

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1043 – October 24, 2010 – Doctrine Of Infallibility Arguments

What I'm going to do today is construct an argument of why Jesus couldn't have made technical errors. Matt 11:25-27. All these arguments are interrelated. Once again this shows you that you can't pick and choose with the Bible. The Bible is an integral whole. In Matt 11:25 Jesus is praying to the Father. This is an interesting prayer, verses 25-27, what we're getting in on here is an intra-Trinity conversation. We're actually permitted to see the Father and the Son discussing something. He says, verse 25, "...I praise You, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that You have hidden these things from the wise and intelligent and have revealed them to infants. ²⁶"Yes, Father, for this way was well-pleasing in Your sight. ²⁷"All things have been handed over to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father except the Son, and anyone to whom the Son wills to reveal *Him*." Then He says, verse 28, "Come to Me, all who are weary and heaven-laden, and I will give you rest." We want to notice in verse 27 that "All things have been handed over to Me," in other words, what Jesus is saying here is I'm very much greater than all of the OT prophets. I'm greater than Moses, I'm greater than Isaiah, I'm greater than John the Baptist. Remember what John the Baptist said? The one coming after me is greater than I, His sandals I'm not fit to untie. That's the first point in the argument. Who is Christ greater than? All the OT prophets. In the OT a prophet could have made technical mistakes and could very well have been ignorant, except when he wrote God's word. What does Micah say when he's ready and he's prepared to address the people of his time? He says "The word of the Lord came to me," and then he revealed the word of the Lord to them. So when the OT prophet spoke the word of the Lord they were infallible, that's when they were writing the word of God, but hanging out on Thursday night at the bowling alley they were not necessarily infallible. However, the Lord Jesus, because He was God, was infallible through His whole life; at a wedding, at a

feast, at home, not just when the word of the Lord came to Him because He was the word of the Lord. The word of the Lord doesn't come to Jesus; He is the word of the Lord. So that means that He has to be infallible as a total person. The OT prophets only had to be infallible when they were giving the word of the Lord, writing Scripture; but the Lord Jesus had to be infallible all the time.

In the OT the prophets had a function. Let's go back to Deuteronomy because the role of the prophet is outlined there. We want to be sure we picture correctly what the OT prophets were like. The word "prophet" in the Hebrew is *nabi*, the *nabiim*. This was a class of individuals that followed Moses. Notice Deut 18:18, God announces that "I will raise up a prophet from among their countrymen," so is he Gentile or Jewish? He's Jewish. "...like you," who's "you?" Moses. So Moses becomes the archetype of the prophet. The prophets that follow are like Moses. "...and I will put My words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him." Notice the phrase, "I will put My words in his mouth," that is something no genuine intellectual who's well-schooled in the climate of thinking around us, familiar with the 20th century theory of languages, could ever accept. Because in the intellectual climate around us the idea that God can speak to man in human language that can convey anything absolute, inerrant and true has been totally rejected. And it infects authors, it infects the media, it infects the classroom, it infects academia, it infects books that are written. All language is on par with your dog barking, it's just whatever happens to be jostling around your brain and comes out your mouth. That's what language is, it's all relative. But this challenge says that God takes a thought from His omniscience and packages it in human language of the prophet so it can be spoken to man.

That's an amazing thing. How can God take a thought from His mighty omniscience, put it in a finite package, inject it into the mouth of the prophet so the guy speaks it. But we don't have time for the Bible today, too busy doing other things. However He does that is what's being discussed in Deut 18:18. The prophets that followed Moses would speak the words of God, not because they thought up the words, but because the words were put in their mouth. Does that mean that every prophet heard a tape recording of some spooky voice and that's how he got the word of God? No, that's necessarily what it means. It means all of the ways that God has open to the prophet, (it

could be someone talking to him, it could be a thought happen, it could be through research), He works the channels and He gets the message through on a clear channel so that in the final analysis, what comes out of the mouth of the prophet is what God speaks from heaven.

There had to be some verification for this. In verse 20, obviously you have a serious issue involved. “The prophet who shall speak a word presumptuously in My name which I have commanded him to speak, or which he shall speak in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die.” So there’s a capital offense involved. This prophet business is heavy stuff; we’re talking about getting out the rocks. As one of my seminary profs said, we’re going to have a rock concert if he’s guilty. This is capital punishment.

Verse 21 says, “And you may say in your heart, ‘How shall we know the word which the LORD has not spoken?’” Suppose this is you, you’re called in for a capital crimes case, and you say, gee, how am I going to decide, I don’t know a true prophet from a false prophet, how do I know, how do I decide? You might be called to give your two cents why you think this guy’s a phony, or why do you think he’s genuine. What are you going to say? Moses says here’s what you do. There’s actually two tests given, one here and one in Deut 13, but the test here is given in verse 22, “When a prophet speaks in the name of the LORD, if the thing does not come about or come true, that is the thing which the LORD has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously; you shall not be afraid of him.” That little verb “not be afraid” tells you something else about a prophet. If he was a genuine prophet and the word of the Lord had come to him and he speaks it, you better be afraid in the sense this is God’s word and you salute and say “Yes Sir” to God. You might not like the prophet; he might have been weird, most of them were. A lot of people didn’t like John the Baptist, he ate strange things, he wore funny clothes, and he lived out in the desert all by himself. Not a popular guy socially, but it didn’t make any difference. If God had spoken His word through this kind of guy, then you’re not saying the guy is totally infallible, remember that. This is not a claim that the prophets were infallible in every detail of life like Jesus was. All this is the words that he spoke that he said were the Lords had to be followed, that’s all.

So one rule of evidence, verse 22, is that you had to have 100% fulfillment, not 98%, not 14%, but 100%. Notice, this is a negative test. It says if the thing does *not* come about or come true, that is the thing which the LORD has not

spoken. It doesn't say, if the thing does come about or come true that is a thing which the LORD has spoken. That's not the test. Most people think the test is if a person says something will happen and it happens they're a true prophet. That's not true. I predict the stock market will fall tomorrow and it does, does that make me a true prophet? No. But if I predict something and I get it wrong then I surely am not a prophet. That's the test, it's a negative test. People can make correct predictions, we've all done that, but a true prophet was different in that he always made correct predictions, always, 100% of the time, not 89%, 100%.

The other standard of evidence is in Deut. 13. Deut 13:1, "If a prophet or a dreamer of dreams arises among you and gives you a sign or a wonder," now look at this, ²"and the sign or the wonder comes true," aha, well if it comes true, isn't that proof that the prophet is true? Think about this point of logic here. If I say to you that a false prophecy implies a false prophet, if you've had some training in logic you realize you can't infer from that statement that if a prophecy comes true that proves the prophet is true. The Bible is very, very careful here. Deut 18 says that if the prophecy something and it doesn't come true they're false. That doesn't say anything about if the prophecy comes true. You've got to be careful. All that statement says is that false prophets make false prophecies. It doesn't say that false prophets can't make true prophecies. Deut 13 answers the question, well, what if it does come to pass. If it does come to pass, how do I know if he's a true prophet? What other test do I have left? There's another kind of evidence in this case. "If the sign or the wonder comes true, concerning which he spoke to you, saying, 'Let us go after other gods (whom you have not known) and let us serve them,' ³you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams; for the LORD your God is testing you to find out if you love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul." The point is in verse 2 where it says "Let us go after other gods," it looks like it's a quote but quotes in the Bible are sometimes summary quotes, and it's the essence of they're theology. The idea of that expression is not that the false prophet is going to march up and down main street saying, don't worship the God of the Bible, let's go worship Satan. It's not that obvious; they're not stupid. The sense of it is that if we think through the teachings of this person which way are we led, to love the God of the Scriptures or not? And how are you going to tell that? By looking at the Scriptures. So we're back to the Bible. If the prophecy does come to pass, you have to subject the proclaimed prophet to

another test, what is this person teaching? Is his teaching compatible with prior revelation or not?

So you've got one test in Deut 18; you've got the Deut 13 test, and those are the two tests. And those are the two tests that reappear in the NT in places like Matt 7 and 1 John 4. The logic is the same; it doesn't change from the OT to the NT. But there's some hard, objective base for judging here. Notice what is not said in any of these statements. It doesn't say how do you feel about this person? Do they give you a sense of peace? There's no emotional feeling, there's nothing like that here. This is all cold, hard, objective evidence, the same kind of thing that we would see in the rules of evidence in a court room. That's not to say there aren't feelings, that's not to say that people don't have feelings, it's just saying the feelings aren't how you decide. It's the teachings, whether they fit the standard of Scripture, with a logical consistency with the Bible, and the test of whether the thing predicted fails to come to pass.

Coming back to the topic, we're looking the OT prophets. These OT prophets had to meet that test, and if they did they were the prophet and they would be considered infallible. Turn to Deut 32 to see the technical details issue. When these guys made a prophecy, what were they prophesying about? We covered this passage; this was a foundation part of the Mosaic Law, and this could be looked upon as sort of like our Star Spangled Banner. It's a song, and it was taught to the people. Look at the verse just prior to Deut 32:1, the last verse of the previous chapter says "Then Moses spoke in the hearing of all the assembly of Israel the words of this song, until they were complete." Then if you go to 32:44, "Then Moses came and spoke all the words of this song in the hearing of the people, he, with Joshua the son of Nun. ⁴⁵When Moses had finished speaking all these words to Israel, ⁴⁶he said to them," notice what he says about his song, "Take to your heart all the words with which I am warning you today, which you shall command your sons to observe carefully, even all the words of this law. ⁴⁷For it is not an idle word for you; indeed it is your life."

Moses is telling them that you have to listen and pay attention to the content of this song. What is the content of the song? The content, unlike our Star Spangled Banner, which reports a historical event that happened in the Baltimore Harbor, doesn't report a historical event in the way we normally think of history as a past event. Their Star Spangled Banner predicts the

future, history in advance. Think of this. The nation Israel's Star Spangled Banner predicted the nation's future to a T. So this song is a prophetic national anthem. Our national anthem is not a prophetic national anthem and frankly we might not want to know what the future holds for our nation. The handwriting is on the wall. But in the prophetic part of this song, look what is said here. Deut 32:15, up to verse 15 it's talking about all the blessings that God gave the nation. Everything up to verse 14 is history, the nation's past. It's the story of what? The Exodus and the Conquest. But then it shifts in verse 15 to the future, "But Jeshurun grew fat and kicked—You are grown fat, thick, and sleek—Then he forsook God who made him, and scorned the Rock of his salvation. ¹⁶They made Him jealous with strange gods; with abominations they provoked Him to anger. ¹⁷They sacrificed to demons who were not God," now isn't that interesting. Paul says the same thing when he talks about the communion service and how communion service can be dedicated to demons when it's done under false teaching, because who are the authors, the instigators of false teaching? Satan and his hordes. So in effect what happens is that where deceitful and false teaching exists and comes into the church, you're taking communion to demons; they're really the center of your worship. So he says you're really sacrificing to demons, "to gods whom they have not known, new gods who came lately, whom your fathers did not dread. ¹⁸You neglected the Rock who begot you, and forgot the God who gave you birth." See, you forgot history, you forgot what God did for you at the Exodus and Conquest and they were to remember, pass it on father to son, father to son, always to remember. What are we to do in communion? Remember, and how do we remember? We teach history, the cross work of Jesus Christ, we don't forget it lest we worship demons in communion.

And then it goes on to say certain things. It says in verse 23-24, "I will heap misfortunes on them; I will use My arrows on them," what are God's arrows? He lists these arrows in verse 24, one is famine, one is plague, one is bitter destruction, one is teeth of beasts, one is the venom of crawling things out of the dust, one is talking about the enemy, soldiers, military conquests, verses 26-27. God is saying that He is going to rule His kingdom and He will not tolerate disobedience and disloyalty in His kingdom. And if it happens, then discipline; He's going to lower the boom.

If you go back to Deut 32:1 and notice the language, the song when it was sung was sung before witnesses. That's the picture. Somebody else beside Israel and God are listening to this. They really are; and it's the same thing in the NT when it says the angels watch and learn from the Church. We are being watched; we are in a fish bowl and we can't see outside the fish bowl but we can be seen in the fish bowl. It's kind of unnerving actually, if you think about it. Other creatures of God's universe are looking at us; they must be wondering how does God put up with these people, good grief! But they are looking at us and learning peculiar things... the wisdom of God I guess, from what we do. They look and see all our mistakes, all our sins and how God handles us. But in verse 1 when it says "Give ear, O heavens, and let me speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth," these aren't just little metaphors, poetic metaphors of the earth and the heavens. This is talking about the beings that inhabit the earth and the heavens. Where do we see the beings that inhabit the earth and the heavens? In the book of Revelation. When the prophecies are given to the angel of the sun and the sun physically responds by upping the voltage and the heat of the sun is intensified. It's interesting, if you read the passage it's not just the physics of the solar disc that are involved there, there's an angel addressed who changes the physics, which is a peculiar and very non-scientific view of the universe, that behind these laws that we think we've got grasp on because we can write $F=MA$ and we say oh how brilliant am I, behind that is the fact that these so called laws, laws that we can describe in mathematical equations, are actually manipulated by angelic powers operating under the word of God. Just because they work this way here, today, doesn't mean they always operated like that or that in the future they will operate like that. No, when God speaks to the powers that are controlling nature things can change, there's mutability inside the creation. This isn't pagan animism, don't mistake this. In pagan thought they didn't believe in any law outside at all, they just believed there were spirits of the air, spirits of this, spirits of potato plants. In order to be blessed in your life you had to placate all the spirits. That's animism. That's not what we're saying. We're saying this is an orderly universe, run by the sovereign word of God. These powers and principalities have to get permission through His sovereign word. Back of all His word is controlling. It's not demons doing this autonomously. Our God is in control. The keys of the kingdom have gone to Jesus Christ. So He reigns, the Lord reigns. But that isn't to say that He doesn't use means to accomplish His ends that He's doing in reigning. So if the book of Revelation is read in any

kind of straightforward fashion, you have to accept that the physics of the environment can be tampered with, and in fact, may be supported all the time by God's angels. And when He wants to manipulate He just tells one of them, go manipulate, and he does it. The book of Revelation, go manipulate the physics of the solar sphere, turn on some more hydrogen or something, heat it up. Okay, boom, it's done. That's so mysterious to our human minds, we don't think that way because we're not trained in our educational systems to visualize the universe in those terms. But that's what's happening.

Keep that in mind and turn to Isaiah 1:2, one of the prophets of the OT.

Isaiah was sent... we said the role of the prophet was a prosecuting attorney, because the prophet brought God's case against the nation when they had violated this covenant. And when the prosecuting attorney brings his case, he's doing it not just before the judge, but he's doing it before the witnesses. Who are the witnesses? Who is it that Isaiah...way, way, way after Moses, who does he address here? "Listen, O heavens, and hear, O earth; for the LORD speaks; 'Sons I have reared up and brought up, but they have revolted against Me. ³An ox knows its owner, and a donkey its master's manger, but Israel does not know, my people do not understand," they're worse than animals, these people.

It's an appeal to the angels, and the issue is, has God been faithful to His covenant. The answer: yes! Has man been faithful to the covenant? No! How do you prove that? Here's Isaiah, let's say in the 7th century BC, here's Moses in the 14th century BC, many centuries have come and gone, we have an indictment here, we have the original contract here. What is the proof of the statements Isaiah makes? How would he make the case? The case is made by citing specific historical acts of disobedience. What does the rest of the book of Isaiah do? It records history. History is the record, it's His story. That's why the genealogies are in Scripture, that's why the stone monuments are in Scripture, that's why the tribal land boundaries are in Scripture, all those details we wonder, what is this in here for, all we can guess is it's there to put me to sleep, but it's in there because it deals with contracts, the historical outworking of the contracts in Scripture; land, events, ancestry. How else do you build a case? Are we or are we not in the realm of historical and technical details? Sure we are. The case can't be made without reference to historical details. So how can you say that the prophets made mistakes in the area of historical details and hold on to their ethics? How do you separate, if you've

got historical errors intermingled with ethics, the ethics from the error. We want to hold on to this ethics stuff because that helps me with my life, but we eschew the historicity of the events the ethics come out of.

So the OT prophet had to get involved in history and details to carry out his role when he wrote prophecy. By the way, who is it that wrote all the historical books of the Bible? The first book in history, it wasn't Herodotus and Thucydides like I learned when I went to high school and took a history course, those were not the first historians. The first historians were the prophets of Israel, and they wrote history, not as a neutral academic exercise because they had nothing else to do. They wrote it because there's a purpose and a plan to history and it speaks of God and His plan and His sovereignty, and His faithfulness. That's the motive for writing history.

I think that's why many of you probably have had this happen to you personally, that it wasn't until you became a Christian that you really began to get interested in history. What turned on the switch? Some of you may have a lot of academic training in history, but there's a passion to know history that often times accompanies intellectual arrogance but the true motive for learning history is we want to know the neat things that God has done because we know that behind all the neat things is a very majestic God. And we worship Him and we stand in awe of Him, and we do so because we see how He pulled things off. That's the motive for studying history. That's what drives the passion; it's not cranking out a test two weeks from now to memorize every date between 1700 and 1900. That's not the motive for this stuff.

Now let's come to Jesus Christ. Jesus is greater than the OT prophets. So instead of just being infallible here, because of His hypostatic union, everything He says is infallible. Those are the earthly things. And when, therefore, Jesus Christ gives historical and scientific data it is just as true as when He gives faith and ethics data. There's no split and somehow I have to separate the historical and scientific from the faith and ethics. In Matt 19 He deals with divorce and He builds His argument on Gen 1-2. In Matt 23 He's talking about His return in history, the culmination and climax of history, and He relates it back to Abel in Gen 4. In Matt 24 the same thing, He links His return in visible history to the times of Noah, Gen 6-8. In Luke 27 He talks about the Mosaic authorship of the Law that no scholar today basically

accepts; conservative, godly scholars do, but I'm talking about the academia as a whole.

These are technical historic details, now are we going to believe what the Lord said or not? If He's mixed up here we've got some serious, serious problems about trusting anything else the Lord Jesus Christ says. If you've got a blubbering idiot for a Savior, He's not much of a Savior.

Let's go on to another passage in the NT, 1 Cor 15 because Paul carries on this same logic. Here Paul is testifying to the resurrection of Christ. Verse 12 is another key passage. I said one of the key passages is John 3:11-12, but here is another good passage to remind yourself whenever you want to review this and think about it again and ask the Lord for insight and understanding, go to this passage. This is a neat one, because it's so thoroughly honest. Look what he says. "Now if Christ is preached, that He has been raised from the dead," that's the gospel, "how do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" The people in the Corinthian church, they're like Christians that believe the Bible, errors and all. Well, now Paul was a nice man, you know, he was for missions and we believe in missions here, it's just that we don't buy some of the things Paul says. You know, we're good Greeks and Greeks just have a hard time accepting resurrections. So I don't think that we ought to preach the resurrection; that offends Greek people. So they denied the resurrection, and there was a party inside the church, this isn't unbelievers outside the church, these are people inside the church that fundamentally rejected the gospel. He says how can you be saying "that there is no resurrection of the dead? ¹³If there is no resurrection of the dead, not even Christ has been raised." Now watch how he traps them. He starts with their argument, it's like jiu-jitsu, somebody throws a punch and you take the punch further than they originally wanted and pin them flat on their face. This is what Paul is going to do now. He says okay you guys, you're so smart, so let's see how smart you are. If you deny the resurrection "then," the syllogism begins, "Christ has not been raised." Verse 14, "And if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is vain, your faith also is in vain." And in verse 15 he goes on to say (and now we have an ethical contradiction. See where we're going? We're moving from a technical error to an ethical consequence.) ¹⁵"Moreover we are even found to be false witnesses of God, because we witnessed against God that He raised Christ, whom He did not raise, if in fact the dead are not raised." Isn't there something in the Bible

about bearing false witness? Oh, ethics. So you see you can't mess with the historical and technical details lest you wind up tripping all over the place in the ethical details, now you're guilty of bearing false witness.

If that applies to Paul, it certainly applies to the Lord Jesus Christ, because Christ in His hypostatic union is bearing witness, bearing witness, bearing witness. Everything He said, everything He did, bearing witness, bearing witness, bearing witness. And He makes mistakes? What kind of a witness bearing is that? Jesus is a false witness if Jesus made technical mistakes.

Here's another point we want to make today before we finish. If this gives you trouble, don't feel bad about it, just take some time to think about it, it will pay dividends over and over in conversation after conversation you have with people. Here's the argument: infallibility can never be denied. What happens is that infallibility is relocated from God to men. If you deny infallibility of Scripture, you're placing the standard somewhere. Right? Because now if the Scripture has errors in it, who tells you which are errors and which aren't? Where's the infallible standard now? It moved to man didn't it? It moves from the Scripture to man. See the move? It's like a magician's trick: he has you looking over here and meanwhile his hand is doing something else over there. Keep your eyes over here. What's going on? Infallibility has been relocated. This is useful, sometimes you might be able to use this in a conversation, somebody pooh-poohs the Bible and you say well, an infallible Bible may sound silly but I'll tell you what sounds sillier is that a person like you can be infallible. Let's look at this a little bit. Dewey Beegle and many evangelicals say that the Bible is infallible "in all essential matters of faith and practice." So what they're saying is that the Bible is correct when it deals with matters of faith and practice only. Who qualifies what's essential and what isn't? Dewey Beegle and many evangelicals do.

"Some evangelical proponents of errancy say that the texts relating to women's roles in the church and at home in passages such as 1 Tim 2, 1 Cor 11, Eph 5 and Tit 2 are wrong. They deal with an outdated cultural situation. "I'm not endorsing some position right now but I am saying that evangelicals are writing these off and we can't do that. We can't just say, well, that was a cultural thing. And the reason we can't write it off is because they're just like Jesus' argument against divorce in Matt 19, they're all built on the historicity of Genesis. They're not built on culture, they're built on history. So we're back

to practice intermingled with history, not just faith and practice. Professor Paul Jewett, another one of our errant evangelical brethren says that's technically wrong, that's just a technical error that crept into Paul. Oh, that's good to know. Now how do I decide what's a technical error and what's not? If it applies to 50% of every congregation, you'd think it would be important? Do you see what happens? You get on grease when you start messing around and trying to say there's errancy inside the text, because now you've moved outside of the text to get another standard to judge this standard. So you're always locating infallibility somewhere.

“This phenomenon of a moveable location of infallibility led Rushdoony to call infallibility ‘an inescapable concept.’ Noting how “infallibility has been ascribed by unbelieving writers” now he’s going to go through some of the writers, watch this, because this has been done in history again and again. “...unbelieving writers [sometimes] ascribe it to the cosmic evolutionary process (de Chardin),” a Frenchman who influenced theology in the 20th century an awful lot. It’s been ascribed “to the general will of society (Rousseau),” do you realize that Rousseau, another French thinker, (my what things have come in from France), and his way of thinking has basically taken over this country. Think about the discussion. If we take a Gallop poll and 51% of the people say something is right, we should make it into law. Huh? Why do we make it into law if 51% of the people say it’s right? Well, this is a democracy, that’s how you decide what’s right and wrong. Oh really! Then if 51% of the people decide that murder is okay, we sign it into law? Murder is okay? See what happens here when you bring this in? So Rousseau tried to locate it in “the general will of society,” that really is the heart of autonomous democracy. Then some tried to apply it “to the ruling political party (Communism),” see each one of these has their point of infallibility. You’ve just got to smoke it out, sometimes it takes you a while, weeks, months of study, but sooner or later you’re going to find out they have their version too, it’s just hidden; it’s called by different names, hidden with the vocabulary but it’s there. They don’t use the word infallibility but the concept is there, veiled, disguised, but it’s there and it’s ascribed to concepts, things, men, and institutions.

“One observes this movement of infallibility away from Jesus and the Bible to man in the conflict between Genesis and historical science. Modern schemes of earth history are basically considered infallible in that no amount of data

[it is believed] will radically alter them toward the view of early Genesis.” Have you ever heard of an evolutionist saying well, I’m not really sure of this, after all, we might discover data that validates the Bible? Never said that. In their heart of hearts they believe that evolution is basically true, we’ve just have to clean up a few details here and there but it’s basically true, these Christians should just give up; just give up, you’re never going to undo the case. That’s essentially a claim of infallibility. What is infallibility? You don’t question. It’s true; it’s your starting point.

“Another instance is the view that apparent discrepancies between the historical data of the Bible and the records of secular history will never be resolved by future data in favor of the Bible,” same thing, archeology and the Bible. The Bible may be true here or there but only where it meets the criteria of our infallible tools of investigation.

Now we come to the last thing, and that is why only those of us who are Christians, who take the Bible seriously, have a basis for infallibility because we have God, who is omniscient, who is sovereign; we have man down here with finite knowledge, and God in His sovereignty rules history so that everything comes under His control, His omniscience provides the plan for His sovereignty, and that omniscience is communicated to man. So we have knowledge that God has knowledge. We don’t have omniscience, we don’t know all the details, we have finite knowledge but we have within our finite knowledge, knowledge of One who has infinite knowledge, and because of that we trust. And because of that we know that there’s a pattern out there, we know that whatever happens in our lives personally, though it’s sometimes very painful, sometimes very mysterious, sometimes shocking, whatever happens it is being controlled. That doesn’t take away the pain in every case, but it doesn’t knock you for a loop and knock you totally flat so that you just give up all hope for living. You never get to that point because you know that there is a plan there.

Now because of all of that and when this God moreover says that I’ve designed you in My image, and the Son becomes flesh, so we have the hypostatic union, it’s this that gives us the basis for infallibility. The pagan doesn’t have infallibility. So even though he tries to generate a substitute for infallibility, he’s desperately trying to locate it somewhere and what he does is he locates it right up here, hanging in thin air, not a basis, no support, no

justification, it's just hanging there. Our infallibility is grounded in all this that we've studied over the years; the God who planned history, the God who providentially runs history, the God who created man in His image, and the God who incarnated Himself in man, walked around this earth and told us the truth of the way it is, "I am the way, the truth, and the life, and no man comes to the Father but by Me." That sounds like a very arrogant claim, "I am the way; I am the truth; I am the life," said the God-man. And no man, NO man ever "comes to the Father except through Me." How did they come to the Father through the OT? Through Jesus Christ as preincarnate... who was speaking to them? Who was it that came to Isaiah when it says "And the Word of the Lord came to me?" What was that that came to Isaiah? That was God the Son. Who was it that created the world? God said, "Let there be light and there was light." That's the word of God. Who's the speaker? It's the Son. So it's always been true, it was true of Job, it was true of Adam, it's true of Isaiah, and it's true of David. It's true of the numerous people in pagan societies that believe. Think of the Samaritans, think of the Gentiles, think of the Ethiopian in the book of Acts that became Christians, all came to God in the name of the Son. Only in Christianity do you have this.

Gordon Clark taught philosophy at a secular university most of his life and from what I hear he had numerous discussions with the faculty at that particular institution. But here's how he summarizes his discussion of infallibility. "A sinless Christ is an example of such concurrence more stupendous than the errorless writings of an apostle...." Remember the writings of the prophets were infallible only in a small zone when he's writing the Scripture. But here we have Jesus Christ 100%, everything He did, everything He said, every look that He gave was revelation of the Father. "A sinless Christ is an example of such concurrence more stupendous than the errorless writings of an apostle.... If the Second Person can become man without sin, the lesser miracle of Paul's inerrancy is all the more possible." Arguing from the greater to the lesser.

See, it's not a problem to have inerrancy. How did Dr. Luke ever write a document like the Gospel of Luke, the Book of Acts, free from technical and historical error? If Jesus Christ never committed a technical or historical error in His entire life it's easy to accept that Luke wrote a technically and historically error free document.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010

