

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***

*107 East Austin*

*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*

*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B1042 – October 17, 2010 – Doctrine Of Infallibility**

We're looking at the Life of the King and the three doctrinal truths associated with it. First we looked at kenosis, which is the Greek word in Phil 2:5-8, that means Christ gave up the independent use of His attributes. Basically, in His humanity He continually depended upon the Holy Spirit to fulfill the Father's will for His life always and everywhere. He didn't utilize the divine attributes that He fully possessed unless the Father okayed it. And by doing that He gave us the model of the Christian life. He demonstrated it works. He also showed that He qualifies to be a sympathetic high priest, that He can be touched by our weaknesses, because He went through what we go through. And further, all judgment has been handed to Him because who better to judge the human race than a member of the human race, a fellow peer who's been where we are? All that falls out of the kenosis. Second, we looked at impeccability; that's the question - was Jesus Christ able not to sin or not able to sin? We said, in his human nature he was able not to sin; in his divine nature he was not able to sin. As a Person he was not able to sin, He's impeccable, it was certain. So Jesus Christ becomes the Perfect One, the sinless One which then leads to the third doctrine, which we'll pick up today, and that is the question of His infallibility. This may seem a little strange to you that, after saying Jesus Christ was sinless, why are we now going to consider the question whether He was infallible or not.

I assure you this has become an issue. There are theologians in conservative evangelical circles who believe that Jesus Christ was impeccable yet fallible, so we want to understand one of the things that's going on and how this has developed through church history such that today we have a division among evangelicals on the question of Christ's infallibility.

First, let's define infallibility. By this term theologians are referring to what is believed or said by a person regarding scientific and historical details. It doesn't have to do with how they lived, their behavior; it has to do with what one believes regarding scientific and historical details. Here's the issue: did Jesus, although He was morally perfect and never sinned, make technical errors; errors in scientific and historical details, such that he was fallible in these areas? Here's the argument, (conservative evangelicals are sliding all over the board on this so pay attention to what's happening). Here's how Donald Bloesch states it, "They (scripture writers, including Jesus) did not err in what they proclaimed, but this does not mean that they were faultless in their recording of historical data or in their world-view, which is now outdated." Bloesch doesn't have a problem with Jesus being morally perfect, but he says, you know, Jesus, He lived in the first century, I mean, He had a 1<sup>st</sup> century view, and in the 1<sup>st</sup> century people believed strange things about history and science. So Jesus didn't intend to make mistakes here, He just couldn't help it, He was a man of His time and we now know his views of science and history are wrong. These kinds of errors they classify as "technical errors." So infallibility deals with this issue did Jesus make technical errors? And if He made technical errors does that violate impeccability? They claim no, they claim He could be impeccable and fallible concurrently. Do you see the claim? I'm just trying to show you the position. The idea is that Jesus can make technical errors, He didn't mean to, but He did, but those don't affect His impeccability because we limit that to morals and ethics.

Now, this relates to the doctrine of revelation because everything Jesus said and did was revelatory. So let's go back to the doctrine of revelation. When we studied the doctrine of revelation, what was the OT event we linked that doctrine to? The giving of the Law at Mount Sinai. God spoke. That's the picture you want to have in your mind's eye to guard you against the modern theory of language which totally denies the possibility that God could speak to man inside history in human language. We said with this doctrine revelation has certain characteristics. First, it's verbal; thoughts are transferred in revelation, ideas, not just feelings. Second it's personal, I'm not listening to a computer printout, God isn't just a list of attributes, God is a Person and so I'm listening to the words of a Person. Third, revelation is historical, meaning it's not abstract, it's not theoretical, God speaks in history in real human languages. If you had an audio recorder you would have

captured God speaking in the Hebrew language. Fourth, it's comprehensive; it deals with every aspect of life and society. Does it deal with clothing? Yes, it does. Does it deal with sanitation? Yes, it does. Does it deal with diet? Yes. Why does it deal with all those things? Because God created the entire universe. Did it talk about morals? Yes. Does it talk about sin? Yes. It talks about all these things. Why? Because all truth is interrelated. The diet, the clothing, the morals, the ethics and all the rest were discussed and all in the context of worship because what is worship? It's thinking God's thoughts after Him in every area of life. And where do we walk around every day? In the world God made. So if I'm dealing with the physics of flight, I'm just as much in a position where I can worship Him as I am when I'm sitting here praying because He's the Creator of all. So when He talks, as the Creator He speaks comprehensively. He doesn't leave anything out of the discussion. And fifth it's prophetic; that is, it looks into the future and tells us things that are beyond the human horizon.

We want to spend time on this doctrine as it relates to Jesus. Jesus made historical and scientific claims. "Since revelation is necessarily comprehensive, it should be no surprise that Jesus spoke about many things open to historical and scientific investigation. Did He err in doing so? For example, was He right in affirming that Genesis 1 and 2 both form a single, coherent account of creation contrary to many theologians' claims? Turn to Mark 10:5-8 and let's look at that passage in light of what our kids get in college. Your kids and grandkids, if they take a course on the Bible as literature on campus, will hear that there are conflicts in the Bible. Don't be surprised, they've been doing that for about 240 years, they've only been doing it for the last 200 in Christian schools. So wake up, that's the world we live in. Satan is not going to allow this Book to stand unopposed. And He's going to use every trick that He can think of to undermine the text. They can go to Christian schools and get the same crud that they get from the secular schools, the only difference is in a Christian school you pay more for it. It's disgusting, some nice Christian schools in Texas teach the same thing you can get at Princeton and Harvard and it's disheartening because you'd think the nice Christian professors would be propagating the truth and establishing kids in the Scriptures, but the reality is they're living off the hard earned money of God-fearing families who have saved money so that their kids could get a Christian education and they go to a Christian campus and they hear well, we don't really believe that Genesis 1 and 2 fit together.

Now we're not really saying that Jesus made a deliberate mistake here, but we know now things that Jesus didn't know. Oh really! We're going to learn in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that we now know more than Jesus. We're going to learn in Christian psychology class that there's really no such thing as sin, it's just a psychological disturbance caused by the 4<sup>th</sup> chromosome, oh, but Jesus didn't know that so He went and died for it.

Let's look at Mark 10; He's dealing with a divorce issue, verse 5-8. "But Jesus said to them, "Because of your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. <sup>6</sup>But from the beginning of creation, God MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE." What chapter of Genesis is that quoted from? Gen 1. Next verse, "FOR THIS REASON A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER, <sup>8</sup>AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH." What chapter of Genesis is that quoted from? Genesis 2. Uh oh, how can He do that if they're two separate conflicting accounts? The Lord Jesus Christ clearly said, He's building a doctrine here. He's in the middle of the discussion of defining what marriage and divorce is, and poor Jesus, He just built a doctrine on Gen 1 and 2, two conflicting passages? No, Jesus just articulated the fact that Gen 1-2 are not in conflict.

There are many other instances. Take for example, was Jesus right in believing in a literal Abel, the son of a literal Adam as in Matt 23:35? He did, it's all there, available for anyone with eyes to see; it's not hiding. Did Jesus speak the truth about a literal global flood with a literal Noah as in Matt 24:37-39? And did He correctly claim that the Law was written by Moses as in Luke 27:24? Yet no OT professor today, outside of the godly men who are teaching in the few good Christian schools, nobody today in scholarly circles believes that Moses wrote the Law. Nobody! If your children and grandchildren are going to college and if they take a course in religion they will have Gen 1-2 shredded; they will have the Mosaic authorship of the Law shredded, it's not believed at all. Yet Jesus believed it.

According to such people, Jesus' righteousness coexists with ignorance that causes technical errors. Can this be true? It certainly is true of ourselves. The limitations of human knowledge jeopardize every thought and statement we make. Is it true, however, of Jesus? If Jesus functions as a prophet of revelation, as one who carries out God's prosecution against those breaking His covenant, can technical errors be tolerated? What did we learn in the OT?

I said in the OT, pay attention to the definition of a prophet, because we're going to pick it up later. Well now we're picking it up in the context of infallibility. What was the key idea of a prophet? What was the function of the prophet? They weren't social progressives issuing in a new ethic. What were they doing? They were calling the nation back, back to the Mosaic Law Code. What was that Code? It was a contract between Yahweh and Israel. And as the nation violated the contract what did the prophet act as? As prosecuting attorneys. Under God the Holy Spirit they prosecuted God's lawsuit against the nation Israel. That was their function; we showed how Amos, Hosea, Isaiah all used the *rib* format, introducing the lawsuit, they called the witnesses into the court, hear oh heavens take ear O earth, now I'm going to present my lawsuit.

The prophets speaking for God prosecuted the nation for its sin. In order to carry out the prosecution, think of a courtroom. In a courtroom how does the prosecuting attorney, or any lawyer for that matter involved in a courtroom situation, what do they want to do to the witness? Destroy their credibility. If you're testifying to something, he tries to find some problem with the testimony, he tries to take any crack he can find and split it open. And the goal is to cast doubt in the minds of the jury on the credibility of the witness. The idea is to destroy the testimony. Is it okay for the prophets, therefore, to have holes in the case? What does it do to the case if it has technical errors? It leaks water, you've got a leaky case, it won't hold up. So obviously, with the writings of the prophets you've got to have infallibility, don't you? If I can punch a hole in the prophets case, say on some historical detail, then what have I done to, say, a sin detail? I've cast doubt on its validity.

So now when we come to Jesus let's turn to John 3:12 because this points out the problem with saying Jesus made historical and scientific errors. In John 3:12 Jesus recognizes the principles of a valid testimony, and what does He say? "If I told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things?" His point was if I tell you about things on earth you can observe, you can check out, and you don't believe me there, when I tell you your sins are forgiven, what are you going to do, go to heaven on a rocket and check the books? How are you going to do that? You can't observe that? You have to take My word for it. Now if I can show that Jesus can't get his history right, and he's made technical errors all over the place, how can I trust Him when He says to me if you believe in Me you have eternal life? See

how it doesn't work? You can't have technical errors by Jesus in history and science without having them creep into spiritual matters. Do you see the line of logic that we're pursuing here?

Let's look at what's happened down through church history because evangelicals, of all people, are not following this logic and now we have an evangelical divide. We want to understand how these things happen. Once again I want to stress the importance of presuppositions. Let's bring it close to home. This is our doctrinal statement about three months ago, it's now been changed, but observe something in the first point, maybe you've read this a hundred times and never caught this. "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 of Faith and Christian behavior." It sounds pretty good until you read what Dewey Beegle said in the 1970's. Beegle was a southern Baptist who was arguing, yeah, yeah, Jesus didn't make any mistakes morally and ethically, He was sinless, but He did make historical and scientific errors. The Bible, he said, is true "in all essential matters of faith and practice" it is "authentic, accurate, and trustworthy." Look at that expression, "in all essential matters of faith and practice." Who decides what's essential and what's not? Dewey Beegle does. Then look at the end of our statement, "in all matters of Faith and Christian behavior." There's no difference between us and Beegle. So right here, in the first point of the doctrinal statement we had a limitation. The Bible addresses "all matters of Faith and Christian behavior." It does not address history and science. Beegle would agree, Beegle would say, that's right, the Bible is only inerrant so far as Faith and Christian behavior, the Bible errs when it addresses issues of historical and scientific fact.

Here's Dr Robert Thomas who uncovered a lot of this in the last 15 years. Dr Thomas is a hermeneutician, which means he's an expert in biblical interpretation. He's been around for years but unfortunately he's not very widely known among the average Christian and it's because he doesn't write stupid, pop Christianity books. He writes to address real issues that are going on in Christ's church. So with these limited inerrancy statements in mind watch what he says, he's going to trace this idea back to Francis Bacon and the empirical method. He says, "The ascendancy of Bacon's thinking pictured Scripture as infallible in matters of only faith and practice, but not

science and history...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.” Now do you see where the arguments over Genesis and how to read the days of Genesis and all the rest of it are coming from? They’re coming from ideas first propagated by Francis Bacon that the Bible was errant in matters regarding science and history, therefore what do we do? We use the scientific method of Bacon to arrive at historic and scientific truth, and when the Bible differs we re-interpret the Bible to fit science or we jettison the Bible and trust it in the arena of faith and practice only. Is that what our doctrinal statement said? Yes, Faith and Christian behavior. And Thomas points out, that’s the historical-critical view of the Bible that can be traced back to Francis Bacon’s empiricism. So if that’s where it can be traced back to and it came into the historical-critical view of the Bible then what is the historical-critical view of the Bible?

A couple of months ago I introduced two terms; lower criticism and higher criticism. We said we don’t have a problem with lower criticism. Lower criticism just deals with manuscript variants. We have different manuscripts and there are variants so lower criticism is interested in those: which manuscript is correct? There are only a few that are significant; the most obvious one is the ending of Mark’s Gospel. Mark’s Gospel has four different endings. Which manuscript is the genuine ending of Mark? That’s a question for lower criticism. Another question for lower criticism would be the KJV only-ism debate. These are people who are debating which manuscript is best. The KJV is translated from the Textus Receptus and virtually every other Bible is translated from what’s called the Critical Text. But the argument here is not over whether the Bible is God’s word; that’s accepted, it’s just an argument over variants in the manuscripts.

Higher criticism, on the other hand, is interested in who *really* authored the biblical material, when was it put together, how was it put together. In other words, here we’re trying to explain the Bible as merely a creation of man. So the uniqueness of the Scripture, in spite of its own self-claim that it is essentially a creation of God, that it’s inspired, is tossed aside, and the Scripture is arbitrarily at step one in the discussion classified as a piece of

humanly generated literature. Now, given that fact how did it happen? This is the historical-critical view Dr Thomas is referring to. And he says it gets back to Francis Bacon. Bacon introduced this and now this view is raised up against the Bible and stands in judgment over it.

So let's see what Francis Bacon said. I was taught this in biology class on the university campus so let's look at what Bacon said because Bacon is a key idea man in history. You want to key in on the idea men because their ideas permeate culture. In 1620, Francis Bacon published *Novum Organum* (i.e. the New Instrument). Notice the date, 1620. what happened 100 years before in Europe? The Protestant Reformation. Calvin, Luther; these guys ended up breaking with the Roman Catholic Church and returning to full biblical authority in every area of life. 100 years later Bacon comes along and he counters the Reformation. Satan is not going to let the word of God stand unopposed, he is going to attack and here it comes through Francis Bacon, one of the fathers of the Enlightenment; his secretary was Thomas Hobbes, these are Enlightenment men. What's the Enlightenment? Anybody catch what's going on with that term? What picture does the Enlightenment engender? Man has finally come into the light, man has come of age, and it's the dawn of human reason. Before that it was all dark. So before we even get to the discussion the very term itself the great Reformers like Luther and Calvin are written off as men in the dark; men who were primitive, locked in myth. Now the enlightened men have arrived. See how the discussion is set up? We have to learn that there's an agenda in the very language chosen to set up the argument. And our tendency is to charge in at 100mph to give an answer and then we wind up shooting ourselves in the foot because we assumed the argument was a valid argument to begin when it wasn't. We were set up and we don't want to get set up. We want to set them up, interpret them inside of the Biblical worldview, not the other way around. Here's what Bacon set up: in *Novum Organum* Bacon claimed that all knowledge is gained exclusively through experience and experiment. This is the philosophy of inductivism and it's at the heart of the scientific method. Follow carefully what's happening. The idea is that man has his direct experience, and inside that man does experiments and this, Bacon says, is how you attain knowledge. All knowledge comes from experience. ALL. First just think of the statement. If all knowledge comes through experience then the knowledge that all knowledge comes through experience must have also come through experience and that's a self-refuting claim. So that's problem

number one - it's got a built in contradiction. Does anyone see another problem with saying all knowledge comes by experience? There's a tremendous limitation there. John Dewey took this to the logical conclusion. He literally said one could only know what they directly experienced. If 500 people experienced something that's true for them but not for you because you didn't experience it. What's that idea? That truth is relative. And that's coming from the guy who had more influence on the public education system in America than any other person, by far. Between 1930 and 1950 Dewey published over 50,000 articles on education and he held seminars. If you were in public education in the early 1900's you knew Dewey, you couldn't be in the field without knowing him. He engineered America's entire public education system. And he was a relativist. We know him because of the Dewey decimal system but he impacted a lot more than just a catalog system. He said you can only know from your own personal experience. You can extend your experience by instrumentation, using instrumentation we can get indirect experience and so we can extend in three of the four directions with instrumentation. Most people were not as logical as Dewey. They said you could get outside and have knowledge. How do you do it? You extrapolate. You extend your experience outward, it's a deduction, it's not known whether that's really true or not. That was Dewey's point, it's just a guess. But if paganism is to have universal knowledge they must extrapolate. And if you read historical documents, what men wrote in earlier times, and it doesn't line up with your experience then what do you do? Well, your experience is ultimate so your experience is the standard of truth and well, they were just men of their time, they made historical and scientific blunders, and you rip them to shreds all on the basis of your experience. Bacon said this is how you acquire ALL knowledge.

And people were infected with this kind of thinking and they still are. We have the Bible and the Bible is an ancient book, the Bible was written by men of another time, they were products of their era, and they couldn't help it that they made errors. They didn't mean too, they just did, but now we know better. See where this is headed?

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century here came the historical critics. They were products of the Enlightenment; they were thoroughly convinced of Bacon's inductivism. This is their worldview so when they come to the Bible they just apply Bacon's principles to the Bible and rip it to shreds. That's where we get stuff like

Moses couldn't have written the Pentateuch, J, E, D and P did. Daniel couldn't have written his book in the 6<sup>th</sup> century because you can't prophecy; therefore it had to be written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. Genesis is just a myth because we know evolution is true. And so piece by piece they went through the Bible and tore it to pieces.

Then we come to the evangelicals. Unfortunately they were not as careful to detect the presuppositional baggage that was being imported by the historical critics when they were reading this material. They had some valid observations; we're not knocking every thing they said, but the overall thrust was an attack on the word of God. Evangelicals were reading this material, they had to, these were their peers, they were fellow academics, and they held high faculty positions in major universities. The problem was they weren't reading them with filters on and they started to pick up more than a couple of observations. What have we warned about time and time again? Be alert to the presuppositional baggage that's being imported. We have to train ourselves to remember what Paul said in Col 2:8, "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception." Take every thought captive to Christ. And Christ in the hypostatic union is unique; this is the unique God and man in one person without confusion forever, utterly unique, no one ever was like Him and no one will ever be like Him, He's forever unique. You can't treat Him simply as a human being, you have to look at his humanity. You can't overemphasize it because if you do you slide off the cliff evangelicals have slid off.

The key man who slid off the cliff emphasizing Jesus' humanity and the human side of the Scriptures is G.C. Berkouwer, a famous Reformed theologian from Holland. The key man on the other side who did not slide off the cliff was B.B. Warfield, also a Reformed theologian. Warfield wrote the classic work on the inspiration of Scripture. After Warfield died Berkouwer came on the scene and rejected Warfield. There's no question these two men reflect the two different views on Scripture in evangelicalism today.

Watch what happens. Berkouwer wrote a lot of good stuff, but later he rejected Warfield on the inspiration of Scripture and now we've got a little tension setting up because what happens is we all have arrogance built into us because of the fall of man, but what happens when you get in academia is there's a certain kind of arrogance that can easily creep into your soul? Your

promotions in academia come from what? Publications, your acceptability with your peers. Who are your peers? People on the faculty. How do you get stature in academia? By publishing papers; before the papers can be published, what has to happen? Editors look at them and see if they smell something not quite right, and if they do you don't get published because there are fifteen other papers competing for that position of publication. Now what happens to your resume when you want to teach at a college? How many papers have you published recently? None. We'll put somebody else in that position. It's a system that feeds on itself. And it's very, very difficult for godly men and women on faculties. They face the tension of this every single day of their life; their career hangs on it, they've got to publish but they've also got to defend the faith. That's what's going on here. So you get Christians who have to decide, do I want my academic credentials more than I want my loyalty to Jesus Christ. That's the pressure these people face week in week out.

Well, watch it, here it comes. Berkouwer wanted a lot of respectability among his peers, some of the stuff he wrote was great, but you know what they say about rat poison? It's 99% protein; it's the 1% that kills. Berkouwer was working alongside historical critics, and he wants academic respectability so he starts to shift. Remember, the historical critics look at the Bible as a merely human book. If Berkouwer wants to stay in step he's going to have to somehow appease them. Here's what he says, "This mystery is the uniqueness through which Holy Scripture in all its humanity was distinguished from all other human writings..." What? Do you see something strange in that statement? Would you write that way? "Holy Scripture in all its humanity." Is that the emphasis of Scripture? We're not denying a human element, but is that the emphasis of Scripture? No, it's the divinity of Scripture that's emphasized; finally it's the word of God, not the word of man.

But he thinks by saying that he can agree with the higher critics of the Bible on the humanity of Scripture and yet also somehow speak of it as divine origins. Remember, the game is to keep his scholastic respectability. Jesus' belief in a literal Adam, Berkouwer thinks, is an instance of a technical error. Ooops. If Jesus is the second Adam and I've already relegated the first Adam to the pile of myth what logically do I do with the second Adam? Relegate him to the pile of myth. This has consequences.

The purpose of the Bible and Jesus, Berkouwer writes, now watch this one, this is a key statement, and all the evangelicals that push this view say the same thing when you challenge it. What's the purpose of the Bible? They've got to define the purpose of the Bible in such a way that they can disbelieve Genesis without impinging on the purpose of the Bible. So what has to happen? They've got to define the purpose of the Bible so they can also have historical and scientific errors in the Bible without violating the purpose of the Bible. Here's how they do it. Berkouwer writes, the purpose of the Bible and Jesus "is not at all to provide scientific gnosis [knowledge] in order to convey and increase human knowledge and wisdom, but to witness of the salvation of God unto faith." You'll have to think about that for a while, this is something you have to think about, but there's some greasy words being used in there. There's an element of truth there, the Bible is not to make everyone bigheaded. That's not the purpose of Scripture, and it's true that one of the purposes of the Bible is "to witness of the salvation of God unto faith." But notice the separation he's made in defining the purpose that way, he's limited the purpose of the Bible to the latter, cutting it off from the former. He's trying to admit errors in Genesis and keep the salvation of John's Gospel.

Nobody wants to say it but this is what they're saying: We believe in the Bible, errors and all. But if you have an errant Bible you're going to have an errant Christ. If you have an errant Christ, then we have the problem of how can He be Lord, impeccable, the perfect Savior, and going around bumbling, making all kinds of technical mistakes here and there because He's ignorant? When you phrase it this way everybody catches on, well gee, you can't do that. But it's never phrased this way. It's always phrased in carefully polished words like Berkouwer's that don't sound like really what's going on.

This argument came to a head in the 1970's. In the 70's the issue of the inerrancy of Scripture took center stage. The evangelicals who argued with all rigor were triggered by two groups. The Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church had a man by the name of Preuss who was the Synod President at the time. The Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church is more conservative than the Lutheran Church. So when he became President he decided he was going to get everybody off of the faculty that didn't believe in inerrancy, which he did. Of course, once he did that the press picked it up and said the Missouri Synod was taken over by the right-wing extremists. Any time you're

for truth you're the right-wing extremists, but all the other guys, they're moderates.

Then it broke out in the Southern Baptist Convention. Dewey Beegle was a Baptist professor and he wrote a book on the *errancy* of Scripture and argued that evangelicals should come of age, and should basically believe the Bible, errors and all, as people sarcastically said of Dewey Beegle. He was answered by Criswell and his staff at Dallas, the First Baptist Church at Dallas. Within the Southern Baptist Convention there was a long, hard, bitter struggle between these two groups. The press always printed it as though it was the right-wing conspiracy out of Texas that was going to take over the Southern Baptist Convention, like there's something wrong with Texas or something. The point was it was Criswell and his group in Dallas that were saying no, the Southern Baptist Convention is representative of the churches.

They mobilized and all of a sudden when the Baptist convention occurred. They had done a lot of telephone work because a lot of the churches get lazy and they don't send their delegates, so the delegates never showed up and the quote "moderates," really the liberals, had taken over by default. Same way it always happens. It had gone on far enough and the mud hit the fan with this issue of inerrancy, so that galvanized hundreds and hundreds into action, little country rural churches, everybody all of a sudden sent delegates to the convention, and now all of a sudden the moderates got outvoted and they lost. Then they started putting their little press spin on it saying that the kooks had taken over. That's always the way it comes out when it regurgitates through the Associated Press and everybody else. You can ignore the press, the point is behind all the goofy stories there was a serious issue, and we're dealing with the issue of inerrancy.

The conclusion of this was the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy, a statement that came out in 1978. Here's part of their summary so you can see how they shut the door on this mess. "Holy Scripture, being God's own Word, written by men prepared and superintended by His Spirit, is of infallible divine authority *in all matters upon which it touches*:" see, here we're not cutting out science and history, "in all matters upon which it touches." "Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God's acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to

God's saving grace in individual lives." So this is what you have to write to close the door to this historical critical thing. That's the only way to hold off an errant Bible and the only way to hold off an errant Christ.

The lesson for us is we have to pay close attention to the forces at work. Satan is not a weak opponent and if we let our guard down and just trudge along thinking Jesus and this book are going to be unopposed we're naïve. These things slip into the language and they slip into our thinking and then we find ourselves out in left field. We have to suck up ideas that were born out of pagan empiricism, brought into the church, sanctified of course, under the guise of Jesus and all the rest of it. The bottom line is we get duped because it sounds good but then it turns around and rips the Bible to shreds. That's how these things get started. And we have to be very careful to take every thought captive to Christ. Christ is impeccable and infallible and so next time we'll work with the difference between Christ and the prophets and the difference it makes. They're not the same, only Jesus is in hypostatic union and this difference is important for how we state the doctrine of infallibility.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010