon the word of naturalistic textual criticism, which holds to a low view of scripture, believing our copy of the Word of God has errors?

Isn't it time we return to preaching the *high* view of scripture as taught in the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy? Which holds our *copy* of the Word of God is 100% pure; as given by Divine *Inspiration*, kept by Divine *Preservation* and revealed by Divine *Identification* in the witness of the saints.

The challenge is few have ever heard it; therefore it falls to us to preach it anew! To do so we must die to the praise of man, as did Apostle Peter, Paul and the rest.

There's only one antidote for the *fear of man*, it's the *fear of the Lord*. What is the Fear of the Lord? In short, it means conducting ourselves with the *reality* there are divine *consequences* for our behavior. It's the only thing I have found which sobers me when I'm in a 'fog' over conflicting loyalties; the praise of *man* or *God*. It was the guiding force of Apostle Paul to which he refers in his farewell to the Elders at Ephesus:

"Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." What did he mean in emphasizing, "I am pure from the blood of all men"?

He was drawing from a scriptural principle God revealed to the Prophet Ezekiel. It reveals that Preachers will be held accountable to God for what we say, as well as what we do not say; for *fear of man*. God states:

"I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. If thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul.

Again, When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumblingblock before him, he shall die: because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Nevertheless if thou warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not, and he doth not sin, he shall surely live, because he is warned; also thou hast delivered thy soul." ⁹⁵

This alone should give us a 'holy backbone' and keep us faithful to preach, "all the counsel of God". God says, until the Word is cast the responsibility is upon the Preachers, once it's sown the accountability passes to the hearers. God is not a respecter of persons;⁹⁶ like Ezekiel and Paul, Preachers are accountable. This sober truth underscores the divine duty of preaching. We have a calling not a job. What's the difference? An employer does not defer our compensation, our Lord does.⁹⁷ An employer does not expect us to be politically incorrect, our God does.⁹⁸ An employer does not expect us to die for him, our Chief Shepherd does.

⁹³ Hebrew 12:1

⁹⁴ Deuteronomy 28:58; 30:19-20; Proverbs 1:29; 8:13; Galatians 6:7-9

⁹⁵ Ezekiel 3:19-21; 34:1-12; Jeremiah 23:1-41

⁹⁶ Act 10:34-35

⁹⁷ 1Peter 5:2-4: "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

⁹⁸ John 6:66: "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." See Luke 4:28-29 - Jesus' 1st sermon.

"I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." ⁹⁹

This brings us to our summary and a question to every Preacher, do we "careth for the sheep". As the Chief Shepherd does and who has given them to us to tend as His under shepherd? Is so, then we must do as Jude admonishes:

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." 100

If we are to decide if inerrancy is a genuine concern for which God says we "should earnestly contend", we need only answer one question. Is it one of the foundational doctrines of the faith, like salvation? The answer is yes; because inerrancy is the doctrine which establishes the authenticity and authority of scripture, the foundation of our appeal to all the truths of the Word of God; including the Great Commission.

Is inerrancy part of "the counsel of God" which we're called to declare as Preachers? I believe most¹⁰¹ would agree that establishing the authenticity and authority the *copy* of scripture is paramount to the faith of the believer. Therefore, what is our response to the question when asked:

Where is the copy of the text of the Word of God kept by Divine Preservation which is identical, pure, inerrant; authentic as the original received by Divine Inspiration?

How do we answer this fundamental question?

We have two choices in how we answer:

1. 'Natural' approach – Naturalistic, Rationalistic one which represents man's way of understanding. This is the witness of *naturalistic* textual criticism which says, "we do not know", but we're trying very hard to find it. It approaches the Word of God from a neutral position, not taking into account the promises of Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation; hence why it is referred to a naturalistic. Rather choosing to walk by sight, in the light of science, demanding we produce empirical evidence for how we know we possess the 100% pure *copy* of the *original* text of the Word of God.

This approach represents a fig-leaf for unbelief, rooted in ignorance or *fear of man*. Why, because neither can our salvation be empirically demonstrated as Jesus told Nicodemus:

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." 102

Our salvation has more significance, yet we readily embrace the Word of God on this doctrine without asking for scientific evidence like Nicodemus, "*How can these things be?*" ¹⁰³ Why then, do we not embrace the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Word of God by the same simple faith we do the doctrine of salvation? This brings us to the next point.

100 Jude 1:3

⁹⁹ John 10:11-12

 $^{^{101}}$ See Appendix $\underline{\#1}$ on page 20: David C. Parker - The Living Text of the Gospels.

¹⁰² John 3:7-8

¹⁰³ John 3:9-10

2. 'Spiritual' approach – Theological, Faith-based one which represents God's way of understanding. This is the witness of the saints who walked by faith in light of the Word of God and affirm, "we do know and here it is", as identified in their Confessions of Faith; which embrace the doctrine of inerrancy which includes Divine Preservation of the copy, 100% pure.

If we're to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints", and faithfully preach, "all the counsel of God", then our witness on the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy must be; "The Bible I hold in my hand is the 100% pure, inerrant Word of God". How do we know; because, 'God says it, that settles it, whether I believe it are not!

It's not enough to affirm, "Everything God says is true".

While this is a good statement it's not complete. Nor is saying, "every word of God in this book is true", as we hold up the Bible. We all agree, every word of God is true, that's not the issue. The question is, "Where on earth is the Word of God", which neither of the above declarations adequately answer.

The question every Preacher need answer is, can we stand in our pulpits next Sunday morning, boldly lifting our Bible and unashamedly declare; "The Bible I hold in my hand is the 100% pure, inerrant Word of God". As 'Preachers', we ought to!

It's the mission of *Standard Bearers* is to help us do so, by understanding for ourselves the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy. Please see our resources found at the end of this paper. Let this be the year we begin casting the good seed of the Word of God on inerrancy; preaching the doctrines of Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation; "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." 104

We must not allow the fear of man to turn us aside us from the ways of God. 105

This Sunday morning while we're shaving, let's answer this question as we look ourselves in the mirror; how can we ask those whom we've been given to shepherd not to be afraid of the giants in their life, but look to God for strength and believe His Word; while we flee in fear in the face the false claims of *naturalistic* textual criticism; afraid to own the Word we're called to preach, for *fear of man*?

Right under the 'Preacher's nose', Satan is spoiling the faith of our flock ¹⁰⁶ in their lack of belief in the authenticity and authority of the Word of God. How is this being accomplished? It is done by binding the *strongman*, ¹⁰⁷ their shepherd with the cords of the *fear of man*, so we no longer cast the good seed of the Word of God regarding the doctrine of inerrancy. The words of Jesus are very applicable in this situation:

"When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth? 108

If we practiced the same lack of preaching on any other doctrine we would see similar confusion, unbelief and loss. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"; ¹⁰⁹ We have an example of the results of this negligence, in our lack of preaching the truths of the Word of God on family for fear of man. Therefore, like inerrancy, this doctrine has experienced the same disorder, skepticism and destruction along with those whom are ignorant to its truths, for which we as Preachers and shepherds of God's flock will give an account:

¹⁰⁵ Proverbs 3:5-8; 29:25

¹⁰⁴ Roman 10:17

¹⁰⁶ Article by the Barna Group entitled, "Christianity is no Longer Americans' Default Faith", (Jan 2009).

¹⁰⁷ Matthew 12:29-33 – "how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man?"

¹⁰⁸ Luke 18:8

¹⁰⁹ Romans 10:17

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children." ¹¹⁰

Let's follow our own counsel, and find sole consolation in God, not trusting in the arm of flesh,¹¹¹ embracing this reality; but by the grace of God we may leave this life a *'loser'* as it 'appeared' Apostle Paul did:

"At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." 112

May our prayer be that of Isaac Watts, penned in his hymn; ¹¹³ "Sure I must fight if I would reign; increase my courage, Lord. I'll bear the toil, endure the pain, supported by Thy Word."

† Let's worship Him, *More Love To Thee O Christ* (click on hymn video to play beautiful worship music)

God bless,

Louis M. Kole
Standard Bearers
louis.kole@standardbearers.net

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." Revelation 3:11

¹¹⁰ Hosea 4:6

^{111 2}Chronicles 32:8 – "With him is an arm of flesh; but with us is the LORD our God to help us, and to fight our battles." See 2Chronicles 16:9 – "For the eyes of the LORD run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him."

^{112 2}Timothy 4:16-18

¹¹³ Am I a Solider of the Cross, by Isaac Watts

End Note: #1 - Three Divine Warnings NOT to alter the Word of God (Click to return to page 11)

If God commands us not to alter His Word, does that not by necessity imply there's a preserved *copy* of His Word to be *known*, otherwise, how would we know whether or not we've changed it?

"Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you."

"Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and [from] the things which are written in this book." 114

Furthermore, the scriptures teach us, that God preserves His Word so we may know what it means, when Apostle Peter writes:

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." ¹¹⁵

When God says that "no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation", does that not by necessity imply there's an interpretation to be understood? What purpose would it serve for God to preserve His Word, if we could not understand what He was saying? God says we're not left to ourselves to understand His Word. The same Holy Spirit which gave it; keeps it; and will also reveal its truth to us as Apostle John says:

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew [it] unto you."

"But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." ¹¹⁶

The doctrine of inerrancy can be clearly understood from the scriptures, which was the witness of the saints in their Confessions. God expects us to *think* when we read the scriptures. One the three qualities we have as being made in the *'image of God'*, ¹¹⁷ is a intellect which we're given to reason in light of His character and mind as revealed in His Word.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

This is what Abraham, the 'father' of faith¹¹⁸ did, which brings us to End Note #2.

17

¹¹⁴ Deuteronomy 4:1-2; Proverbs 30:5-6 (see Psalms 12:6-7 on the duration of the purity of the Word of God); Revelation 22:18-19

 $^{^{115}}$ 2Peter 1:20-21

 $^{^{116}\,} John \ 16:13\text{-}14; \ 1 \ John \ 2:27$

¹¹⁷ Genesis 1:26-27; 9:6; 2Corinthians 4:4

¹¹⁸ Romans 4:16

End Note: #2 - Do the Math Principle (Click to return to page 11)

The principle of a loving Father's heart is helpful in understanding God and His Word. It can clear-up the fog of winding theological arguments. There are times we are called to 'calculate' in our relationship with God based on His character as a loving Father, whose word is sure and will lead us right. This is what Abraham did when God asked him to doing something seemingly contradictory to what he had been previously told by God.

"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." (Hebrews 11:17-19, see full story in Genesis 22)

It says Abraham did *accounting* when confronted with seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God. The Greek word used for *accounting* is translated, count in the New Testament five times and a synonym would be 'to calculate'. On what was Abraham counting or calculating to navigate these seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God? It was on the character of God Himself!

Abraham 'did the math'; taking inventory of God's character and came up with the right answer and response! If we follow Abraham's faith, and do the same when faced with seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God, we'll discover the right response as well!

Oswald Chambers has a very good quote on this point: "All our fret and worry is caused by calculating without God" ¹¹⁹ and in another place; "We have nothing to do with the afterwards of obedience". ¹²⁰ I might add, "Confusion is calculating without God" or as Dr. Charles Stanley states in number his #2 Life Principle, The Life of Obedience from his 30 Life Principles, "Obey God and leave all the consequences to Him".

This is easier to confess than to possess; it's a process. The starting point is to know that, "God hath said!" rather than wondering, "Hath God said?" This is why the issue of the doctrine of inerrancy is so vital to our faith; "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked"; 121 "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"; 122 "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him"; 123 "For we walk by faith, not by sight". 124 Selah

This is what Dr. Edward F. Hills¹²⁵ refers to as a *believing* versus a *neutral* approach to the Word of God. Meaning, we *do not* put aside what we know to be true about God and His Word and start with a *neutral* mind. What would have happened to Abraham's faith had he done that when God called him to offer Isaac, the seed of promise? Instead, the Bible says Abraham 'reckoned', meaning he '*did the math*', ¹²⁶ and kept God in the equation, in the '*loop*' of his thinking:

¹²² Romans 10:17

¹¹⁹ Oswald Chambers, My Utmost For His Highest, One of God's Great Don't, July 4

¹²⁰ Ibid, After Obedience-What?, July 28

¹²¹ Ephesians 6:16

¹²³ Hebrews 11:6

^{124 2}Corinthians 5:7

¹²⁵ Edward Freer Hills (1912-1981) was a respected Presbyterian scholar. Graduate of Yale University and earned the Th.B. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary, Th.M. degree from Columbia Theological Seminary. After doing doctoral work at the University of Chicago in New Testament textual criticism, he completed his program at Harvard, earning the Th.D. in this field. In 1956 he published *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript*, which devastated the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure.

126 See End note 1: 'Do the Math Principle'.

"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting [reckon, counted, 'did the math'] that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." 127

We do not put aside our faith at 'crunch-time', 128 that's when we are to lay hold to it with a firm hand as Abraham. Yet, naturalistic textual criticism seeks to convince us if we will only take God out of our equation we will find the original text by the means of 'science'. Therefore we're to ignore the promise of God to keep His Word 100% pure in the copy by the agency of; Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation and Divine Identification. This is the equivalent of going into battle without a sword, if I were Satan that would be plan A. On what basis does naturalistic textual criticism suggest we embrace such a position, when by employing this method for a century they have failed by their own admission? Dr. Hill addresses this thinking in his book, The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript, 129 as follows (emphasis mine):

Why should we Christians study the New Testament text from a neutral point of view rather than from a believing point of view? The answer usually given is that we should do this for the sake of unbelievers. We must start with the neutral point of view in order that later we may convert unbelievers to the orthodox, believing point of view. Sir Frederic Kenyon expressed himself to this effect as follows:

"It is important to recognize from the first that the problem is essentially the same, whether we are dealing with sacred or secular literature, although the difficulty of solving it, and likewise the issues depending on it are very different. It is important, if for no other reason, because it is only in this way that we can meet the hostile critics of the New Testament with arguments, the force of which they admit. If we assume from the first the supernatural character of these books and maintain that this affects the manner in which their text has come down to us, we can never convince those who start with a denial of that supernatural character. We treat them at first like any other books, in order to show at last that they are above and beyond all other books."

Dr. Hills rightly concludes, "if we adopt a **neutral** approach to knowledge, we will soon lose ourselves in a wilderness of details and grow more and more **chaotic** in our thinking." Does this not describe the state of naturalistic textual criticism in its efforts to recovery the original text of scripture with a neutral approach? Then why do 'conservative' seminaries and leaders continue to lead us down this path to no where? It's a sign of the profoundness of our error when we have to convince those once known as 'the people of the Book', who live in the so-called 'Buckle of the Bible-belt', that they possess the 100% pure Word of God in our copy of the scriptures, the Bible!

-

¹²⁷ Hebrew 11:17-19

¹²⁸ Merriam-Webster, "A critical moment or period when decisive action is needed."

¹²⁹ The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript, Chapter 4 (3)(g) 'New Testament Textual Criticism and Evangelism' (h) and 'Believing Bible Study on the Graduate Level-Christ and Grammar'.

Appendix: #1 - David C. Parker, The Living Text of the Gospels (Click to return to page 13)

David C. Parker is the Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology and the Director of the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at the Department of Theology and Religion, University of Birmingham. He is considered one of the world's foremost specialists in the study of the New Testament text and the manuscripts in which it was copied until the invention of printing.

Those who share his belief would probably take exception with my statement that establishing the authenticity of the *copy* of scripture is paramount. This is based on his following comments:

The gospels are "not archives of traditions but living texts,"^[74] and, therefore, "the concept of a Gospel that is fixed in shape, authoritative, and final as a piece of literature has to be abandoned."^[75] As he says elsewhere, "The [free] text indicates that to at least some early Christians, it was more important to hand on the spirit of Jesus' teaching than to remember the letter.... [T]he material about Jesus was preserved in an interpretive rather than an exact fashion."^[76] 130

"The text is changing. Every time that I make an edition of the Greek New Testament, or anybody does, we change the wording. We are maybe trying to get back to the oldest possible form but, paradoxically, we are creating a **new one.** Every translation is different, every reading is different, and although there's been a tradition in parts of Protestant Christianity to say there is a definitive single form of the text, the fact is you can never find it. There is never ever a final form of the text." 131

It's hard to miss where the erosion of the authenticity and authority of the Word of God is leading. The 'hemorrhaging' of New Testament Greek texts is due to this unbiblical view of man's restoration of the Word of God, rather than embracing the divine preservation of it copy. The remedy is to return to the Biblical doctrine of inerrancy which includes divine inspiration and divine preservation. If we do not return, then the above is perhaps where the naturalistic textual critics see the future, having failed in their high expectations of 'restoring' the Word of God to it original text.

Quotes by David C. Parker

Below is the fuller text from which quotes by Dr. Parker where taken, as contained in the article by E. Jay Epp, *The Multivalence Of The Term "Original Text" In New Testament Textual Criticism*, *Harvard Theological Review*, 1999, Volume 92, No. 3, pp. 245-281.

"My final example of a new current in the discussion of "original text" is the work of David Parker, who comes to this issue from a different perspective in his introductory volume, *The Living Text of the Gospels*.^[61]

Parker begins by challenging the common belief that "the purpose of textual criticism is to recover the original text," followed by a call to examine whether there is an original text to be recovered. [62] Indeed, this question is "the principal theme" of his book. [63]

But Parker does not eschew the "attempt to recover early text forms"; he does not,^[64] because such a search is "a necessary part of that reconstruction of the history of the text without which ... nothing can be understood."^[65]

¹³⁰ E. Jay Epp, *The Multivalence Of The Term "Original Text" In New Testament Textual Criticism*. Harvard Theological Review, 1999, Volume 92, No. 3, pp. 245-281. Footnotes in brackets are from his article.

¹³¹ David C Parker, BBC Radio 4 programme "The Oldest Bible". http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_C._Parker#cite_note-BBC-0.

Yet Parker does distinguish the recovery of "earlier forms of the text" from the "original," asserting that "it does not follow that it is also necessary to recover a single original text." [66] He states, "The question is not whether we can recover it, but why we want to." [67]

To the question "whether the task of textual criticism is to recover the original text," Parker replies, "[I]t may be, but does not have to be,"[68] and he chooses not to emphasize and often not to seek a single original.

Parker affirms that the most dramatic changes in the text occurred in the first 150 years -- "initial fluidity followed by stability."^[71] Hence, he characterizes the text of the gospels "as a free, or perhaps, as a living, text,"^[72] and he asks again "whether the attempt to recover a single original text is consonant with the character of a free manuscript tradition."^[73]

The gospels are "not archives of traditions but living texts,"[74] and, therefore, "the concept of a Gospel that is fixed in shape, authoritative, and final as a piece of literature has to be abandoned."[75] As he says elsewhere, "The [free] text indicates that to at least some early Christians, it was more important to hand on the spirit of Jesus' teaching than to remember the letter.... [T]he material about Jesus was preserved in an interpretive rather than an exact fashion."[76]

This conclusion bears on Parker's second reason for choosing not to pursue an original text, one that arises out of important cases where the readings in a variation unit are multiple and do not yield an easily determined original reading, or to any plausible original at all.

Parker's bold statements carry us beyond merely the issue of multiple "originals" to a firm deemphasis on the necessity or desirability of seeking a single "original text" of the New Testament or a single "original" reading in a given variation unit." 132

Excerpts on the meaning of Multivalence in relation to the Original Text of Scripture

from - The Multivalence Of The Term "Original Text" In New Testament Textual Criticism, by E. Jay Epp Harvard Theological Review, 1999, Volume 92, No. 3, pp. 245-281.

The Use of the Term "Original Text" Past and Present and Its Multivalence

It is not only appropriate but helpful to place any discussion of original text in its historical and disciplinary setting. Two phases may be identified in the evolving understanding of "original text," one that may be designated simply as the past, and another that may be characterized as a current, emerging use of the term, though there were preparatory developments for this latter phase that require elucidation as well.

An Emerging Use of "Original Text"

Now, if the goal of textual criticism is to recover the most likely "original" text, what in actuality is the object of textual critics' research -- a text of the gospels that is somewhat earlier than but very likely similar to the text of the earliest manuscripts, or a text of even earlier and now largely lost predecessor forms of these gospels'?

¹³² The Multivalence Of The Term "Original Text" In New Testament Textual Criticism. By E. Jay Epp, Harvard Theological Review, 1999, Volume 92, No. 3, pp. 245-281.

In other words, textual critics face two or more questions rather than one: first, a prior question as to which Mark (or John, or Corinthian letters, or Ephesians, etc.) is "original," followed by the more traditional inquiry as to which variant readings of a particular work are "original." More clearly than before, the multivalence of the term "original text" emerges and confronts textual critics with its complexity.

Have We Moved Beyond the Legitimate Domain of Textual Criticism?

The explorations exemplified in these lists -- and numerous others that might be added -- directly and indirectly invoke the multivalence of the term "original text" and thereby enrich the text-critical discipline by opening the way for fresh insights from the varying interpretations of early Christian thought and life that they reveal.

Moreover, recognizing the multivalence of "original text" ensures that New Testament textual criticism will certainly diminish and possibly relinquish its myopic concentration on an elusive and often illusive target of a single original text. Clearly, for some, these investigations of both predecessor and successor compositional activities will challenge not only the traditional object, but also the customary boundaries of New Testament textual criticism; yet, that challenge should be understood as expanding our horizons and making the discipline more broadly relevant than previously to related fields, such as literary-critical, hermeneutical, and church-historical studies.

The Relation of an Elusive, Multivalent "Original Text" to the Concept of "Canon"

Text and canon have been treated together for generations, as scores of books and encyclopedia articles will attest, but more often than not their relationship has been one merely of juxtaposition rather than of interaction.^[91]

Our concern here is not so much with the long-standing and quite static juxtaposition of the two fields, but with the parallels or interaction between canon and text in the sphere of "authority." "Canon" by nature embraces authority, for it involves "measure," or "standard" -- something measured and meeting a standard. When a Jewish or Christian writing has been measured and accepted as canonical (whether formally by leaders in a given region or informally in the life of a community), that writing and its text acquire authority.

The "original text" of the New Testament -- in its common understanding -- also has been viewed as authoritative, and this point at which canon and text cross paths gives rise to penetrating questions. One example might be, if "original" is multivalent, can "canon" escape multivalence?

As noted, this Appendix draws upon the article, - The Multivalence Of The Term "Original Text" In New Testament Textual Criticism, by E. Jay Epp Harvard Theological Review, 1999, (Volume 92, No. 3, pp. 245-281), presented at the New Testament Textual Criticism Section, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida November 1998. An earlier exploration of several of the issues appeared in an excursus on "The Intersection of Textual Criticism and Canon" (73-91) in Eldon Jay Epp, "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon," in Stanley E. Porter, ed., Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament (NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 45-97. The author wishes to thank ElDoris B. Epp, Ph.D., for her critique and suggestions at crucial points in the writing of this article. http://www.islamic-awareness.org/Bible/Text/original.html,

Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

Vision

It is the mission of Standard Bearers to present the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy; teaching the Bible is 100% pure; inerrant in the copy which we hold in our hands today. Our goal is to strengthen the faith of Pastors, Teachers and Laymen in the authenticity and authority of the 100% pure, inerrant Word of God, knowing ~ "So then faith cometh by hearing, hearing by the word of God" (Roman 10:17).

Share

Prayerful consider using the resources contained in the Standard Bearers Browser (next two pages) for: your Sermon preparation, Bible Study class, to forward to others and post to your Social media. For more, go to the Standard Bearers home page (www.standardbearers.net) for an overview of the Biblical and Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy. For another quick read see, Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation~ The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement.

Teaching

For a presentation by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, Ph.D. Th.D. on any of these topics: Chronology of the Old Testament; Creation & Evolution, Science & the Bible, The Identity of the Text of the New Testament or The Biblical & Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy, please contact me; Louis Kole at, kolelm@gmail.com.

Exhort

You can know for yourself the identity of the 100% pure; inerrant, preserved copy of the Word of God by the aid of the Holy Spirit; the Author, Superintendent and Teacher of the Word of God. This is the promise of God and the witness of the saints.

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew [it] unto you." (John 16:13-14)

"But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (1 John 2:27)

Francis Turretin¹ 1623-1687 (brackets and emphasis mine):

"By **original** texts, we do not mean the **autographs** [originals] written by the hand of Moses, of the prophets and the apostles, which certainly do not now exist. We mean their **apographs** ² [perfect copy; genuine original; 'authentical'] which are so called because they set forth to us the word of God in the very words of those who wrote under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit."3

God bless.

Louis M Kole

Hymn ~ Come, Gracious Spirit- Heavenly Dove!

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." (Revelation 3:11)

¹Gerstner, called Turretin, "the most precise theologian in the Calvinistic tradition." Turretin on Justification' an audio series by John Gerstner (1914-1996) a Professor of Church History at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and Knox Theological Seminary.

² Apograh means "a perfect copy, an exact transcript". This is the same witness of the authors of the Westminster Confession when they described their copy of the Word of God as 'authentical', which Webster's 1828 dictionary defines as "having a genuine original".

³ Turretin, Institutes of Elenctic Theology, (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1992 reprint), 1:106, See also Robert Barnett, "Francis Turretin on the Holy Scriptures," a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Dean Burgon Society held at Calvary Baptist Church, Ontario, Canada, in 1995.

Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

Resources

Enjoy the following works provided by *Standard Bearers* on the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy. I encourage you to share these documents by using the link, since they're being regularly updated.

Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones

• Works of Dr Jones

Works is a PDF portfolio of *all* the Works of Dr. Jones listed below (except the charts from his Chronology of the Old Testament). **Please allow a moment for this PDF portfolio to open**.

- An Analytical Red Letter Chronology of the Life of Christ as Revealed in the 4 Gospels and placed in a Harmony Format: A Return to the Historical Text Dr Floyd Nolen Jones PhD ThD
- The Gospel Colophons and the Synoptic Problem Dr Floyd Nolen Jones PhD ThD
- The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis
- Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Basics

In this book, Dr. Jones provides a systematic framework of the chronology of the Bible from Genesis through the life of Christ and it comes with a CD containing 14 chronology charts. In addition, a set of full-size prints can be obtained at: A&E-The Graphics Complex (713) 621-0022; 4235 Richmond Avenue, Houston, Texas 77027; Reference Quote Number: IQ9209 (Floyd Jones Charts).

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' Chronology of the Old Testament

- ♦ The Length of the Sojourn in Egypt ~ Chapter 4 excerpt (p.54)
- 40 Years after What? The date of Absalom's Rebellion ~ Chapter 5 excerpt (p.105)
- ♦ Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) Age 8 or 18? ~ Chapter 6 excerpt (p.202)

• Chronology Charts by Dr. Jones

The Chronology Charts is a PDF portfolio of *all* the Charts by Dr. Jones from his book, Chronology of the Old Testament. Please allow a moment for the PDF portfolio to open.

Individual Charts by Dr. Jones from, Chronology of the Old Testament

- ♦ Chart 1 ~ Creation to Jesus Christ
- ♦ Chart 2 ~ Jacob's Age Determined
- ♦ Chart 3 ~ 430 Years Sojourn
- ♦ Chart 3A ~ The 4 Generations of Genesis
- ♦ Chart 3B ~ Scenarios for Judah's Family in Egypt
- ♦ Chart 3CDEF ~ Jacob and Judah
- ♦ Chart 4 ~ Judges to the First 3 Kings
- ♦ Chart 4AB ~ Judges Tested by Judah's Lineage
- ♦ Chart 5 ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy
- ♦ Chart 5A ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy
- ♦ Chart 5C ~ Kings of the Divided Monarchy
- ♦ Chart 6 ~ Creation to Creator
- ♦ Chart 7 ~ 390 Years Confirmed

• Which Version is the Bible?

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' Which Version Is The Bible?

- ♦ Mark 16 last Verses ~ Chapter 2 (p.30)
- ♦ The 1881 Revision KJB ~ Chapter 3 (p.49)
- ♦ How Princeton Was Corrupted ~ Chapter 8 (p.186)
- ♦ How the Conservative Seminaries Were Corrupted ~ Chapter 8 (p.189)
- ♦ The Criticism Today: The Age of Miniscules ~ Chapter 9 (p.202)
- ♦ Pericope De Adultera John 8 ~ Appendix A (p.219)
- ♦ The Johannine Comma 1John 5 ~ Appendix B (p.231)
- ♦ Examples of Modern Criticism ~ Appendix C (p.241)
- ♦ History of Texts Transmission ~ Appendix D (p.247)

Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

Louis M Kole

• Works of Louis M Kole

Works is a PDF portfolio of *all* the papers by Louis Kole listed below. Please allow a moment for this PDF portfolio to open.

- How We Know The Bible Is True: 100% Pure, Inerrant
 - ~ The Biblical and Historical Doctrine of Inerrancy (standard bearers home page)
- Letter To A Pastor: How Shall They Hear Without A Preacher?
 - ~So then Faith Cometh By Hearing, and Hearing By the Word of God (custodianship of the Word of God)
- Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic
 - ~ <u>Believing</u> or <u>Neutral</u> to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification (textual criticism)
- Preaching and Loss: Peer Pressure and the Fear of the Lord
 - ~ Why the Tempest? The Foolishness of Preaching (the duty of a watchman)
- Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation
 - ~ The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement (overview in a nutshell)
- Divine Preservation: How We 'Lost' the Doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the Word of God
 - ~ 3 Centuries of Sound Doctrine ~ Eradicated in 3 Generations of Neglect (the error)
- God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative
 - ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God (proof texts & state of our witness)
- The Fear of The Lord: Restoring the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy
 - ~ The Fear of Man verses the Fear of the Lord (flagship paper)
- A Call To Revival: Restoring the Foundations
 - ~ If the Foundations Be Destroyed What Can the Righteous Do? ("hath God said?")
- The Josiah Initiative: Countering The Assault Upon the Inerrancy of the Word of God
 - ~ How are the Mighty Fallen and the Weapons of War Perished! (a call to action)
- The 'Lost' Doctrine: Can A Doctrine 'Die' Which Is a Fundamental Truth of the Faith?
 - ~ The 1000 Year 'Death and Rebirth' of the Doctrine of Justification by Grace Alone (lesson from the past)

Dr. Jeffrey Khoo

• Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology (FEBC) a must read

Dr. Edward F Hills

- ullet Scholasticism Versus the Logic of Faith \sim Excerpt from A History of My Defence of the King James Version (FEBC)
- The King James Version Defended

Dr. Wilbur N Pickering

- What Is Eclecticism? ~ Excerpt from The Identity of the New Testament Text
- The Identity of the New Testament Text

More...

- Bible audio
- Songs ~ Hymns of Worship from the Standard Bearers' play list
- Bible teaching ~ Audio by Dr Floyd Nolen Jones
- Bible teaching ~ TV by Dr Floyd Nolen Jones from the Standard Bearers' channel
- Bible teaching ~ TV by Dr Charles Stanley
- Bible resources ~ Blue Letter Bible digital Bible and study tools
- Dictionary ~ Noah Webster's 1828 Digital dictionary
- Devotional ~ Oswald Chamber's My Utmost for His Highest

Hymn ~ We Rest on Thee, Our Shield and Our Defender!

"Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." (Revelation 3:11)