

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1223 – May 10, 2012

Scripture

Alright, today we start a class designed to be a basics course covering the major points of our doctrinal statement. So there won't be anything advanced in this course. Everything will be basics. What I'll try to do is follow a strict format where first of all we make plain the doctrinal statement regarding the point under consideration. Second, we'll lay out some categories for thinking about the doctrine. Third, we'll go to the major passages in Scripture that support the doctrine. These are passages you want to memorize because they're just basic, every Christian ought to have these passages memorized, if not word for word, at least where they are located. A fourth thing we'll do throughout the class is definition work. Definitions are necessary for clear thinking and communication. So I'll be defining key words and ideas as they come up. That way we're all on the same page. Really the goal of this class is for all of us to remember what is basic and fundamental to everything we believe.

Before we get to the first point I want to say a few introductory things about doctrinal statements. Just what is a doctrinal statement? Why do we have them? A doctrinal statement is a set of statements defining the core beliefs held, taught and defended by an organization of people. In the Church, doctrinal statements originated with the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15, so there's Scriptural precedent. The leading men of the Church gathered at Jerusalem in order to discuss a major question that was dividing the church, namely, was it necessary for Gentiles to go through Judaism in order to enter the Church? Many Jews thought it was necessary to circumcise Gentiles and put them under the yoke of the Law of Moses. The council discussed this issue and resolved it, finding that it was not necessary for Gentiles to go through Judaism in order to enter the Church. Both Jew and Gentiles entered the Church the same way, by grace through faith apart from

circumcision and the Law of Moses. So that everyone was on the same page on this core issue of the gospel, a letter was written and distributed throughout the early church, certain concessions were made, etc...

The point is that a doctrinal statement is important for establishing what is to be believed, taught and defended. Following the pattern laid down by the Council of Jerusalem, when later controversial issues arose, for example, the deity of Christ or the deity of the Holy Spirit or the relationship between God's sovereignty and the human will, other ecumenical councils were held in order to clarify what the Scriptures teach. Those councils put forth what are called creeds. And most churches, Protestant and Roman Catholic claim these early creeds as part of their doctrinal heritage. Actually however, Protestants and Roman Catholics do not give equal authority to the early creeds. Roman Catholics hold that they are equal in authority to Scripture. Protestants hold that they are lesser in authority to Scripture.

So then as Protestants we hold that no creed or doctrinal statement is equal in authority to Scripture. The Scripture alone is the final authority. Nevertheless creeds and doctrinal statements are helpful clarifications of what a group believes the Scriptures teach. But in the end they are always subject to revision because they are not the word of God but reflections of men on what the word of God teaches. So then the purpose of writing a creed or doctrinal statement is to clarify or articulate precisely what a group understands the Scriptures to teach.

Now one reason we are going back to basics is because of the present distress the church is facing concerning setting forth doctrinal statements. Churches are denigrating setting out their doctrinal beliefs because they say doctrine is divisive. Really they just hate truth, they hate absolutes and they love feelings, they love experience. We live in an age where Christianity is more of a new age mysticism which emphasizes feelings over facts, subjectivity over objectivity, experiences over words, uncertainty over certainty and so forth. Therefore churches are not putting out doctrinal statements, they are considered irrelevant and divisive. And I encourage you to go try and find doctrinal statements for the churches in our town. I looked on their websites and I could only find seven churches that even put one out on the web, and some of the doctrinal statements were one sentence. So we are facing a hatred in the Church today for clarity of thinking and it is wreaking havoc on

the lives of the next generation of Christians. The new generation believes it no longer matters what one believes...only that one is sincere about his beliefs. We need to wake up and smell the coffee because this is spawning a radical religious pluralism in Christian circles, the idea that all religions are equal, and relativism, the idea that all truth is relative to the individual.

So if you want a solid course on the basics then it's my prayer this course will help clarify the basic teachings of the Bible, what they are, why we hold them to be most certain and why we should never compromise them.

So taking our first point in our doctrinal statement, the subject is Scripture, what do we hold regarding Scripture?

1. We believe the Bible is, in the fullest sense, the very Word of God, given by inspiration of God, inerrant, authoritative and sufficient, and is the supreme and final authority in all matters upon which it touches (2 Tim. 3:16-17; 2 Pet. 1:20-21).

First let's take what we mean by the Bible. Bible comes from the Greek word *ta biblia* which means "the books." So what are the books we are referring to here? The 66 books of the Protestant Canon: 39 OT books and 27 NT Books. We do not include the Apocrypha. Why don't we include the Apocrypha? Because they were never recognized by the Jews as Scripture, they are Jewish books and yet they didn't recognize them; the Jews only recognized the Law, the Prophets and the Writings - 22 books in their Bible, corresponding identically in content to the 39 books we have in our OT Bible. Further, the Apocrypha books admit there was no living prophet at the time they were written but that they would have to wait for a prophet. Nor were they recognized by the early Church as Scripture. They were considered only to be helpful books for giving a history of the Jews during the intertestamental times. Last, they were only recognized as of late by Roman Catholics at the Council of Trent (AD1545-1563), the purpose of which was to support certain strange doctrines not taught anywhere in the 66 books, over and against the Protestants who were rejecting these doctrines. So when it comes to the word "Bible" we mean the 66 books, 39 OT books, the same content of which was always and everywhere recognized by the Jews as Scripture, and the 27 NT books which were recognized early on by the Church as apostolic and authoritative (ca AD363).

Second, what do we believe about the Bible? It “is, in the fullest sense, the very Word of God, given by inspiration of God.” Let’s break that down because it’s talking about two things here, the nature of the Bible, what it is by nature, the very Word of God, and how it was given, by inspiration of God. There’s a lot packed in that statement so let’s try to unpack it. What the statement is trying to do is protect the idea that ultimately the Bible is God’s word, but the means by which God delivered it was through men to write it. This is difficult for people to understand. How can the Bible be God’s word if men were involved? That’s what verbal, plenary inspiration is trying to articulate. And with that I’ve introduced two new terms which we’ll define in a moment. But let me show you what we’re trying to account for by turning to Exodus 3:6 and at the same time Luke 20:37. This is just a sample of what the data says, there are many of these and I’ve got them listed in the notes. Looking at the Exodus 3 passage this is the burning bush incident. Moses is out with his flocks, he’s wandering around and sees a bush on fire. So what, big deal, the temperature was about 120 degrees out there, so to see a bush light up was something he probably saw every day. What was a big deal was the bush wasn’t burning up. And the other big deal was a voice came out of the bush calling Moses by name. You want to talk about a weird day! Now looking at verse 6 and tell me who’s the speaker. “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” Then Moses hid his face.” Who’s talking there? God is. But take a peek now at the other passage, Luke 20:37 and tell me from Luke who is attributed with saying these words? “But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the passage about the burning bush, where he calls the Lord THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC, AND THE GOD OF JACOB.” Now wait a minute, did Moses call the Lord THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC in Exod 3:6 or did God say I AM THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC. Who said that? They both said it. That’s what we’re struggling to explain. We see this over and over; the scriptures interchange God and the human author. We call that dual authorship. Verbal, plenary inspiration is trying to account for how God and man can author this book.

Let me show you one more just for good measure, if you doubt this, Acts 28:25. And this one is neat because both authors are mentioned together in the same verse. “And when they did not agree with one another, they *began*

leaving after Paul had spoken one *parting* word, “The Holy Spirit rightly spoke through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers, 26saying, ‘GO TO THIS PEOPLE AND SAY.’ Now wait a minute, did Isaiah say it or did the Holy Spirit say it? The answer is yes. The Holy Spirit said it and Isaiah said it. The Holy Spirit said it through Isaiah. This happens a lot with the Psalms, David wrote a lot of the Psalms but they are ascribed to the Holy Spirit. The point is we have to account for this.

Let me summarize this idea. What verbal, plenary inspiration tries to do is give the most Scriptural account for dual authorship in the Bible. No book of the Bible was authored exclusively by God. (compare Ps 110:1 with Mark 12:36-37; Exodus 3:6 with Luke 20:37; Acts 1:16; 4:25; 28:25). Even sections of the Bible like the early days of creation were dual in authorship because while no man was there to hear God’s voice, when God later decided to reveal to man exactly what He said at creation, He employed a human to record it. So we err if we say that God alone authored the Bible and we err if we say that man alone authored the Bible. Equally we err if we say that God authored some of the Bible and man authored the rest. Though both errors are easier to understand, the truth of the matter rests somewhere in between. Dr Lewis Sperry Chafer captures succinctly the biblical truth when he said, “The divine and human authorship are both without impairment to either, wholly present in every word from the first to the last.”ⁱ An excellent statement of dual authorship.

Now let’s just look at the divine side of dual authorship. And we’ll start working on verbal inspiration, go ahead and turn to 2 Tim 3:16. Now what do we mean by verbal, plenary inspiration? Verbal refers to the “words,” the very words are selected by God, not just the ideas, the exact words. So verbal inspiration means that, in the original writings, the Spirit guided in the choice of the words used. However, the human authorship was respected to the extent that,” in other words, here we’re asking, how much of the Scriptures should be attributed to man? “The writers’ background, vocabulary and style were employed, but without the intrusion of error.” That is to say, when you read Luke his medical background comes through, he uses a lot of medical terms, his education shines through, his language is a very high, classical Greek. When you read Peter his fishermen background comes through, he uses fishermen terms, his lack of education shines through, he has a rough, shoddy Greek. The point is you can tell Luke and

Peter are not the same person by reading their books. But it's the Spirit who guided them in the choice of words, so they are His words. Plenary is the other word, it means "full," that is all the Scripture or every Scripture, all of it in its entirety. So plenary inspiration means that the accuracy which verbal inspiration secures is extended to every portion of the Bible, both OT and NT, verbal, down to the very words.

Let's look at some verses for plenary inspiration. Notice 2 Tim 3:14, "You," who's you? Paul is talking to Timothy, "You [Timothy], however, continue in the things you have learned and become convinced of, knowing from whom you have learned them," who taught Timothy? His grandmother, there's a lesson on family dynamics there, the grandmother teaching the grandson, verse 15, "and that from childhood you have known the sacred writings," what are the "sacred writings?" Was the NT around when Timothy was a kid? What sacred writings are we talking about here? The OT writings. And what does he say about them? "which are able to give you the wisdom that leads to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16All Scripture," and this is where there's controversy, "All Scripture is inspired by God," or God-breathed, *theopneustos*, we think Paul coined this word. Literally it means "God-breathed." Paul Feinberg says, "Warfield, whose exhaustive and often bypassed analysis has not been matched, has concluded—after a thorough examination of eighty-six words ending in *tos* and compounded with *θεος* – that *theopneustos* has nothing to do with *-inspiring*, but relates to the production of sacred, authoritative Scripture."ⁱⁱ By which he means that this word does not mean that God breathes life into the Scriptures and makes it energetic, makes it active in your life. He may do that but that is not what this means. This word means that Scripture originates with God! That is why 3,808 times the Scriptures say something like, "The Lord says," "the word of the Lord came to..." Fundamentally the Bible is His word. It comes from Him. Of course this doesn't do away with the human element described earlier, it's just that as far as origin is concerned, the Scriptures originated exclusively with God.

The controversy here over plenary is what does "all Scripture" in v 16 refer to? *pasa* all can mean all or each or every, and the issue is does it refer strictly to the OT Scripture (because that's what Paul was referring to with Timothy), or does it extend the meaning and include NT Scripture? Clearly in the context the Scriptures Paul has been referring to are the OT. But does

Paul in verse 16 extend it to the NT? I don't know but it's not a problem because other NT passages are called Scripture. For example, all of Paul's writings are clearly called Scripture by Peter in 2 Pet 3:16, Paul cites Luke 10:7 as Scripture on par with Deuteronomy 25:4, so he recognizes Luke. Peter puts the apostles NT writings on par with the holy prophets of the OT in 2 Pet 3:2 as does Paul in 1 Cor 2:13. So whether all refers only to the OT or both the OT and NT is hard to say, but they were cognizant they were writing Scripture and this statement was written very late, AD67, after all NT writings except perhaps Hebrews and the Book of Revelation, so I suspect verse 16 extends to the NT as well and acts as sort of a divine insignia of the entire NT.

I mentioned a few passages that extend inspiration to the NT, let's look at one, 2 Peter 3. "This is now, beloved, the second letter I am writing to you in which I am stirring up your sincere mind by way of reminder, ²that you should remember the words spoken beforehand by the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Savior *spoken* by your apostles." Is Peter not equating the commandments of the NT apostles with the words of the OT prophets? Of course he is. It seems the NT apostles were consciously generating Scripture and they recognized it as on par with OT Scripture. So both the OT and the NT are Scripture, that's what we mean by plenary inspiration, that inspiration extends to all and every portion of the Bible.

Let's show some passages that relate directly to the verbal side of things. Turn to Gal 3:16 because when we talk about verbal inspiration we're talking about the exact words, we're not just talking about concepts, we're talking about the human author being guided to use exact words. And when you get into words you realize they have mood, they have tense, they have voice and if you change these you change the meaning of the passage. It doesn't take much and you've changed it altogether. So when you see this you get the impression that the NT authors took the OT words quite seriously. Notice this one; Paul's building his entire argument off of one aspect of an OT word. Gal 3:16, "Now the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed." He's looking back to the promises made in Genesis. "He does not say, "And to seeds," as to many, but to one, "And to your seed," that is, Christ." He says, go back to Genesis and read the promises yourself and you'll see in the Hebrew text he never says seeds, plural, he always says seed, singular, and he's right, you can check it yourself. And by golly I hope he's right because his argument

is there's only one person in whom we have salvation, Jesus Christ. If you have multiple seeds then we're talking about multiple ways of salvation. So the whole argument for salvation only in Jesus Christ rests on what? The fact that the "seed" is singular not plural. This is why we're so insistent that inspiration refers to the very words of Scripture, we're not trying to be divisive, it's just that hey, when I get into this book and I see this kind of specificity being pointed out by the NT authors, I'm inclined to think they thought the very words were inspired. This isn't Jeremy Thomas creating this and this wasn't invented by the Fundamentalists. This is the apostle Paul, so don't blame me, take it up with the text.

Alright, let's show another passage, 2 Pet 1:20-21 and this passage actually shows how you can have dual authorship. We can state it but how did it happen? What is going on such that God and man are both wholly present in every word from the first to the last? This is a fascinating passage because Peter is talking about Christ, the incarnate Word, and how he predicted the transfiguration and then fulfilled the transfiguration. And while he's thinking about this it reminds him of the written word, and how the written word is just as certain as the incarnate Word. The Word, Christ and the Word, Scripture, go together. And notice what he says about the word, Scripture, in 2 Pet 1:20, "But know this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation," scratch interpretation, the meaning in the original Greek is that the prophecies of Scripture did not originate with the prophets themselves. So you might translate this "origination," no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own origination. The prophets didn't make this up, that's what false prophets do. He explains in verse 21, "for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." And there it is, notice the participle "moved," *phero*, it's a passive participle meaning the prophets were acted upon from the outside; they were being driven, moved along or carried by the Holy Spirit. In fact, Peter was being driven along as he wrote this. So the Scripture was not originating with them. People have pointed out this is the word used of a ship being driven by wind to a certain destination. And that's the picture of the prophets when they wrote; they were ships being driven along by the Holy Spirit to write what they wrote, exactly, precisely. So that gives us an idea of what happens in inspiration, it doesn't give us any details, it doesn't explain the exact mechanism God used to do it, how he was carrying them along, it just states that He did. And from this you've got to

conclude what Chafer concludes in his Systematic Theology, “The Bible is not of man as to its source, nor does man contribute any feature of infallibility or authority to it. It is, however, through man as the medium or instrument. This medium or instrument is a living, voluntary, and intelligent factor in its production.”ⁱⁱⁱ They were not automatons writing only as the words were dictated to them. Such a conception would diminish the human authorship to the point of vanishing. At the same time they were protected against inserting any natural fallibility into the text by the supernatural work of God.

So we’ve defined the Bible, the 66 books of the Protestant canon. We’ve defined what is meant by the Bible being in the very fullest sense, the Word of God, given by inspiration, that’s verbal, plenary inspiration, each and every word in the entire Bible originates with God and moves men to write Scripture in their own vocabulary, background and style. Now we come to without error or inerrant, which naturally follows. If verbal, plenary inspiration is true then inerrancy follows logically. What is inerrancy? Basically inerrancy means without error in the original autographs. What are the original autographs? The original writings as they were first penned by the human authors. Inerrancy does not extend to the copies. There are copyist errors. We’re not denying there are copyist errors. We are affirming however, that the errors are minor. So if we do not have any originals why are we so insistent on inerrancy? What good does it do to affirm inerrancy in the originals if we don’t have any of the originals? Well, first of all because of the nature of God. If God is perfect and the Scriptures originate with Him and He carried along human beings to record His word in their own language and style, then of necessity the Scriptures must be perfect as originally given, or else we attribute error to God. So the first reason the originals must be inerrant is because the nature of God is inerrant, He cannot err. Second, because if there is no original then we can have no hope of ever restoring the text to its original condition. What do I mean here? I mean there is an entire field called textual criticism, which doesn’t mean they’re criticizing the text, though some of them do, but what this field is interested in is analyzing the various manuscripts according to rules in order to establish which reading, when there’s a variant, is original. So they spend their time looking at these variants. But even if you’re bothered by this you ought to consider that God never promised to preserve the copies with 100% accuracy and none of these

variants impact any doctrine of the word of God. Just to give you a sampling of what some of these errors are I've put this little chart together.

Copyist Error	Meaning	Example
Haplography	Writing a word, letter or syllable only once when it should have been written more than once	Ps 93:4
Dittography	Writing twice what should have been written only once	Lev 20:10
Metathesis	Reversing the proper position of letters or words	
Fusion	Combining two words into one	
Fission	Dividing one word into two	
Homoteleuton	Omitting a section because the scribes eye skipped a line	

The bottom line is they are very minor and just like we can easily pick out the errors in some article; most of these can easily be picked out by someone who knows the language. For example, maybe you've seen this before:

"Accdrnig to a rscheearch at Cmabrigde Uinervtisy, it deosn't mtttaer in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is taht the frist and lsat ltteers be at the rghit pclae. The rset can be a toatl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit porbelm. Tihis is bcuseae the huamn mnid deos not raed ervey lteter by istlef, but the wrod as a wlohe."^{iv}

Of course, you have to be able to read already to be able to read this. But the point is this is way worse than any copyist error in Scripture and you can figure out what it says. We have about 96% certainty of the OT and 98-99% of the NT certainty. The two largest questionable sections are the John 7:53-8:11 passage and Mark 16:9-20, but neither impacts any biblical doctrine. So

inerrancy does not extend to the copies, it extends to the original autographs and it has to, as a necessary corollary to the nature of God and for the hope of restoring the original.

Let's think about another thing, the sufficiency of Scripture and turn to Ps 19:7. What do we mean by the Scriptures are sufficient? We mean they speak comprehensively to every area of life containing everything necessary for a life of godliness.^v Turning to therapy such as psychoanalysis or psychotherapy is turning away from Scripture. Scripture has not failed; people have failed to follow Scripture. Many of us have not realized the depths of the word of God or disciplined ourselves to live according to it's principles, so we turn away from Scripture to worldly alternatives, to psychoanalysis to solve our problems, to science to explain the origin of life, to philosophy to explain the meaning of life and to sociology to explain why we sin. As one author writes, "There is no substitute for submission to Scripture. Your spiritual health depends on placing the utmost value on the Word of God and obeying it with an eager heart. If you think you can find answers to your spiritual problems through human counsel or worldly wisdom you are forfeiting the most valuable and only reliable source of answers to the human dilemma."^{vi} That's why I had you turn to Ps 19. Notice what the Spirit says through David in verse 7, "The law of the LORD is perfect, restoring the soul;" What can the word of God do? Restore the soul. "The testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple." The word of God makes wise. Verse 8, "The precepts of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart;" The word of God brings rejoicing. "The commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes." The word of God brings understanding. Verse 9, "The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring forever; The judgments of the LORD are true; they are righteous altogether." The word of God is pure and true. Verse 10, notice the value of the scriptures. "They are more desirable than gold, yes, than much fine gold; Sweeter also than honey and the drippings of the honeycomb." So what we mean by the sufficiency of Scripture is that they speak to every area of life and they contain everything necessary for a life of godliness.

Alright, let's conclude by thinking about authority. If everything we've said so far is true then logically the Scriptures are authoritative. But what do we mean when we say the Scriptures are authoritative? We mean they are implicitly true and binding. When God told Adam the nature of the various trees in the garden He was in effect declaring His authority. "Thus saith the

Lord, in the day you eat of it you shall surely die.” God assigned the meaning and interpretation of His entire creation including all trees, and any affront to this, such as Eve testing the meaning and interpretation God already assigned, such as by eating the forbidden fruit, declaring it not to be a cause of death, was nothing less than denying the authority of God and transferring it to herself. So then by authoritative we mean that truth is inherent to the Scriptures because it is the very voice of God who is the Creator. As such it does not need any outside verification, it is true because He is truth. In other words, we don’t need to find the ark to prove the account of Noah and the Flood is true. It’s truly independent of external verification because God said it. And any human who attempts to prove the Bible by imposing an external standard of verification is assuming that man has the powers of legislating meaning and interpretation in themselves and that is a denial of the absolute authority of God in Scripture and an affirmation of our own authority. Humans have no such authority. The bottom line is the Scriptures are the ultimate authority and they are binding upon all men independent of human verification. We do not prove the Bible is true, the Bible is true and proves that we are sinners. That is, it is implicitly true.^{vii}

Lastly, our statement says, Scripture “is the supreme and final authority in all matters upon which it touches.” You often read “in all matters of faith and practice.” You can see we don’t say that, the reason we don’t say that is because it leaves open the door for a person to hold to partial inspiration. Sometimes you’ll hear people say, yes, the parts of the Bible dealing with matters of “faith and practice” are accurate but that “we cannot accept historical, geographical, or scientific statements in Scripture.” (Chafer, *Major Bible Themes*, 19). Robert Thomas says, “The ascendancy of Bacon’s thinking pictured Scripture as infallible in matters of only faith and practice, but not science and history. However, the separation of faith and practice from science and history is unbiblical. The grammatical-historical hermeneutic of the Reformation linked the historical and scientific implications of Scripture inseparably to the theological implications of Scripture (for example, compare Genesis 3 with Romans 5). So Bacon cleared the way for the historical-critical view that the Bible is infallible only in “spiritual matters” but does not speak inerrantly on “historical and/or scientific matters.” Instead of Scripture serving as a guide to science, scientific interpretations became the exclusive avenue to all truth and stand in judgment on Scripture.” (Thomas, *The Jesus Crisis*, 87). The point being that what is really being described here is what is

meant by the word infallible. Infallibility means the Bible is unfailingly accurate in every topic to which it speaks. If the Bible says something about science, it can be trusted. If it says something about geology, it can be trusted. If it says something about archaeology, it can be trusted. We'd quote John 3:12, "If he's told us earthly things and we don't believe how will we believe heavenly things?" (also cf Col 2:2-4, 8; 2 Cor 10:5).

It follows that the only way to think about anything at all, if thinking is to have any meaning whatsoever, is on the basis of the presupposition of Scripture. That is to say, we must accept Scripture for what Protestantism says it is, as the sufficient and authoritative interpretation of human life and experience as a whole, if not it will be impossible to find any meaning at all. Reality is what Scripture says it is and we are subject to Scripture.

In conclusion, "We believe the Bible," the 66 books of the Protestant canon "is, in the fullest sense, the very Word of God," verbal and plenary, originating in God yet "given by inspiration of God," the Holy Spirit carrying along human men, employing their natural background, vocabulary and style, and yet it is "inerrant," in the original autographs, "authoritative," implicitly true and binding, independent of human verification, "and sufficient," speaking comprehensively to every area of life and supplying all that is necessary for a life of godliness, thereby it "is the supreme and final authority in all matters upon which it touches (2 Tim. 3:16-17; 2 Pet. 1:20-21)," which gets into infallibility. Whenever the Bible touches any detail of history or science it is true regardless of human reconstructions or theories. Any other position enthrones man above Scripture.

ⁱ Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology, Vols 1&2*, 75.

ⁱⁱ Normal Geisler, *Inerrancy*, 278.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, 74.

^{iv} <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,511177,00.html#ixzz1wC5I9KJ4>

^v <http://www.tms.edu/tmsj/tmsj15g.pdf>

^{vi} *Ibid.*

^{vii} I am indebted to Cornelius Van Til's insight on this matter in his *Christian Apologetics*, 79-99.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012