

**A LAYMAN'S SYSTEMATIC  
AND BIBLICAL EXPOSITION  
OF THE 1689 LONDON BAPTIST  
CONFESSION OF FAITH  
VOL. I**



**A LAYMAN'S SYSTEMATIC  
AND BIBLICAL EXPOSITION  
OF THE 1689 LONDON BAPTIST  
CONFESSION OF FAITH  
VOL. I**

**CHAPTERS 1-18**

**SIMON WARTANIAN**



© 2021 by Simon Wartanian

*A Layman's Systematic and Biblical Exposition of the 1689 London Baptist Confession of Faith: Vol. I*

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or comment, without the prior permission of the author.

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2007 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scriptures marked HCSB are taken from the Holman Christian Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2009 by Holman Bible Publishers. Used by permission.

Scriptures marked ISV are taken from the International Standard Version (ISV). Copyright © 1996-2008 by the ISV Foundation. All rights reserved internationally.

Scriptures marked NKJV are taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scriptures marked NET are from the NET Bible® copyright ©1996, 2019 by Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C. <http://netbible.com> All rights reserved.

Scriptures marked LXXE are from Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton's translation of the Septuagint (1844).

Unless otherwise indicated, emphases (bold, italic) have been supplied by the author in Scriptural citations and citation of other authors. The author has also taken the liberty to reformat citations taken from TheWord Bible Software (especially the way Scriptural references are used).

Unless otherwise stated, square brackets indicate content (e.g., transliterations) added by the present author to citations.

Author's website: [www.thecalvinist.net](http://www.thecalvinist.net)  
Author's e-mail: [admin@thecalvinist.net](mailto:admin@thecalvinist.net)

ISBN: 979-8-5952-8962-7

This work is dedicated to every man and woman,  
who is not formally educated in theology,  
but loves and devotes themselves to the study of the Word of God.

But as for you, continue in what you have learned and have firmly believed, knowing from whom you learned it and how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.  
(2 Tim. 3:14-17)

# Table of Contents

PREFACE .....	xv
CHAPTER 1 OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES .....	1
CHAPTER 2 OF GOD AND OF THE HOLY TRINITY .....	49
CHAPTER 3 OF GOD'S DECREE .....	99
CHAPTER 4 OF CREATION.....	147
CHAPTER 5 OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.....	157
CHAPTER 6 OF THE FALL OF MAN, OF SIN, AND OF THE PUNISHMENT THEREOF.....	167
CHAPTER 7 OF GOD'S COVENANT .....	179
CHAPTER 8 OF CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.....	265
CHAPTER 9 OF FREE WILL .....	373
CHAPTER 10 OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.....	395
CHAPTER 11 OF JUSTIFICATION .....	414
CHAPTER 12 OF ADOPTION .....	449
CHAPTER 13 OF SANCTIFICATION.....	453
CHAPTER 14 OF SAVING FAITH .....	477
CHAPTER 15 OF REPENTANCE UNTO LIFE AND SALVATION.....	507
CHAPTER 16 OF GOOD WORKS .....	521
CHAPTER 17 OF THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS .....	535
CHAPTER 18 OF THE ASSURANCE OF GRACE AND SALVATION.....	589
APPENDIX.....	599
SCRIPTURE INDEX.....	605
SUBJECT INDEX .....	611
AUTHOR INDEX .....	617

# Detailed Outline

PREFACE.....	XV
CHAPTER 1 OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.....	1
§1 The Holy Scripture is the Only Sufficient, Certain, and Infallible Rule of Faith.....	1
<i>General Revelation and the Necessity of Scripture</i> .....	3
<i>Scripture is the Self-Revelation of God</i> .....	4
<i>The Truthfulness, Infallibility, and Inerrancy of Scripture</i> .....	5
<i>Sola Scriptura</i> .....	8
§2 The 66 Books of the Old and New Testament.....	10
<i>The Canonicity of the New Testament</i> .....	11
<i>The Inspiration of Scripture</i> .....	13
<i>The Words of the Bible are God's</i> .....	18
<i>The Rule of Faith and Life</i> .....	20
§3 The Apocrypha and Canon of the Old Testament .....	20
<i>The Canon of the Old Testament</i> .....	21
<i>The Apocrypha</i> .....	27
§4 The Authority of the Holy Scripture.....	29
§5 The Testimony of the Spirit to the Holy Scripture .....	31
§6 The Sufficiency of the Holy Scripture.....	34
<i>The Sufficiency of Scripture</i> .....	34
<i>The Closed Canon of Scripture</i> .....	38
§7 The Perspicuity of the Holy Scripture .....	39
§8 The Hebrew and Greek Immediately Inspired by God .....	41
§9 The Analogy of Faith.....	42
§10 Holy Scripture is the Supreme Judge in All Matters .....	44
<i>Acts 15</i> .....	44
<i>2 Peter 1:19a</i> .....	45
CHAPTER 2 OF GOD AND OF THE HOLY TRINITY .....	49
§1 The Attributes of God.....	49
<i>The Incommunicable Attributes of God</i> .....	50
<i>The Communicable Attributes of God</i> .....	68
§2 The Self-Sufficiency of God.....	69
§3 The Trinity of God.....	71
<i>Definition of Terms</i> .....	72
<i>The Deity of the Three Persons</i> .....	74
<i>Monotheism and Equality</i> .....	86
<i>The Distinction of Persons</i> .....	87
<i>The Athanasian Creed</i> .....	93
<i>Trinitarian Heresies</i> .....	94
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	96
CHAPTER 3 OF GOD'S DECREE .....	99
§1 God Hath Decreed in Himself, from all Eternity, Whatsoever Comes to Pass.....	99
<i>Introduction</i> .....	100
<i>General Sovereignty</i> .....	101
<i>Particular Sovereignty</i> .....	105
§2 God's Decree is not Based on What He Foresaw .....	117
§3 Reprobation .....	118
<i>What is Reprobation?</i> .....	119
<i>What About God Hardening Hearts?</i> .....	120
<i>A Biblical Case for Reprobation</i> .....	120
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	127
§4 The Immutability of Election and Reprobation .....	127
§5 Unconditional Election.....	128
<i>Definition</i> .....	128
<i>The T is First</i> .....	129



<i>A Biblical Case for Unconditional Election</i> .....	130
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	143
§6 God Foreordains the Ends and the Means.....	144
§7 The High Mystery of Predestination.....	145
CHAPTER 4 OF CREATION.....	147
§1 It Pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to Make the World.....	147
<i>Creation Exists for God's Glory</i> .....	148
<i>The Days of Creation</i> .....	149
<i>What Was Created on Each Day?</i> .....	151
<i>Age of the Earth</i> .....	151
<i>Presuppositions</i> .....	152
§2 Man is the Image of God.....	152
§3 The Law of Nature and the Positive Command in the Garden.....	155
CHAPTER 5 OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.....	157
§1 God the Good Creator of all Things.....	157
§2 God is the First Cause and Orders Second Causes.....	159
§3 God Uses Means.....	159
§4 God's Determinate Counsel Extended to the Fall and Every Other Sin.....	161
§5 The Providence of God as it Relates to His Children.....	162
§6 The Providence of God as it Relates to the Wicked.....	163
§7 The Providence of God as it Relates to His Church.....	164
CHAPTER 6 OF THE FALL OF MAN, OF SIN, AND OF THE PUNISHMENT THEREOF.....	167
§1 Man was Created Upright and Perfect, but They Fell.....	167
§2 The Fall from Original Righteousness.....	169
§3 Original Sin and Federal Headship.....	169
§4 Total Inability.....	171
<i>Man's Intentions are Evil</i> .....	172
<i>Man is Unable to do Good</i> .....	173
<i>Man is Unable to Come to God</i> .....	173
<i>Man is a Slave of Satan</i> .....	175
<i>Man is Dead in Sins</i> .....	175
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	177
§5 The Corruption of Nature, During this Life, Doth Remain.....	177
CHAPTER 7 OF GOD'S COVENANT.....	179
§1 Covenant Theology.....	179
<i>Introduction to Covenant Theology</i> .....	180
<i>What is a Covenant?</i> .....	181
<i>The Covenant of Works</i> .....	182
<i>Federal Headship and Covenant Theology</i> .....	190
§2 God Moved to Redeem Man after the Covenant of Works was Broken.....	191
<i>The Curse of the Law</i> .....	191
<i>The Condemning Adamic Covenant</i> .....	192
<i>The Covenant of Redemption</i> .....	192
§3 The Covenant of Grace is Revealed by Farther Steps.....	194
<i>The Covenant of Grace</i> .....	195
<i>The Noahic Covenant</i> .....	201
<i>The Abrahamic Covenant</i> .....	206
<i>The Mosaic Covenant</i> .....	223
<i>The Davidic Covenant</i> .....	242
<i>The New Covenant</i> .....	250
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	263
CHAPTER 8 OF CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.....	265
§1 It Pleased God to Choose and Ordain the Lord Jesus.....	265
<i>Christ the Elect</i> .....	266
<i>Christ the Priest and Mediator</i> .....	266

<i>Christ the Prophet</i> .....	270
<i>Christ the King</i> .....	271
<i>Christ the Savior</i> .....	271
<i>Christ the Head</i> .....	271
<i>Christ the Heir</i> .....	272
<i>Christ the Judge</i> .....	273
<i>Christ's Seed</i> .....	274
§2 The Person of Christ .....	275
<i>Eternal God</i> .....	276
<i>The Incarnation</i> .....	278
<i>Very God and Very Man</i> .....	283
<i>Christological Heresies</i> .....	288
§3 The Human Nature United to the Divine .....	290
<i>He was Sanctified and Anointed with the Holy Spirit</i> .....	290
<i>In Him are the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge</i> .....	291
<i>He was Called by the Father to be the Mediator</i> .....	292
§4 The Lord Jesus Most Willingly Undertake all Things .....	292
<i>Christ Fulfilled the Law</i> .....	293
<i>The Penal Substitutionary Atonement of Christ</i> .....	294
<i>He Remained in the State of the Dead</i> .....	298
<i>The Resurrection of Christ</i> .....	299
<i>The Ascension of Christ</i> .....	303
<i>Christ the Intercessor</i> .....	304
<i>Christ the Returning Judge</i> .....	307
§5 The Lord Jesus Purchased an Everlasting Inheritance .....	307
<i>The Active Obedience of Christ</i> .....	308
<i>The Sacrifice of Himself</i> .....	309
<i>Christ Fully Satisfied the Justice of God</i> .....	309
<i>Reconciliation with God and Particularity (2 Cor. 5:21)</i> .....	310
<i>The Believers' Inheritance in Christ</i> .....	312
§6 The Virtue, Efficacy, and Benefit of Christ Were Communicated to the Elect in all Ages .....	313
<i>The Retroactive Blood of Christ</i> .....	314
<i>The Benefits were Revealed through Shadows and Types</i> .....	316
§7 Christ Acts According to Both Natures .....	316
§8 Particular Atonement .....	317
<i>John Owen's Case for Particular Redemption</i> .....	319
<i>The Purpose and Scope of the Atonement</i> .....	342
<i>Passages used for Universal Atonement</i> .....	353
§9 Christ is the Only Mediator Between God and Man .....	371
§10 The Threefold Offices are Necessary .....	372
CHAPTER 9 OF FREE WILL .....	373
§1 Natural Liberty and Power of Acting Upon Choice .....	374
<i>God Ordains Human Actions</i> .....	374
<i>Edwards on the Will</i> .....	375
§2 The Will in the State of Innocence .....	384
§3 The Will in the State of Sin .....	385
<i>The Biblical Testimony about Fallen Man's Will</i> .....	386
<i>The Inconsistency of Libertarian Free Will</i> .....	388
§4 The Will in the State of Grace .....	390
<i>No Longer Slaves of Sin</i> .....	390
<i>Remaining Corruptions</i> .....	392
<i>Will the Good</i> .....	393
§5 The Will in the State of Glory .....	394
CHAPTER 10 OF EFFECTUAL CALLING .....	395
§1 Those Predestined Unto Life, are Effectually Called by the Word and Spirit .....	395
<i>Called by the Word and Spirit</i> .....	396
<i>State of Death and Sin</i> .....	398
<i>Enlightening our Minds</i> .....	398
<i>Renewal of Nature</i> .....	399
<i>Effectual Drawing</i> .....	399
<i>Made Willing by His Grace</i> .....	399

§2 This Effectual Call is of God's Free and Special Grace Alone .....	400
<i>Not from Anything at all Foreseen</i> .....	400
<i>Man is Wholly Passive</i> .....	401
§3 Elect Infants Dying in Infancy are Regenerated and Saved .....	401
<i>Infant Salvation</i> .....	403
§4 The Reprobate May Have Some Common Operations of the Spirit .....	411
<i>Unbelievers in the Congregation of the Believers</i> .....	411
<i>Solus Christus</i> .....	412
CHAPTER 11 OF JUSTIFICATION .....	414
§1 Those Whom God Effectually Calls, He also Freely Justifies .....	414
<i>Not Infusion of Righteousness</i> .....	415
<i>Imputed Righteousness</i> .....	416
<i>Blessings of Justification</i> .....	419
<i>Faith is a Gift</i> .....	423
<i>Regeneration Precedes Faith</i> .....	426
§2 Faith is the Alone Instrument of Justification .....	430
<i>The Case for Sola Fide</i> .....	430
<i>Relation Between Faith and Justification</i> .....	432
<i>Faith and Works</i> .....	435
§3 Christ, by His Obedience and Death, did Fully Discharge the Debt .....	439
<i>By Obedience and Death</i> .....	440
<i>Substitutionary Atonement</i> .....	440
<i>Not from Anything in Them</i> .....	440
<i>God Glorified in Justification</i> .....	441
§4 God Has from all Eternity Decreed to Justify all the Elect .....	442
<i>The Work of the Trinity</i> .....	442
<i>Justified in Time</i> .....	443
§5 God Continues to Forgive the Sins of the Justified .....	444
<i>Continued Confession of Sin and Forgiveness</i> .....	445
<i>The Justified can Never Fall Away from their Justification</i> .....	446
<i>Renew their Faith and Repentance</i> .....	446
§6 The Justification of Believers Under the Old Testament was the Same.....	446
CHAPTER 12 OF ADOPTION .....	449
§1 The Grace of Adoption.....	449
<i>In and for Christ</i> .....	450
<i>The Liberties and Privileges</i> .....	451
<i>The Future Aspect of Adoption</i> .....	452
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	452
CHAPTER 13 OF SANCTIFICATION.....	453
§1 Through the Virtue of Christ's Death and Resurrection Believers are Also Farther Sanctified... 453	453
<i>United, Called, and Regenerated</i> .....	454
<i>Sanctification</i> .....	454
<i>The Differences Between Sanctification and Justification</i> .....	470
§2 Sanctification is Throughout the Whole Man, yet Imperfect in this Life.....	471
<i>Remnants of Corruption</i> .....	471
<i>Irreconcilable War</i> .....	471
<i>Body and Soul</i> .....	472
§3 The Regenerate Part Doth Overcome.....	473
<i>The Victory is Guaranteed</i> .....	474
<i>Sanctification is Completed in Eternity</i> .....	475
CHAPTER 14 OF SAVING FAITH .....	477
§1 The Grace of Faith is the Work of the Spirit .....	477
<i>Word Study</i> .....	478
<i>Expressions for Faith</i> .....	483
<i>Definition of Faith</i> .....	485
<i>Different Kinds of Faith</i> .....	486
<i>The Grace of Faith</i> .....	487

<i>Means Appointed for the Strengthening of our Faith</i> .....	488
§2 By Faith a Christian Believes to be True Whatsoever is Revealed in the Word.....	489
<i>The Nature of Saving Faith</i> .....	490
<i>The Object of Saving Faith</i> .....	491
<i>The Elements of Saving Faith</i> .....	494
<i>The Ground of Faith</i> .....	497
<i>The Blessings of Faith</i> .....	499
<i>Faith and Repentance</i> .....	502
§3 Faith May be Weak or Strong.....	503
<i>Temporary Believers</i> .....	503
<i>The Lasting and Growing Faith</i> .....	505
CHAPTER 15 OF REPENTANCE UNTO LIFE AND SALVATION .....	507
§1 God Grants Repentance unto Life .....	507
§2 God Has Mercifully Provided Continual Renewal .....	509
<i>Forgiveness</i> .....	509
<i>David and Peter</i> .....	511
§3 Repentance – Definition and Case.....	511
<i>Repentance is an Evangelical Grace</i> .....	512
<i>Marks of True Repentance</i> .....	514
<i>Repentance and Faith: Interconnected and Necessary</i> .....	516
§4 Repentance is to be Continued through our Lives.....	517
§5 There is no Sin that can Damn the Repentant.....	518
CHAPTER 16 OF GOOD WORKS.....	521
§1 Good Works are only such as God has Commanded in His Holy Word .....	521
<i>The Criteria for Good Works</i> .....	521
§2 Good Works are the Fruits and Evidences of a True and Lively Faith.....	523
<i>Good Works are Fruits of our Faith</i> .....	524
<i>They Manifest our Thankfulness</i> .....	524
<i>They Strengthen our Assurance</i> .....	525
<i>They Edify Our Brethren</i> .....	526
<i>They Adorn the Profession of the Gospel</i> .....	526
<i>They Stop the Mouth of the Adversaries</i> .....	527
<i>They Glorify God</i> .....	527
§3 Ability to do Good Works is Wholly from the Spirit of Christ .....	528
<i>Good Works are God’s Good Works in Us</i> .....	528
<i>The Call to do Good Works</i> .....	529
§4 Even the Best of Us Fall Short of our Duty .....	529
§5 We Can’t by Our Best Works Merit Pardon of Sin or Eternal Life .....	529
<i>Good Works do not Merit Pardon of Sin</i> .....	530
<i>We are Unworthy Servants</i> .....	530
§6 The Good Works of Christians are Accepted in Christ .....	531
§7 Works Done by Unregenerate Men .....	532
<i>The Works of the Unregenerate are not Good</i> .....	532
<i>Neglect of Their “Good Works” is Even Worse</i> .....	533
CHAPTER 17 OF THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS .....	535
§1 The Elect Can Neither Totally nor Finally Fall from the State of Grace .....	535
<i>The Impossibility of Final Apostasy for the Elect</i> .....	536
<i>Storms and Floods</i> .....	557
<i>Falling Away From Grace?</i> .....	557
§2 The Perseverance of the Saints Depends not Upon Their Own Free Will.....	583
<i>Perseverance Depends not on Man</i> .....	584
<i>Perseverance Depends on</i> .....	584
§3 The Elect Shall Renew their Repentance and be Preserved to the End .....	587
CHAPTER 18 OF THE ASSURANCE OF GRACE AND SALVATION .....	589
§1 A Believer May be Certain that they are in the State of Grace.....	589
<i>Temporary Believers</i> .....	590
<i>Assurance of Being in the State of Grace</i> .....	590

§2 Infallible Assurance of Faith Founded on the Blood and Righteousness of Christ .....	591
<i>What Assurance is Founded on</i> .....	592
§3 Infallible Assurance Does not so Belong to the Essence of Faith .....	594
<i>Seek Assurance!</i> .....	594
<i>The Fruits of Assurance</i> .....	597
§4 True Believers May Have their Assurance Shaken, Diminished, and Intermitted .....	597
APPENDIX.....	599
1 - John Owen's 17 Differences Between the Mosaic and the Covenant of Grace .....	599
SCRIPTURE INDEX.....	605
SUBJECT INDEX .....	611
AUTHOR INDEX .....	617



## PREFACE

In a time when doctrine and true knowledge of God is neglected, it is important for Christians to know *what* they believe and *why* they believe it. This is the reason that this study of the 1689 began for me. Through the ministry of Dr. James R. White, watching his debates and listening to *The Dividing Line*, and Facebook theological groups, I came to learn of the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith. Around that time, I had already become a Calvinist and was involved in a (general) Baptist church in the Netherlands where I live. Initially, I began to read the Confession and make brief comments on each chapter and paragraph. Around the same time, I got the idea to work on a commentary on the book of Revelation. I got to chapter 6 before I realized that there was something more important that I could spend my time on. Eschatology is important, but knowing *what* I believe and *why* I believe it is more important.

I started studying the Confession, not for the sake of the Confession, but to learn the biblical doctrines asserted. The Confession, by its nature, is a systematic collection of assertions about Christian doctrine. But an assertion is just that—an assertion. I was not satisfied with assertions alone. I wanted to *prove* the assertions made by the Confession. I know only one standard of truth—the Word of God. Around that time, I had read Wayne Grudem’s *Systematic Theology*. It was my first introduction to deep and biblically argued doctrine. It set a precedent for me of how I should handle doctrine and the biblical text. Therefore, having now learned a bit about doctrine and approaching doctrine systematically, I started to make cases for the confessional assertions. This process, basically, began in 2015 when I began posting these commentaries on my website<sup>1</sup> and continued as I better learned to articulate doctrine and defend it. I kept expanding each chapter. In a sense, it was or is never *finished*. I wanted the commentary to be beneficial to the average believer, and to show them the importance of doctrine and that one does not to be formally educated in theology to love theology. I’m just a software engineer. But I’ve been graced to know Jesus Christ, my precious Lord, and my purpose is to do everything in my power to increase my knowledge, reverence, awe of and love for Him. I thank the Triune God that He has granted me His Holy Spirit and His Word through which I may come to know Him and grow in my knowledge of Him.

As you read this commentary, it will quickly be manifest how dependent I am on theologians of the past, as well as some of the present. I acknowledge my dependence and I am thankful for these faithful men that God has gifted the church.

My prayer is that God might be magnified and glorified through this work. The purpose of this work is to focus on the God-breathed text as the only infallible, final, and ultimate standard. This work tries to show how the Particular Baptist forefathers were immersed in the Word of God and how biblical their assertions were. This means that the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith from 1689 is a

---

<sup>1</sup> The contents of the book can be found at [www.thecalvinist.net/1689](http://www.thecalvinist.net/1689). The book was (slightly) modified and expanded.

faithful interpretation of biblical doctrine and the Bible.

A word is due concerning how the commentary is to be used or is arranged. First of all, the chapters are inter-dependent. You will see me reference other chapters in the Confession for a larger treatment on a subject or something else. I've tried to provide a lot of references to other sections and pages because I know that sometimes one doesn't want to read a whole chapter or the whole book, but some sections. Where relevant, references to other sections and portions are made in the footnotes or the main text. Secondly, you will notice that I only quote commentaries from TheWord Bible software.<sup>2</sup> These commentaries are in the public domain and are thus freely available elsewhere on the Internet.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, each paragraph starts first with a textual commentary. This commentary concerns itself mainly with the wording of the paragraph and is brief. Following that is the larger, biblical exposition of the confessional assertions. The proof-texts have been supplied by Dr. Sam Waldron's *A Modern Exposition of the 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith*.

You will quickly notice that I use a lot of emphasis in the commentary especially bold font. In the brief commentary sections, the bold words indicate words directly used in the paragraph. In the main body, they indicate emphasis. References to chapters and paragraphs of the Confession are likewise in bold font (e.g., see **ch. 1**).

Grab your Bible and let us dive into the divine Scriptures by the grace of the Holy Spirit and to the glory of the Triune!

Simon Wartanian  
April 2021  
Hoogeveen, NL

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.theword.net](http://www.theword.net)

<sup>3</sup> See especially [www.wordmodules.com](http://www.wordmodules.com) for modules for TheWord and [www.studylight.org/commentaries.html](http://www.studylight.org/commentaries.html) and [www.bible.cc](http://www.bible.cc) for the commentaries.



# CHAPTER 1

## OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

What does the Bible itself teach about the Word of God? Which books are contained in the Bible? Are the Apocryphal books God-inspired and authoritative? Who made the Bible authoritative? What is *sola scriptura*? What does it mean that Scripture is inerrant and infallible? Is Scripture sufficient? What does it mean that the Scripture is inspired? Are creeds and confessions above or subordinate to the Scriptures? In this chapter, we will explore the Bible's view of the Word of God. The paragraphs in which I deal with parts of the Scripture's doctrine are not necessarily in logical order, therefore, here are the topics in a somewhat more logical order:

1. Necessity of Scripture (§1);
2. Scripture as self-Revelation (§1);
3. Canon of the Old Testament (§4);
4. Canon of the New Testament (§3);
5. Inspiration of Scripture (§2);
6. Inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture (§1);
7. Authority of Scripture (§4);
8. Sufficiency of Scripture (§6);
9. Sola scriptura (§§1, 10);
10. Authentication of Scripture (§5);
11. Perspicuity of Scripture (§7);
12. Interpretation of Scripture (§9).

This chapter is in many ways based upon the truths in 2 Timothy 3:16. All the particular subjects which are treated are part of a unified whole doctrine about God's Word.

### §1 The Holy Scripture is the Only Sufficient, Certain, and Infallible Rule of Faith

1 | The Holy Scripture is the **only sufficient**, certain, and **infallible rule** of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience 1, although the **light of nature**, and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to **leave men inexcusable 2**; yet are they **not sufficient** to give that knowledge of God and his will which is necessary unto salvation. 3 Therefore it pleased the Lord at **sundry times and in divers manners to reveal**

**himself**, and to declare that his will unto his church **4**; and afterward for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan, and of the world, to **commit the same wholly unto writing**; which maketh the **Holy Scriptures to be most necessary 5**, those **former ways of God’s revealing his will** unto his people being now ceased. **6**

1. Isa. 8:20; Luke 16:29; Eph. 2:20; 2 Tim. 3:15-17
2. Ps. 19:1-3; Rom. 1:19-21, 32; 2:12a, 14-15
3. Ps. 19:1-3 with vv. 7-11; Rom. 1:19-21; 2:12a, 14-15 with 1:16-17; and 3:21
4. Heb. 1:1-2a
5. Prov. 22:19-21; Luke 1:1-4; 2 Pet. 1:12-15; 3:1; Deut. 17:18ff; 31:9ff, 19ff; 1 Cor. 15:1; 2 Thess. 2:1-2, 15; 3:17; Rom. 1:8-15; 15:4; Gal. 4:20; 6:11; 1 Tim. 3:14ff; Rev. 1:9, 19; 2:1 etc.; 2 Pet. 1:19-21
6. Heb. 1:1-2a; Acts 1:21-22; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:7-8; Eph. 2:20

Holy Scripture, which is defined to be the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments, is **sufficient, certain, and infallible**. This means that Scripture is enough; true and sure; and cannot err. What is the scope of this sufficiency, certainty, and infallibility? The Confession says that Scripture is the only infallible **rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience**. Holy Scripture is given as a measuring line and a standard. It is a standard of standards. There are other standards and rules besides the Bible, but the Bible *alone* is the **sufficient, certain, and infallible rule**. The Bible is the norm and rule to test everything else by.

§1 then moves to speak about the insufficiency of general revelation for salvation. The **light of nature, and the works of creation and providence** demonstrate that there is a powerful God Who is the Creator of everything. Yet this knowledge is not sufficient to save. Although it is sufficient to leave men inexcusable. This is basically Paul’s argument in Romans 1:18-32. Men know the God Who exists because of the creation which they are able to observe and because God has revealed Himself to them. So clear is this revelation that when they stand before the thrice holy God they will be found “without excuse” (v. 20). General revelation condemns. If we are to be saved, we need something more than general revelation. *Because* general revelation is insufficient to save (“**Therefore**”), the Lord specially revealed **Himself** and **His will** to His **church**. This is what theologians call *special revelation*. This revelation of God is to His people, the **church** and it concerns **Himself** and **His will**. Scripture is the self-disclosure of God. 1 Samuel 3:21 is an interesting passage where it is said that “the LORD revealed himself to Samuel at Shiloh by the word of the LORD.” The revelation of the LORD happened *by* the word of the LORD. When God reveals His Word and speaks to us through the Bible, He is not merely revealing *things* about us and about Himself, but He reveals *Himself* to us. 1 Timothy 3:16 describes the Bible as the breath of God.<sup>1</sup> The Word of God is personal to God and it reveals Him and is ever true and certain as the Author of it is true and certain.

This part of the paragraph spoke about the revelation of the Word of God. The next part speaks about the inscripturation of the Word of God. This is the process whereby the Word of God is written down to be preserved for the next generations. This was so as to bless the **church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan, and of the world** so that we would have a certain and infallible Word of God. We would not have to try to remember what God said when we could read the inscripturated Word in the Bible. Furthermore, this also establishes the truthfulness of the Word of God. The Word of God is one and certain, though the interpretations thereof might differ among men. This revelation of God and His will and the subsequent inscripturation thereof is **most necessary** to know Who the true God is and the way of salvation. This is also because the **former ways of God’s revealing his will** have now ceased. God no longer gives His Word and commands it to be inscripturated. The revelation of God is complete and is sufficient for us to live godly and obedient lives before His face.

The Confession starts with the authority of the Bible because the Confession is meant to be an interpretation of the Bible. Therefore, it must start with its position on the Bible. The Confession seeks to be faithful to the Bible in what it confirms and thus it is most appropriate to start by declaring its

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 13-16 below.

position on the Bible. I think it's appropriate, though it may be strange that the Confession starts with the Bible rather than with God. But that is the case because the presentation of God in the Confession is drawn from the Scriptures and that's why it was necessary for the Confession to declare what it believes about the Bible before it dives into topics whose belief is based upon Scripture above all. According to the Confession, the Scripture is sufficient, certain and infallible. It is all that we need in this life for godliness and to know the will of God. We don't need extra revelations when we have His pure and sufficient Word in our hands.

## General Revelation and the Necessity of Scripture

Looking at creation, we perceive that there must be a powerful Creator Who has created all these things and brought them into being. Looking in our hearts, we see that our conscience condemns us and that there is a law which dictates what is right and what is wrong. Looking at the beauty of the world, it is most reasonable for us to conclude that there must be an Amazing Designer of this world. This is what we call general revelation. This is the revelation of God which is available to everyone. This revelation, says the Confession, "manifest[s] the goodness, wisdom, and power of God", but it is not perfect. The purpose of general revelation is to condemn and leave men inexcusable for their rebellion against the God Whom they know. The apostle Paul makes it very clear in Romans 1:18ff that all people know the true God, yet they hold down the truth, suppressing it and choosing rather to believe the lie. He says that the created world testifies to the fact that there is a Creator Who has revealed Himself to them. God reveals Himself in creation. But since we live in a fallen world, this revelation of God is distorted, hence the necessity of verbal and special revelation. By looking at the beauty of the world and the awesome things in nature we cannot deduce that God is a Triune being existing as Father, Son, and Spirit. Nor can we deduce that we have to believe in the Lord Jesus to be saved from God's wrath. Nor can we have an idea of His special love for His people. For these things, general revelation falls short. It is able to condemn men and leave them without an excuse (v. 20), but it is not able to point them to the way of salvation. That's why it pleased God to reveal Himself in words besides His general revelation in nature.

God's revelation of Himself came in words after the Fall to Adam and Eve, and it continued with Noah, Abraham and the other saints of old. Certainly, people knew the true God in these times, just think of Melchizedek who was a high priest of the Most High God coming to Abraham. Therefore, there must have been some kind of *special* revelation from God. When we speak of special revelation, we mean God's revelation in words and visions to His people, as in the Bible. Special revelation is necessary for salvation, but the Bible is not necessary for salvation. Let me clarify. Nobody has been saved through general revelation alone for it does not have such a power. General revelation has the ability to condemn, but not save. On the other hand, every soul (beyond the age of childhood or disability, see **ch. 10:3**) that has been saved, has been saved because of God's special revelation. The message of the gospel came to them, even if they had not read the Bible. In the Bible, we have the full special revelation of God, which God wanted His people to possess. But knowledge or possession of that complete special revelation is not necessary for salvation. What is necessary is knowledge and reception of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Therefore, when we speak of the necessity of Scripture, we do not mean that you can't be saved if you have not read the Bible, or you can't be saved without the Bible. Rather, what we mean is that special revelation, which the Bible is, is necessary for salvation because of fallen man's condition in a fallen world. In Romans 10:13-15, Paul explains the necessity of special revelation for salvation. He says:

For "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved." 14 How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching? 15 And how are they to preach unless they are sent? As it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news!"

The call is for everyone to receive and call upon the Lord Christ. But, asks the apostle, how are they to call upon the Lord Christ if they had never heard of Him? Hence, Paul shows the necessity for gospel mission and gospel preaching to everyone, so that they may be saved through calling upon the name of the Lord Christ Who is willing and able to save everyone who comes to Him. It would have been very easy for the apostle to affirm that those who have not heard of the gospel are not condemned. But such

an idea would have been in contradiction to what he said in chapter 1 of the same epistle. Therefore, the call to preach the gospel is even more necessary and heightened in light of the fact that 1) they are under the wrath of God and without an excuse, and 2) the only way of salvation is through calling upon the name of the Lord. Thereby, the necessity of special revelation, which is the Scripture in our hands today, is established. We must preach the gospel, which is revealed in Scripture, for people to be saved. *That* is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 1:16).

Moving beyond the subject of the necessity of special revelation, Scripture is necessary for our spiritual growth. We need special revelation to know the will of God more certainly and more clearly. Certainly, we know the law of God by virtue of us being made in the *Imago Dei*, and therefore, we know some things concerning the will of God and right and wrong. But as we noted above, just like our perception of general revelation has been corrupted through the Fall, so likewise our perception of the moral law is corrupted and not clear. Therefore, it pleased God to reveal His perfect law to us in the Bible with words, so that His people would more clearly know what He said and what He meant (see **ch. 19**). The Scripture is necessary for us as Christians because it is our spiritual food. Our Master, as the God-Man, repeatedly appealed and relied on Scripture, how much more should we? When tempted by Satan, the Lord famously said:

Matt. 4:4 But he answered, “It is written, ““Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.””

Notice that even in upholding the necessity and authority of Scripture, the Lord Christ appeals to Scripture (Deut. 8:3). We do not truly live by physical bread and food alone, but we are to live by every word of God. Notice how the Scripture is here described. It is said to be “word[s] that comes from the mouth of God.” It has its origin with the God of the world, and it is Him speaking by His mouth to us. We are to feed and live on this Word. The Lord does not say that we should feast on the Word, implying that we read and study it *occasionally*. But the Word ought to be like bread to us—every day’s food. We are to read and study Scripture daily so as to grow in our faith and in our relationship with God.

In 1 Peter 1:23-2:2, the apostle Peter speaks about the “imperishable...[and]...the living and abiding word of God” (v. 23), which “remains forever” (v. 25; cf. Isa. 40:8) and which is “the good news that was preached to you” (v. 25). He goes on in chapter 2 to speak of us as “newborn infants” who “long for the pure spiritual milk” (2:2), which is the word of the Lord about which he is writing. Just like newborns cannot survive without the milk of their mothers, in the same way, Christians are dependent upon the Word of God.

The subject of meditation and delight of the psalmist is “the law of the LORD” (1:2). He does not occasionally think about the Word of God, rather, “he meditates day and night” on the Word of God. It is an essential part of his life. It is the light in which he walks (119:105). He stores up God’s Word in his heart and has the desire to learn more from God (119:11-12, 18, 20). His delight is in God’s Word (119:16) and on it he meditates (119:15, 23, 27, 48, 78, 148). And so, goes the 119<sup>th</sup> Psalm praising God for giving us His law and His Word as a guide and self-revelation. A Christian cannot be spiritually healthy without the Word of God.

Although general revelation reveals that there is a God, yet it is not enough to save us. General revelation condemns. That’s why special revelation is necessary for salvation and special revelation inscripturated in Holy Writ is necessary for Christian discipleship and spiritual growth.

## Scripture is the Self-Revelation of God

The Scripture is the Word of God, which is our ultimate standard in all matters. It is the self-revelation of God to us. It is to be trusted, cherished, studied, and obeyed. In the Scriptures, we have the God of the universe speaking to us in human words, so that we may understand Him. There is a very interesting passage in 1 Samuel 3 which reads:

1 Sam. 3:21 And the LORD appeared again at Shiloh, for the **LORD revealed himself** to Samuel at Shiloh **by the word of the LORD**.

Notice how here Yahweh the Lord revealed and disclosed Himself, by His word. God revealed Himself to Samuel, who did not know the LORD yet (v. 7), by His word. God revealed Himself savingly to Samuel by a self-revelation. The word which the LORD spoke to Samuel was a revelation of

Himself. It was the Lord of all the earth speaking to a man in human language so that he would understand. God condescends so as to reveal Himself in human language to us miserable sinners. What an amazing grace! What we have in Scripture, which is “the word of the LORD”, is, in fact, the self-disclosure and revelation of God Himself. He reveals to us things about His character, His promises, His plans, His judgments, His people, and so on. It is God Himself Who makes this condescension to reveal His glory to us in verbal revelation. It pleased the Lord not to restrict this revelation of Himself to the persons or nation(s) which He originally gave, but to commit these to writing for future generations. Even in things which are no longer applicable to Christians (e.g., ceremonial law, civil law) or prophecies which are already fulfilled, we see a self-revelation of God’s holiness, covenant-keeping, and promise-keeping nature. Since Scripture is His Word. In it we have Him speaking to us and revealing Himself to us.

In 2 Timothy 3:16, Paul writes to Timothy that “All Scripture is breathed out by God”. θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*) is compound word formed from the words for *God* and for *breath* or *spirit*, hence the translation “breathed out by God”, or “God-breathed” (ISV, YLT). The idea here is that Scripture is God’s revelation and is given by His mouth. All and the whole of Scripture has that nature of God speaking to us. It is the breath from out of His mouth. When we put our hands before our mouths while we are speaking, we cannot but feel our breath. That is the same way Scripture is described in relation to God. It is God’s breath. It is God’s Word spoken from His mouth. This does not mean that every word of the Bible is *dictated*, but rather, the result of all that is in the Bible is exactly what God wanted to have there and is God-breathed. The Bible as (self-)revelation is closely connected with the discussion of its authority, therefore, we will say more on this below.

## The Truthfulness, Infallibility, and Inerrancy of Scripture

We may know and not doubt the truth of the matter which is affirmed in the Scriptures on the basis of the God of Scripture. We know that the world was created in 6 days because Scripture testifies to this. We know and believe that Adam and Eve existed because Scripture treats them as historical persons. We know that the Flood and Babel occurred because they are treated as historical facts in Scripture. We know that Christ died for our sins because Scriptures say so. We know that He rose because Scripture says so. We know He ascended into heaven because Scripture says so. We know that He will come back to judge the living and the dead because Scripture promises so. This is circular, we know, and every argument for an ultimate standard is circular. But there is a difference between a narrow circle and a wide circle. A narrow circle says the Bible is true because the Bible says that it is true. This is obviously true for Christians, but it is a very narrow circle. On the other hand, you could argue that the Bible is true because of its self-authenticating nature, fulfilled prophecy within itself based on the God that it reveals. Isaiah 53 is an incredible example of fulfilled prophecy within the pages of the Bible. One Testament records the prophecy, the other records its fulfillment against all the beliefs and expectations of the Jews at that time. The Bible is the palace of the King, and we may certainly go into the palace to inquire about what this King has said about Himself.

The truthfulness, infallibility, and inerrancy of Scripture are based on the God of Scripture. Since Scripture is His Word, therefore, it reflects His character. God is described as being “the truth” (John 14:6), the “God, who never lies” (Titus 1:2; cf. Num. 23:19). His Word is said to be “the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation” (Eph. 1:13), “pure words...purified seven times” (Ps. 12:6), “Every word of God proves true” (Prov. 30:5), “your word is truth” (John 17:17; cf. 2 Sam. 7:28; 1 Kgs. 17:24; Ps. 119:43, 89–90, 142, 151). The word “infallible” is closely related and sometimes synonymous with “inerrant.” Noah Webster defines infallibleness as “Not fallible; not capable of erring; entirely exempt from liability to mistake; applied to persons. No man is infallible; to be infallible is the prerogative of God only.”<sup>2</sup> He likewise defines inerrability as, “Exemption from error or from the possibility of erring; infallibility.”<sup>3</sup> He sees these two terms as synonymous and meaning the same thing, namely, that thing which is inerrant and infallible, cannot be wrong or contain errors. But there is a certain way in which inerrancy and infallibility differ from each other. Michael D. Marlowe, commenting on the *Chicago Statement On Biblical Inerrancy*, gives us this distinction:

<sup>2</sup> *Infallibleness* (Webster's Dictionary 1828). Retrieved from <http://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/Infallibleness>.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Inerrability*. Retrieved from <http://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/Inerrability>.

*Infallible* signifies the quality of neither misleading nor being misled and so safeguards in categorical terms the truth that Holy Scripture is a sure, safe, and reliable rule and guide in all matters.

Similarly, *inerrant* signifies the quality of being free from all falsehood or mistake and so safeguards the truth that Holy Scripture is entirely true and trustworthy in all its assertions.<sup>4</sup>

Article XI states that “Infallibility and inerrancy may be distinguished, but not separated.”<sup>5</sup> Therefore, when we speak of the inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture, we are speaking about the complete truthfulness of Scripture, and of the fact that they’re incapable of being wrong or teaching us falsehood as truth and is free from all error. But do we mean that the translation of Scripture in various languages do not contain errors? No, this is not what we mean. Do we mean then that the existing Greek and Hebrew manuscripts contain no errors? “No” to this question as well. The inerrancy of Scripture concerns the original autographs, which the original writers of Scripture, penned by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Only they were incapable and actually free from all error. The extant manuscripts do, in fact, contain errors in the variants, but these variants were always known to the church and not because of modern biblical criticism. The church has also known the existence of textual variants because the transmission of the NT texts was a free transmission. This means, that it was people, like you and me, who copied the Scriptures, and not government officials or professionals. Add to that the fact the way in which the NT was written in the first millennium. It was written in uncial form, which is all capital letters with almost no space or punctuation. In such a setting, where you see a long string of letters, which are multiple words, it is no wonder that scribes would make some mistakes. Add to that the fact that anyone who was able, did copy the Scriptures. In other words, not all the copyists of Scripture were professional scribes. In light of this, it is easy to see how textual variants have crept into the NT text. These textual variants are not hidden from the public but are well known. Most NT scholars know these variants and have a plausible explanation for how they might have crept into the text. But the fact remains, as Dan Wallace says, that although we have some errors (i.e., textual variants), we still have the original words there. It is like a puzzle of 1000 pieces, but we have 1100 pieces. You cannot go wrong. Furthermore, and contrary to popular opinion, these textual variants are insignificant and do not affect the doctrines of the NT.<sup>6</sup>

Returning back to our discussion of inerrancy, we said that the original autographs are what were infallible, not the extant copies. But all scholars admit that the original autographs are no longer with us. Therefore, is it not a waste of time to talk about the inerrancy of Scripture? That will stand only on the supposition that the originals vary radically from the extant manuscripts, which is false. As we said above, we have not lost the original readings of the NT because when copies were made, the manuscripts from which the copies were made, were obviously not destroyed. So, although a scribe may have made some (unintentional) mistakes in his copy, we have not lost anything from the original text, but we have gained some textual variants. In other words, what we have is not 900 pieces for a 1000-piece puzzle, but 1100 pieces of a 1000-piece puzzle. There is not a loss of data to the NT, but an addition of data, which means that the original is still in the body of NT manuscripts. Using various criteria of authenticity scholars are able to determine which readings belonged to the original writers of Scripture. There is not a variant which affects any doctrine of the NT. Therefore, the Christian should not be afraid to believe in the complete truthfulness of Scripture. Dr. Greg Bahnsen, in a very fine article, writes that

restricting inerrancy to the autographa *enables us to consistently confess the truthfulness of God* – and that is quite important indeed! Inability to do so would be quite theologically damaging. Only with an inerrant autograph can we avoid attributing error to the God of truth. An error in the original would be attributable to God Himself, because He, in the pages of Scripture, takes responsibility for the very words of the biblical authors. Errors in copies, however, are the sole responsibility of the scribes involved, in which case God’s veracity is not impugned.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Michael D. Marlowe, *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy with Exposition* (Bible Researcher). Retrieved from <http://www.bible-researcher.com/chicago1.html>.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, or <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/the-chicago-statement-on-biblical-inerrancy>.

<sup>6</sup> For more on this subject, check out Daniel Wallace and James White (his book *The King James Only Controversy* is likewise good) on YouTube.

<sup>7</sup> Greg L. Bahnsen, *The Inerrancy of the Autographa*. Retrieved from <http://www.cmfnow.com/articles/pt042.htm>. Emphasis original.

In light of this all, the infallibility of Scripture is that none of the inspired writers of Scripture affirmed or taught in their writings that which is false and contrary to fact. In other words, everything that they wrote down was completely true. This does not mean that the Bible is in error when it describes things from the observer's point of view (e.g., the sun rising), or it rounds numbers, approximations and so on. Likewise, grammatical precision is not required by the doctrine of infallibility. Some statements may be grammatically inaccurate, though still communicate truth (e.g., "you ain't seen nothing!"). It is not a problem or a challenge to the doctrine of inerrancy when the NT loosely quotes or alludes to the Old, without being precise, as we in the modern world would with quotations. Rather, the issue is that the writers of Scripture never affirmed or communicated that which is false and contrary to fact. What they wrote down were the words of God, which are altogether true.

This is affirmed, as mentioned, on the basis of the fact that the Scriptures claim to be the self-revelation and words of God. Therefore, if they truly are the words from God, they are true and infallible words, just like their Author. Any contrary view of infallibility must limit God's power or activity in the world in the claim that such an idea of inerrant inspiration and inscription is not possible, God couldn't have accomplished such a thing. Since God is truthful (Ps. 65:16; John 14:6) and cannot lie (Num. 23:19), therefore, His words are likewise truthful and without error. The Lord Jesus says to the Father, "your word is truth" (John 17:17) because the God to Whom this Word belongs is truthful. Therefore, "The words of the LORD are pure words" (Ps. 12:6), and "Every word of God proves true" (Prov. 30:5). If they are truthful, they cannot contain error. Never in the many disputes of the Lord Jesus with the Pharisees do we read of any doubt, from both parties, about the truthfulness, inerrancy or canonicity of Scripture. Never.

In fact, we believe the Lord affirmed the inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture with no opposition from the Jews, i.e., the Jews did not reject the doctrine. In John 10:35, we have our Lord saying that "Scripture cannot be broken". There is no way to annul or to make ineffective what the Scripture says. It is altogether true. The *ESV Study Bible* notes that "Jesus is depending on just one word ("gods") in the OT for his argument. When he says that Scripture "cannot be broken," he implies that every single word in Scripture is completely true and reliable. His opponents do not differ with this high view of Scripture, either here or anywhere else in the Gospels."<sup>8</sup> Have you noticed, in Jesus' discussion with the Jews, the offhanded nature of this remark? It is a big deal to us, but it is just thrown there by the Lord as a way of saying, "and just like we agree that the Scripture cannot be broken, therefore..." The statement does not form an essential part of his argument, rather, it is an offhanded comment about what they both believe about Scripture. Kevin DeYoung writes:

In John 10:35 *lou* carries the sense of breaking, nullifying, or invalidating. It's Jesus's way of affirming that no word of Scripture can be falsified. No promise or threat can fall short of fulfillment. No statement can be found erroneous.<sup>9</sup>

Do you also remember Luke 20:27-40 where the Lord Jesus made a whole argument on the basis of the verb "I am" being present tense? Would He have made such an argument if there was a question about the fallibility and errancy of Scripture? The whole argument was that God said to Moses "I *am* the God of..." and not "I *was* the God of..." and it is said that "they no longer dared to ask him any question" (v. 40). Such trustworthiness in the Scripture and faith in its complete truthfulness is the doctrine of inerrancy. John Gill explains that the Scripture cannot

be made null and void; whatever that says is true, there is no contradicting it, or objecting to it: it is a Jewish way of speaking, much used in the Talmud; when one doctor has produced an argument, or instance, in any point of debate, another says, *איכא למיפרך*, "it may be broken"; or objected to, in such and such a manner, and be refuted: but the Scripture cannot be broken, that is not to be objected to, there can be no confutation of that.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The Holy Bible: English Standard Version: *The ESV Study Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2008), p. 2044.

<sup>9</sup> Kevin DeYoung, *Taking God At His Word: Why the Bible Is Knowable, Necessary, and Enough, and What That Means for You and Me* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), p. 98.

<sup>10</sup> John Gill, *Exposition on the Entire Bible* (1746-1763), on John 10:35. Retrieved from TheWord Bible Software. Footnote references removed.

In Matthew 5:17-18, the Lord said:

Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. 18 For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, **not an iota, not a dot, will pass** from the Law until all is accomplished.

Here the Lord Jesus demonstrates His commitment to the full authority and infallibility of the OT. The Lord Jesus goes to the most insignificant detail of the Scriptures and affirms that they will not by any means pass away. This demonstrates that He believed in the inspiration, inerrancy as well as the preservation of Scripture. John MacArthur notes, “Here Christ was affirming the utter inerrancy and absolute authority of the OT as the word of God—down to the smallest stroke or letter.”<sup>11</sup> Matthew Henry comments on this place:

Heaven and earth shall come together, and all the fulness thereof be wrapped up in ruin and confusion, rather than any word of God shall fall to the ground, or be in vain. *The word of the Lord endures for ever*, both that of the law, and that of the gospel. Observe, the care of God concerning his law extends itself even to those things that seem to be of least account in it, the iotas and the titles; for whatever belongs to God, and bears his stamp, be it ever so little, shall be preserved.<sup>12</sup>

The same is asserted for the Lord Jesus’ teaching, and by extension to His teaching *through* the apostles, in Matthew 24:35. His words will not fail to accomplish that which He intends. They are the words of God and are more powerful than the cosmos itself. It would be easier for the whole cosmos to vanish away than the Words of our God to pass away.

Words of men are known to contain lies, but the words of God have no lies whatsoever in them (Titus 1:2) because this God is a God of truth (Isa. 65:16; John 14:6; 17:17). Paul says in Romans 3:4:

By no means! **Let God be true** though every one were a liar, as it is written, “That you may be justified in your words, and prevail when you are judged.”

God is always true and every time when He opens His holy mouth and speaks to His people through His God-breathed Word. Words of men may contain errors, but the God of the Word cannot lie and His words are always true.

Believing the doctrine of inerrancy is the natural implication if we affirm that the Bible is the Word of God. Affirming the doctrine of inerrancy is simply submitting to the absolute lordship of God, even in thinking about His Word and following the Messiah’s view of Scripture. Since we are Christians, we, therefore, should share the same view of Jesus on Scripture, which was clearly that they were inerrant and infallible, and fully trustworthy.

## Sola Scriptura

The Scriptures are the sole infallible rule of faith for the church. Since they are *theopneustos*, God-speaking (Matt 22:31; 2 Tim. 3:16-17; 2 Pet. 1:20-21), they are, by definition, ultimate in authority, for there can be no higher authority than God Himself. All other rules of faith, creeds, councils, or anything else produced by the church herself, is subject to the ultimate correction of God’s Word.

This subject is related to the truthfulness and infallibility of Scripture, the inspiration of Scripture (§2), the authority of Scripture (§4), and the sufficiency of Scripture (§6). If all these things are true, what we get is *sola scriptura*. What does *sola scriptura* actually mean? Does it mean that the church is not to use anything but the Bible? Does it mean that the Bible is the only authority? Does *sola scriptura* deny the validity of using creeds and confessions?

We can assume that the answer to the last question is obviously a “no,” since *sola scriptura* is asserted in all the Reformed *confessions*. According to the definition given above of *sola scriptura*, the doctrine teaches specifically that *since* the Bible is described as God-breathed, that is, spoken by God

<sup>11</sup> John MacArthur, *The MacArthur Study Bible: English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2010), p. 1367.

<sup>12</sup> Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (1708–1710), on Matthew 5:17-20. Retrieved from TheWord Bible Software.



and coming from His mouth,<sup>13</sup> and since it is only the Bible which is described thus, therefore, the Bible is to function as the sole infallible rule of faith. Only the Word of God is infallible, inerrant, God-breathed, absolutely authoritative and binding. Only the Word of God is described thus in Holy Scripture. Traditions and other things are never said to be infallible, inerrant, sufficient and so on. Therefore, since it is only in the Scriptures where we have the direct voice of God speaking to us (Matt. 22:31) and we have His very words (2 Tim. 3:16), therefore, they are the only infallible rule of faith.

*Sola scriptura* teaches that since the Bible is the only God-breathed revelation to the church and the world, therefore, it is the highest authority for the church. *Sola scriptura* does not deny other authorities in the church, as is often erroneously thought. There is a difference between *sola* and *solo scriptura*. *Sola scriptura* teaches that the Scriptures are the only and sole *sufficient, certain, infallible, inerrant, and absolutely authoritative* rule of faith for the church. A special and hard emphasis is placed on the adjectives describing the rule of faith. This does not imply that the church has no other authorities such as elders, confessions, creeds. But what *sola scriptura* teaches is that all other authorities are subject to the sole infallible and sufficient authority of the Word. *Solo scriptura* on the other hand, which is not the Reformed position, teaches that the Bible is the only authority for the church, period. It teaches that the church cannot benefit from creeds, confessions, councils, writings of dead men and so on. We, on the other hand, accept all these things, yet we do not blindly accept them, but we have to test them against the “only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience” (§1).

Since the Scriptures teach their truthfulness, inspiration, sufficiency, and authority, therefore, it follows that they are the only infallible and certain rule of faith given to the church. To be sure, this does not mean that we may not use other authorities, as councils, creeds, and confessions, but these authorities are *subordinate* and are to be examined by “the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience”. Notice that the Holy Scriptures are said to be sufficient on matters of faith and obedience, not all things. We do not find in the Scriptures where we should go to work, how we should start our car and a ton of other things. But that is not the Reformed position on the sufficiency and the sole authority of Scripture. Rather, Scripture is the sole authority and sufficient on *matters of faith and obedience* because those things are only known through special revelation, which the Bible is. Scripture is the only and highest authority to decide matters of religion. As §10 of this chapter asserts:

The **supreme judge**, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be **no other but the Holy Scripture delivered by the Spirit**, into which Scripture so delivered, our faith is finally resolved.

Scripture alone is the supreme judge (notice the adjective), not councils, ancient writers or doctrines of men. In all these disputes, only Scripture is the infallible and highest authority in the possession of the church. All these things are judged by the Scriptures, but Scripture is not to be judged by these things. We may indeed be corrected in our *interpretation* of Scripture by these things, but Scripture is not judged or corrected by them. If, in the writings of men we find things for which we see no warrant in the infallible Word, we are not bound to believe these. But if in the Word we find doctrines which we don't want to believe, we are sinning and are disobeying God Whose Word Scripture is. *Sola scriptura* teaches that the Bible alone can bind the conscious to obedience, since it alone is the Word of God, and God alone is the Lord of the conscious (see **ch. 21**).

On the other hand, Roman Catholics believe that sacred tradition and Scripture share the same authority. That's why they can believe unbiblical doctrines and practice unbiblical things as prayers to the dead, infant baptism, penance, the assumption of Mary, the ever-virginity of Mary, Mary as Queen of Heaven, Popery, infallibility of the Pope, Purgatory and the list goes on, which have no warrant in Scripture, but they find in “Sacred Tradition.” Lest I be accused of misrepresenting them, here are a few statements from the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. First, they say that they have the same source:

“Sacred Tradition and Sacred Scripture, then, are bound closely together, and communicate one with the other. For both of them, flowing out from the same divine well-spring, come together in some fashion

<sup>13</sup> See pp. 13-16 below.

to form one thing, and move towards the same goal.” Each of them makes present and fruitful in the Church the mystery of Christ, who promised to remain with his own “always, to the close of the age”.<sup>14</sup>

Sacred Tradition is described to be divine and together with the Holy Scripture “to form one thing, and move towards the same goal.” I beg to differ. You would be hard-pressed to find a single passage in Scripture which attributes the things attributed to Scripture to “Sacred Tradition.” It is interesting at this point to note, that it was *sola scriptura*, dependence upon the Scripture alone as the highest authority, which ignited the Reformation. Scripture and Sacred Tradition allows the Roman Catholic Church to bind the consciences of men with man-made doctrines, which the Holy Scriptures know nothing about. But since it is the assertion of the Roman Catholic Church that both Scripture and Tradition have the same divine source, then it is reasonable to assume that Tradition is to be obeyed also. Our problem really is that tradition is nowhere described in such a way in the only special revelation of God—the Bible, therefore, “Sacred Tradition” is not of God. Moreover, this “Sacred Tradition” is binding only as interpreted and explained by the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, basically, they accept as tradition what accords with their doctrine and deny that which disagrees with them. The words of Jesus to the Pharisees come to mind, “in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.” You leave the commandment of God and hold to the tradition of men’ (Mark 7:7-8). And by teaching the tradition of men they make “void the word of God by your tradition that you have handed down” (v. 13). Since Scripture is not the sole and final authority for the Roman Catholic Church, they can teach their false doctrine as authoritative and as binding upon the consciences of their members, without any warrant from Holy Writ. In this way, by teaching “Sacred Tradition” and attributing to “Sacred Tradition” the same things as attributed to Scripture, i.e., having God as its source, they make void the true Word of God and worship Him in vain. This is a solemn word from the Lord Jesus Himself to caution us that when tradition, i.e., something which does not have a warrant in the Scriptures, is taught as the Word of God, we worship God in vain, dishonoring Him, and making void the true Word of God. Let us take heed and notice the warning here, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. Roman Catholics demand equal reverence and acceptance both for the Word of God and “Sacred Tradition.” In their own words: “Both Scripture and Tradition must be accepted and honored with equal sentiments of devotion and reverence.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, they dishonor God by teaching the doctrines of men as the commandments of God.

Let us carefully learn what the true doctrine of *sola scriptura* is and what it is not, for caricatures and distortions of *sola scriptura* are abundant. Therefore, it is necessary to know that the doctrine of *sola scriptura* teaches that since the Scriptures are the only *inerrant, infallible, certain* and *God-breathed* revelation in the possession of the church, they, therefore, form the highest and supreme authority in the church.<sup>16</sup>

## §2 The 66 Books of the Old and New Testament

Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these:

2

Of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi

Of the New Testament: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, The Acts of the Apostles, Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, I Timothy, II Timothy, To Titus, To Philemon, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Epistle of James, The first and second Epistles of Peter, The first, second, and third Epistles of John, The Epistle of Jude, The Revelation

<sup>14</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church: With Modifications From The Editio Typica* (Double Day; 2nd edition, 2003), p. 31, article 80. Footnote reference removed.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, article 82.

<sup>16</sup> See also §10 (pp. 44-47) on the Scriptures as the supreme judge in all matters.

All of which are given by the inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life. **1**

1. 2 Tim. 3:16 with 1 Tim. 5:17-18; 2 Pet. 3:16

This list is different than that of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church has this set along with the Apocryphal ('hidden') writings, which is sometimes called Deuterocanonical (second canonical) writings. The Apocrypha is spoken of in §3.

To be given by the inspiration of God means that they are the Word of God and come from Him as their original Author. 1 Timothy 3:16 says that Scripture is "God-breathed". In the KJV it says that "All scripture [is] given by inspiration of God". This translation was further dependent upon the Latin Vulgate which had here the Latin word *inspirata*. But the original idea conveyed through the Greek is that whatever is considered Scripture, it is by definition God's breath and God's Word. This canon of Scripture, i.e., the list of what is considered Scripture, is to be **the rule of faith and life**. It is by Scripture which we should test and establish what we are to believe. It is by Scripture that we learn how we are to live God-pleasing lives. Scripture is the only infallible and certain rule of faith and life. There might be other rules or standards, but only Holy Scripture is the rule of rules, norm of norms and the standard of all standards.



## The Canonicity of the New Testament

This is the only binding "rule of faith" upon every Christian. It is God's scepter of righteousness on every Christian soul. The consistent testimony of Scripture is what every Christian needs to heed. In regards to the NT canon, Christians have not had much disagreement although Gregg Allison observes that 'James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Hebrews—were on the "fringe" of the early church's canon.'<sup>17</sup> The book of Revelation was likewise not too quickly received for obvious reasons.

First, let us look at what early Christians looked to see if a work is inspired or not.

1. First was the question of **apostolicity**. Was the book written by the apostles? Was it written by close associates of them, as Mark and Luke?
2. Second was the question of **antiquity**. Did the actual work go to the time of the apostles or does it come much later from the eyewitnesses that it cannot be trusted?

Using these criteria, the church looked to the writings that were claiming to be inspired and eventually came with the canon that we now possess, the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments. The church did not select the books, but merely *acknowledged* the ones that God had inspired. As Calvin long ago said:

Nothing, therefore can be more absurd than the fiction, that the power of judging Scripture is in the Church, and that on her nod its certainty depends. When the Church receives it, and gives it the stamp of her authority, she does not make that authentic which was otherwise doubtful or controverted but, acknowledging it as the truth of God, she, as in duty bounds shows her reverence by an unhesitating assent. As to the question, How shall we be persuaded that it came from God without recurring to a decree of the Church? it is just the same as if it were asked, How shall we learn to distinguish light from darkness, white from black, sweet from bitter? Scripture bears upon the face of it as clear evidence of its truth, as white and black do of their colour, sweet and bitter of their taste.<sup>18</sup>

The church did not claim to *select* books to be included in the canon, but merely *acknowledged* the books which were inspired and rejected those which were not.

Now let us take a brief look at why a few books in the NT were not admitted to the canon too quickly.

<sup>17</sup> Gregg R. Allison, *Historical Theology: An Introduction To Christian Doctrine: A Companion To Wayne Grudem's Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), p. 44.

<sup>18</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2008), p. 31, §1.7.2.

The thing with **James** was the uncertainty of the author. It may also have been with what is taught in James 2:24-26, which at first glance seems contrary to the gospel preached by Paul, as was the case with Luther's rejection of or doubts upon James. There are three possible candidates for authorship:

1. James the son of Zebedee,
2. James the son of Alphaeus,
3. James the brother of the Lord or James the Just.

James the son of Zebedee (John's brother) died in 44 AD and that would be too early for him to write the book of James (Acts 12:2). James the son of Alphaeus or James the Less, another apostle of Jesus (Mark 3:18), was not credited in writing any surviving materials, which makes him an unlikely candidate. The last option seems to be the best. James the brother of the Lord Jesus and the brother of Jude (Mark 6:3) who was an unbeliever in Jesus' ministry prior to the cross (John 7:5) but believed after the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:7). He is the prominent leader in Acts 15 of the Jerusalem Church, which is interesting in connection to the Epistle being addressed to the "twelve tribes in the Dispersion" (Jas. 1:1).

**2 Peter** is interesting as it has a lot of similar material to **Jude**, which the church also doubted because of the citation of the apocryphal book of 1 Enoch in Jude 14. 2 Peter was further doubted because of the many pseudo-writings in the name of Peter as *The Acts of Peter* and the *Revelation of Peter* that were circulating at that time. Some have said that the Greek of 2 Peter is different than that of 1 Peter, but Christian scholars have replied by noting that 1 Peter was written by amanuensis by its own admission (5:12). Therefore, Peter could have used another amanuensis or written 2 Peter himself. There is also the different usage of Greek vocabulary because of the main subject of the two Epistles. 1 Peter was written to help suffering Christians, while 2 Peter was written to battle false teachers within the church. The differences in goal for writing can account for the vocabulary and style. Furthermore, it is merely an assumption to think that a single epistle or multiple epistles for that matter, exhausts an author's vocabulary and style.

**Jude** identifies himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." This is the James of the epistle of James, the brother of the Lord. Neither James nor Jude (or Judas) call themselves brothers of the Lord because of their humility and felt-unworthiness, they call themselves a *doulos*, a slave of Christ (Jude 1; James 1:1). James and Judas (Jude) are said to be among the brothers of the Lord in Mark 6:3, who were not believing, but became believers after the resurrection. Since the writing is from a close associate of the apostles, from the brother of the Lord, it is, therefore, to be accepted.

**2 and 3 John** were doubted because of the size of the volumes. 2 John having only 13 verses and 3 John 14 verses. They seemed so insignificant because of the other volumes that were written by John like the Gospel with 21 chapters, the Revelation with 22 chapters and the first epistle of John with 5 chapters (not suggesting that John divided his writings by chapters or that the early church did that). The church seemed to think that 2 and 3 John were not important, and probably were pseudo-writings. The other thing is that John identifies himself as the "elder" (2 John 1; 3 John 1), unlike in 1 John which has no introduction of the author much like the gospel (1 John 1; John 1:1). Peter used the term "elder" to refer to himself in 1 Peter 5:1, which is *not* the equivalent of "not an apostle." Apostles could be elders, as Peter was. Therefore, John referring to himself as an elder does not cast a shadow on identifying him as John the apostle.

**Hebrews** was doubted because of its author did not identify himself. It's not that anything was wrong with the theology of Hebrews, but it had to do with the criteria of apostolicity. It came to be accepted as a letter by Paul, although throughout the centuries some have expressed doubts upon the Pauline authorship. Clement of Alexandria believed that the letter was written by Paul "in Hebrew for Hebrews and then carefully translated by Luke for the Greeks."<sup>19</sup> Origen said, "But who wrote the epistle only God knows."<sup>20</sup> Some think that it was a sermon by Paul transcribed or modified by Luke.

Lastly, the **Book of Revelation** was doubted because of its unique genre to what was already known of the NT, the question about which John wrote it, and its content. The book of Revelation belongs to the genre of apocalyptic, and sometimes it is called the Apocalypse, after the first word in the book (Ἀποκάλυψις, *apokalupsis*). No other book in the Bible is as much symbolic and apocalyptic as the

<sup>19</sup> Eusebius: *The Church History*, trans. and com. Paul. L. Maier (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2007 [313]), p. 198; book 4:14.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 207; book 6:25.

Revelation, also not to mention that nothing like it appears in the NT, therefore, it was unique to the NT. As to the authorship question, I believe that the apostle John was the author. Who else could simply refer to himself by the first name and expect to be known to at least seven churches in the first century? Furthermore, there are some unique concepts to both the Apocalypse and the Gospel of John. Christ as the Word (John 1:1; Rev. 19:13); Christ as the Lamb of God (John 1:29; Rev. 5:6-8); Christ as the Witness (John 5:31-32; Rev. 1:5); the unique translation of Zechariah 12:10, which deviates from the LXX, but is in agreement with each other (John 19:37; Rev. 1:7). Lastly, because of the content of the book, it was wise for the church to not be rash in accepting a book of dragons, beasts, 666 and a millennium, as there were more apocalyptic books circulating in the early church, trying to deceive people into thinking that they were written by apostles. It was cautious of the church not to be to rash about receiving it into the canon.<sup>21</sup>

As a short time passed, these books came to be recognized by the church as authentic and received as Scripture. Since then, there has not been controversy concerning the NT canon. The Protestant, as well as the Catholic branch of Christianity, accepts the same canon of the NT. As to the OT canon, there has been some controversy throughout church history as to the question of the Apocrypha, but I believe that our question is settled by looking to what the Jews possessed and viewed as God-given Scripture in §3.

## The Inspiration of Scripture

What do we mean when we say that Scripture is inspired? What does it mean that 2 Timothy 3:16 in the KJV says, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God”? Why do we believe that Scripture is inspired? To answer the last question first: we believe in the inspiration and divine character of the Bible because that is what the Bible itself testifies to its character. We believe in the inspiration of Scripture, whatever that is because God, in the Bible, testifies to it.

### 2 Timothy 3:16

Dr. John Frame defines inspiration as “a divine act creating an identity between a divine word and a human word.”<sup>22</sup> Inspiration is the doctrine which teaches that while it is true that human authors wrote the Bible, yet their words are exactly what God wanted to have. In this way, we can truly say that the Bible is the Word of God, without implying that everything in the Bible is the direct speech of God. As Dr. Frame wrote, in inspiration, God works mysteriously with the authors of Scripture so that the product which becomes Scripture is completely what He wanted to have there. Sometimes people imprecisely speak of the *authors* of Scripture being inspired. Alan M. Stibbs explains that

When the word “inspiration” is used of the Bible it is often thought to describe a quality belonging primarily to the writers rather than the writings; it indicates that the men who produced these documents were inspired men. In contrast to this idea, which indubitably has its place, we find that the Scripture employs the word bearing this meaning primarily to describe not the writers but the sacred writings.<sup>23</sup>

The words are that which are inspired by the Spirit of God, not the authors themselves. The product which they write is Scripture and inspired of God. This is seen from the prime passage on the inspiration of Scripture, 2 Timothy 3:16-17—

All Scripture is **breathed out by God** and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, 17 that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.

Notice the rendering of the ESV in comparison to the KJV. The KJV is here relying on the Latin

<sup>21</sup> For a longer and better treatment of the question of the NT canon as it was received in the early church, see F. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Pr., 1988), pp. 117-241. It is an excellent treatment of this subject. See also Michael J. Kruger, *Canon Revised: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> John M. Frame, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Christian Belief* (P&R Publishing, 2014), p. 595.

<sup>23</sup> Alan M. Stibbs, “The Witness of Scripture to Its Inspiration” in *The Scripture Cannot Be Broken: Twentieth Century Writings On The Doctrine Of Inerrancy*, ed. John MacArthur (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2013), p. 205.

translation of this passage, which says, “*omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata*”, but the more proper and literal translation is given by the ESV. The word *θεόπνευστος* (*theopneustos*) is a unique compound word used only here in the Bible, and it is made up of two words. The first word is the noun *θεός* (*theos*), which means *God*, and the second word is the verb *πνέω* (*pneō*), which means *to breathe*. Therefore, putting two and two together, what we have is “God-breathed” (YLT, NIV) and “breathed out by God” (ESV). What is the significance of this metaphor or picture? The significance of this word is that just as when we speak, we breath out, so likewise, “All Scripture” is described as God’s breathing out. Start speaking and put your hand in front of your mouth, you will feel your breath. That is exactly how Scripture is described. Therefore, writes Alan Stibbs, “The Greek adjective *theopneustos* (meaning literally “God-breathed”) is a compound, which begins with an explicit recognition of God as the author; the inspiration is divine.”<sup>24</sup> Notice that what is here described as *theopneustos* is the *Scripture* and not the *authors* of Scripture. The product which the authors produce, either themselves or using secretaries, is that which is breathed out by God. Dr. Wayne Grudem explains:

Since it is *writings* that are said to be “breathed out,” this breathing must be understood as a metaphor for speaking the words of Scripture. This verse thus states in brief form what was evident in many passages in the Old Testament: the Old Testament writings are regarded as God’s Word in written form. For every word of the Old Testament, God is the one who spoke (and still speaks) it, although God used human agents to write these words down.<sup>25</sup>

John Calvin, commenting on this passage, states:

This is a principle which distinguishes our religion from all others, that we know that God hath spoken to us, and are fully convinced that the prophets did not speak at their own suggestion, but that, being organs of the Holy Spirit, they only uttered what they had been commissioned from heaven to declare. Whoever then wishes to profit in the Scriptures, let him first of all, lay down this as a settled point, that the Law and the Prophets are not a doctrine delivered according to the will and pleasure of men, but dictated by the Holy Spirit.<sup>26</sup>

Even when we use the word that the Bible is the “inspired” Word of God, we must not be understood as saying that there is something extra special done in the inspiration, rather, as Stibbs explains:

The word “inspired,” however, is not to be understood as indicating something “extra” superimposed on the writer or writing, to make the writing different from what it would otherwise be. It indicates rather *how* the writing came into being. It asserts that the writing is a product of the creative activity of the divine breath. The word thus goes right back to the beginning or first cause of the emergence of Scripture and indicates that Scripture has in its origin this distinctive hallmark, that it owes its very existence to the direct, creative activity of God himself. Although it is men who wrote it, it is God who brought it into being. Its content and character have all been decisively determined by the originating and controlling activity of the creative Spirit.<sup>27</sup>

Inspiration is about the *origin* of the Scripture, not how the words become Scripture.

There is here nothing said about the human authors of Scripture. We do not deny that the Bible is a book written by men, but what we deny is the assertion that it is *only* a book written by men. Rather, the words which these men penned were breathed out by God, so that they wrote the very words of God and which He wanted to have written. I do not comprehend the process of how God can accomplish this, but I believe that it is so. This breathing out of God and the inspiration of Scripture is *not* by dictation. Meaning, God did not speak in the hearing of the prophet all the words and then the prophet merely penned them down. To be sure, there is dictation in the Bible. The clearest examples are Revelation 2-3 and a lot of the “Thus says the LORD” and “Declares the LORD” portions in the OT. Yet, the majority of chapters in Holy Writ are not given by dictation and which are not direct speeches by God given to the prophet. Nonetheless, our passage here says that “All Scripture” is inspired and God-

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), pp. 74-75.

<sup>26</sup> John Calvin, *Commentaries* (1540-1563), on 2 Tim. 3:16. Retrieved from TheWord Bible Software.

<sup>27</sup> Stibbs, “The Witness of Scripture to Its Inspiration,” pp. 207-208.

breathed. Everything that is Scripture is given by the inspiration of God and is His word and speech. If something is considered Scripture, it means that it is breathed out by God.

Notice that Paul is here not speaking about a particular subject in Scripture or a particular teaching in which Scripture is “profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness,” rather, the scope is that of all the Scripture. Everything which is written down and given by God to the prophets is God-breathed. The phrase “all Scripture” refers back to v. 15 wherein we read about the “sacred writings, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.” These “sacred writings” are undoubtedly the sacred writings of the OT as we know them. These are then in v. 16 identified as Scripture and they are the words which are breathed out by God. This passage then speaks about the inspiration and divine authorship of the OT. Do we have any reason to believe that the NT is likewise *theopneustos*? I believe we do because NT writings are also referred to as “Scripture.” Read very carefully the following two passages:

1 Tim. 5:17-18 Let the elders who rule well be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching. 18 **For the Scripture says**, “You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain,” and, **“The laborer deserves his wages.”**

2 Pet. 3:15-16 And count the patience of our Lord as salvation, just as our beloved brother **Paul also wrote to you** according to the wisdom given him, 16 as he does in all his letters when he speaks in them of these matters. There are some things in them that are hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, **as they do the other Scriptures.**

In 1 Timothy 5:18, Paul refers to Deuteronomy 25:4, but sadly, the second quotation is nowhere to be found in the OT. So, what went wrong? Nothing went wrong. The source which Paul is quoting here is the Gospel of Luke 10:7! The wording in these two passages is identical except for the “for”:

Luke 10:7 ... ἄξιος **γάρ** ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ [*axios gar ho ergatēs tou misthou autou*]...

1 Tim. 5:18 ... ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ [*axios ho ergatēs tou misthou autou*] ...

Isn't it amazing that already in the lifetime of Paul the Gospel account is recognized and set on the same level as Deuteronomy and called “Scripture”? To be sure, the word γραφή (*graphē*), basically meaning “writing” occurs 51 times in the NT, and in all 51 times it refers to the OT, that is why it is translated by *Scripture*. It is a technical word, as used by the authors of the NT, to refer to the Bible. Therefore, we cannot dismiss this reference to Luke 10:7 as Scripture by saying that what Paul means here is that the Gospel of Luke is simply *a writing* and not Scripture. Therefore, since Paul saw the Gospel of Luke as Scripture, then whatever he said on Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16 likewise applies to the Gospel of Luke and by extension to the other Gospels.

The second passage identifies the writings of Paul as Scripture. How exactly? First of all, notice that Peter was aware not only of writings by Paul but also the *content* of some. Moreover, he recognizes the way that Paul wrote according to the wisdom given him by God. But there are some difficulties in Paul which Peter himself has encountered. This should give us encouragement that it is not only us who may have some difficulties with understanding some passages in Paul, but even an apostle of the Lord has difficulties. But as Peter has difficulties with understanding some of Paul's writings, he does not, unlike “the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction” Paul's writings. Notice that the apostle Peter places the apostle Paul's writings in high esteem as such their twisting brings destruction upon our souls. These are not mere human writings whose twisting does not affect us eternally. Rather, those who twist Paul's writings, do so to their own eternal destruction. Then we have the final clause, “as they do the other Scriptures.” Here is actually where the apostle places the writings of Paul with the Scripture. These ignorant and unstable people twist the writings of Paul just as they twist the *other* Scriptures. The crucial word here is “other” (λοιπὰς, *loipas*). If this word had not been in the passage, we would have little reason to conclude that Peter is identifying the writings of Paul with the Scripture. By saying that the writings of Paul are twisted just like the same people twist the *other* Scriptures, implies that Paul's writings are in the category of Scripture. If the clause read “as they do the Scriptures” instead of “as they do the *other* Scriptures”, then we would see a distinction between the writings of Paul and the OT Scriptures. But as it is, the apostle Peter puts the writings of Paul in the category of Scripture. Therefore, in both 1 Timothy 5:18 and 2 Peter 3:16, we have writings of the NT, which were still new, identified as and put in the category of Scripture. And so, what is said of the OT in 2 Timothy

3:16 is just as true of the NT.

## 2 Peter 1:20–21

And we have **the prophetic word** more fully confirmed, to which you will do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts, 20 knowing this first of all, that **no prophecy of Scripture comes from someone's own interpretation.** 21 For **no prophecy was ever produced by the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.**

Peter relates how the writings, doctrines, and preaching of the apostles is not a result of “cleverly devised myths” (v. 16), but rather it is the truth of what they witnessed and what was confirmed by the Word of God. Although he heard the voice of God bearing witness about Jesus (vv. 16-18), still he says, “we have the prophetic word more fully confirmed”. Meaning, that their experience points to the Word of God and was shown to be truthful because of God’s Word. Or rather, as the KJV translates it, “We have also a more sure word of prophecy”. While Peter’s experience was real and genuine, yet the foremost authority is the “word of prophecy.” It is to the word of prophecy, i.e., Scripture, which Christians should “pay attention” to. Experiences are nice, but the Word of God alone is infallible and completely truthful.<sup>28</sup> Pastor MacArthur writes that

the Greek word order is crucial in that it does not say that [the ESV translation of “more sure”]. It says, “And we have more sure the prophetic word.” That original arrangement of the sentence supports the interpretation that Peter is ranking Scripture over experience. The prophetic word (Scripture) is more complete, more permanent, and more authoritative than the experience of anyone. More specifically, the word of God is a more reliable verification of the teachings about the person, atonement, and second coming of Christ than even the genuine first-hand experiences of the apostles themselves.<sup>29</sup>

The reason that this word is firm and sure is that “no prophecy of Scripture comes from someone’s own interpretation” (v. 20). This passage speaks about the origin of prophecy, but in church history, this phrase has been variously understood. Dr. Philip Schaff explains, “The verse has been largely taken advantage of by Roman Catholic divines in the interest of their theory of the relation in which Scripture stands to the church. It has been regarded as a protest against the right of private judgment. Some Protestant commentators read it as a caution against interpreting particular prophecies separately by themselves, instead of interpreting them in the full light of prophecy as a whole. Others discover in it a re-statement of what Peter has already said in the former Epistle (chap. 1 Pet 1:11-12) about the inability of the prophets to understand all that was in the prophecies which they uttered. Others suppose it to mean that prophecy is not its own interpreter but can be fully understood only in the light of the event.” But he admits that “It cannot be said, however, that any one of these views falls in naturally with the context”,<sup>30</sup> which is true. The Catholic interpretation is the most absurd option given. The Bible was away from the people and that’s why they were able to hold their sway, but as soon as Scripture came into the hands of the common man, he understood the lies of the Roman Church and recognized the true Savior from Scripture. The passage is not about *our own interpretation*, rather the prophet’s. The readers of Scripture simply cannot be meant because the passage goes on to explain the origin of prophecy and the Word of God and not its proper interpretation.

The KJV translation is here very weak in translating the word γίνομαι (*ginomai*) simply with “is” when the word actually means “to become, i.e. to come into existence, begin to be, receive being”,<sup>31</sup> which demonstrates the passage to be about the origin of Scripture, rather than its interpretation by people, which is the sense given by the KJV rendering.

As for the word “interpretation,” it is the Greek ἐπίλυσις (*epilysis*), which is literally “a loosening,

<sup>28</sup> See pp. 45-47 below for more on this.

<sup>29</sup> *MacArthur Study Bible*, p. 1904.

<sup>30</sup> Philip Schaff, *A Popular Commentary on the New Testament* (1879–1890), on 2 Pet. 1:20. Retrieved from TheWord Bible Software.

<sup>31</sup> Joseph Henry Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015 [1889]), p. 114. Emphasis original.



*unloosing*” and metaphorically “*interpretation*”,<sup>32</sup> only used here in the Bible. Pastor MacArthur explains, “The Greek word for “interpretation” has the idea of a “loosing,” as if to say no Scripture is the result of any human being privately “untying” and “loosing” the truth. Peter’s point is not so much about how to interpret Scripture, but rather how Scripture originated, and what its source was.”<sup>33</sup> Dr. Schaff explains that

This noun is found only this once in the N. T. It is used, however, by one of the ancient Greek Versions of the O. T. in the sense of the ‘interpretation’ or reading of a dream (Gen 40:8). The cognate verb, too, occurs in Mar 4:34 (where the A. V. renders it ‘expounded’), and in Acts 19:39 (where it is translated ‘determined’). The verse, therefore, seems to mean that prophecy does not *originate in the prophets own private interpretation of things*—that it is not the mere expression of his own reading of the future.<sup>34</sup>

Therefore, this passage teaches that the prophecy of Scripture, or Scripture as a whole as a word of prophecy, since it was written by prophets, has its origin, not in the musings or thoughts of the prophets, rather, it has another source. This interpretation is confirmed by the following verse which speaks to the fact that prophecy does not have its origin in the will of man. Verse 21a repeats the last thought of v. 20 by explicitly stating that prophecy does not have its origin in the will of man. This does not mean that people are irrelevant, or people merely were dictated the words of God, for it is obvious to those who read the original languages that the writing styles are different for each author. Therefore, if the theory of dictation was true of all the Bible, then we would expect to see no stylistic differences, yet there is, in fact, stylistic difference in the Bible. Verse 21 states that the prophet was not the one who originated his message, rather, his message came from somewhere else. What is denied is the cause or origin of prophecy being from the will of man, and not that men were not involved. Then the second half of v. 21 goes on to explain that “men spoke from God”. The speech which the men spoke came from God. See? The human author is not ignored, rather, he is the one who speaks the message of God. Or to be more precise, since it is the Word of God which he speaks, we can say that it is God who speaks *through* him. Peter describes the process of inspiration as that of the prophets speaking from God “as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.” They spoke the words of God when they were under the power, influence, and working of the Holy Spirit. The emphasis of this passage, therefore, is about the divine authorship and origin of the Word of God.

It is interesting to note here how the Spirit is described as the Author of Scripture. It was under His influence and His working that the word of the Lord came to the prophets. Peter explains this in his first epistle:

1 Pet. 1:10-11 Concerning this salvation, the prophets who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired carefully, 11 inquiring what person or time **the Spirit of Christ in them was indicating** when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glories.

The Spirit of *Christ* was working within the prophets in the OT. He is specifically identified to be Christ’s, indicating that Christ is God Who has the fullness of the Spirit, and also that OT prophecy is ultimately *about* Christ (cf. Rev. 19:10). The third person of the Trinity is the Author and Originator of Scripture. Pastor MacArthur writes concerning the phrase “carried along by the Holy Spirit”:

Grammatically, this means that they were continually carried or borne along by the Spirit of God (cf. Luke 1:70; Acts 27:15, 17). The Holy Spirit thus is the divine author and originator, the producer of the Scriptures. In the OT alone, the human writers refer to their writings as the words of God over 3,800 times (e.g., Jer. 1:4; cf. 3:2; Rom. 3:2; 1 Cor. 2:10). Though the human writers of Scripture were active rather than passive in the process of writing Scripture, God the Holy Spirit superintended them so that, using their own individual personalities, thought processes, and vocabulary, they composed and recorded without error the exact words God wanted written.<sup>35</sup>

The phrase stresses the authorship, activity, and involvement of the Holy Spirit in the origination of prophecy. They did not simply spew out words of God and prophesied as they wanted. As Calvin says,

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 240. Emphasis original.

<sup>33</sup> MacArthur Study Bible, p. 1094.

<sup>34</sup> Schaff, on 2 Pet. 1:20.

<sup>35</sup> MacArthur Study Bible, p. 1094.

“They did not of themselves, or according to their own will, foolishly deliver their own inventions.”<sup>36</sup> Rather, they prophesied and spoke the words of God when “they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.” We should not be bothered just because we do not exactly know how this process of inspiration took place. It is supernatural and it is special, no doubt, but we should nonetheless believe the testimony of God about His Word. There are many mysteries to our faith as the Trinity, the true and full humanity and divinity of our Lord, absolute sovereignty and responsibility, and so on, which we do not fully comprehend. Likewise, the Bible is a divine and human product.

Therefore, in these two passages, 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21, we see clearly the divine authorship of the Holy Scriptures, the OT, and by necessary and plain implication, the NT.

## The Words of the Bible are God’s

Not only do the words of 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21 testify to the fact that all the Bible is the Word of God, but Scripture elsewhere identifies words as words of God, which are not directly spoken by God. Therefore, not only words which are explicitly attributed to God are identified as the Word of God, but words also which are not spoken by God are attributed to God.

A search on the phrase “Thus says the Lord” delivers 415 results in the OT. “Declares the Lord” delivers 344 results in the OT. The formula “the word of the LORD came” is used 109 times in the OT. Expressions similar to “the mouth of the LORD has spoken” occur 5 times. The OT is filled with assertions about the divine origin of its content. We read a lot in the prophets that their prophecies are from the true God, rather than their own inventions. For the following section, I am heavily relying on Grudem’s chapter on the authority of the Bible.

### The prophets speak the Word of God

Balaam says in Numbers 22:38 that “The word that God puts in my mouth, that must I speak.” The prophet ought to function as the mouthpiece of God to the people. He is to speak the very words of God. Whatever they say on divine authority, are, in fact, God’s words. God is said to put words in the mouth of Jeremiah (1:9). In contrast, the false prophets do not have the words of God and they have gone to the people without God sending them (Jer. 14:14; 23:16–22; 29:31–32). Ezekiel likewise receives a similar commission as Isaiah, and indeed to all the prophets (Deut. 18:18–20): “And you shall speak my words to them, whether they hear or refuse to hear, for they are a rebellious house” (Ezek. 2:7). The prophet is to speak the words of God to the people. That is his function and that is his sworn obligation, to communicate to the people the unadulterated Word of God. If the Lord speaks, the prophet is to speak, otherwise, he is to remain silent concerning a divine word. Amos 3:8 rhetorically asks, “The Lord GOD has spoken; who can but prophesy?”

### God speaks by the prophets

The “word of the LORD” is said to have been spoken “by his servant the prophet Ahijah” (1 Kgs. 14:18). The LORD likewise “spoke against Baasha by the prophet Jehu” (16:12); as He did speak “by Joshua son of Nun” (16:34); “his servant Elijah the Tishbite” (2 Kgs. 9:36); “his servant Jonah the son of Amittai, the prophet” (14:25); “he spoke by Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam the son of Nebat” (2 Chron. 10:15).

The “words of the LORD” are said to have been spoken by the LORD “through the prophet Jeremiah” (Jer. 37:2). In another place, it is said that “Jeremiah the prophet, who spoke from the mouth of the LORD” (2 Chron. 36:12). Jeremiah spoke the very words of God. God is said to have spoken through many prophets in this way. Zechariah 7:7 speaks of “the words that the Lord proclaimed by the former prophets when Jerusalem was inhabited and prosperous”. Verse 12 of the same chapter likewise repeats the same idea, “hear the law and the words that the Lord of hosts had sent by his Spirit through the former prophets.” God is again and again identified as the primary author of the words of the prophets. In all of these passages, the One Who speaks through the prophets is the LORD in through His word.

The people in exile are said to have “obeyed the voice of the Lord their God, and the words of

<sup>36</sup> Calvin, *Commentaries*, on 2 Pet. 1:21.

Haggai the prophet, as the Lord their God had sent him” (Hag. 1:12). The words of Haggai, being a prophet, are identified with the voice of the Lord. In v. 13, he is called “the messenger of the LORD” and he “spoke to the people with the LORD’s message”. Therefore, in light of this, to disobey the word of a prophet is to disobey God Whose word the prophet merely declares (Deut. 18:19; 1 Sam. 10:8 and 13:13-14; 15:3 and 15:19, 23; 1 Kgs. 20:35 and 20:36). Nothing’s changed in the NT, rather, we have all the more strongly asserted the divine authorship of the whole Scripture of the OT in 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21.

In answering the Accuser, the Lord Jesus always reverted back to Scripture. He declares, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God” (Matt. 4:4), citing Deuteronomy 8:3, which are actually the words of Moses. Likewise, in v. 7, the Lord quotes Deuteronomy 6:16, and in v. 10 He cites Deuteronomy 6:13. All these passages which the Lord cited were the words of Moses to the people of Israel, yet His principle that man is to live “by every word that comes from the mouth of God” (v. 4), still stands because He identifies these are the words of God by which He withstands temptation.

The Gospel of Matthew quotes from the OT and it is interesting to note how he prefaces his quotations. In 1:22, he says the birth of Jesus fulfills “what was spoken by the prophet” and then he cites Isaiah 7:14. In 2:15, he says that the flight of baby Jesus to Egypt “was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet” Hosea (11:1). In both of these instances, Matthew communicates to us that not only was the Lord responsible for these prophecies but the things that are happening in Christ’s life, are happening to fulfill these words spoken by the Lord through the prophets. We have an interesting instance in 19:5, which attributes the words of Genesis 2:24 to God. In reading Genesis 2:24, we do not get the sense that these words are either Adam’s or God’s, but rather Moses’. Yet the Lord Jesus in 19:5 declares that God, i.e., “he who created them from the beginning” (v. 4) said the words of Genesis 2:24. The Lord Jesus attributes the words of the narrator, in this case, Moses, to God.

In Mark 9:7-13, “the commandment of God” (v. 9), “Moses said” (v. 10) and “the word of God” (v. 13) are all used interchangeably, indicating that all of these are the words of God, even the things which Moses said in Exodus 21:17. What is interesting to note here is the parallel of Mark 9:10. While Mark says, “For Moses said”, Matthew says, “For God commanded” (15:4) and attributes both verses (Ex. 20:12; 21:17) explicitly to God. Therefore, we see here that the NT authors, with no difficulty, attribute the words of Moses to God and vice versa.

In Luke 1:70, Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist says that God “spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old”. The speaker is identified to be God. He is the One Who originated the words which the prophets spoke. In Acts 3:18, we read of Peter saying that “God foretold by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ would suffer, he thus fulfilled.” Not only did God speak by the mouth of all the prophets, but what He foretold, He brought and will bring to pass. Likewise, in v. 21, we read Peter saying, “God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets long ago.” Hebrews 1:1-2 begins by saying, “Long ago, at many times and in many ways, God spoke to our fathers by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son”. In both eras, before and “in these last days,” God is the speaker. In former times, He spoke through the prophets but now speaks to us through His beloved Son.

The Holy Spirit is said to have spoken through David. Peter says, “the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spoke beforehand by the mouth of David” (Acts 1:16) and then quotes Psalms 69:25; 109:8. In Acts 4, the early church recognizes that the LORD spoke through David by the Spirit:

Acts 4:24-25 And when they heard it, they lifted their voices together to God and said, “**Sovereign Lord**, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea and everything in them, 25 who **through the mouth of our father David**, your servant, **said by the Holy Spirit**, “‘Why did the Gentiles rage, and the peoples plot in vain?...’”

The Father spoke *through* David by the Holy Spirit Who indwelt him as a believer. David himself testifies, “The Spirit of the LORD speaks by me; his word is on my tongue” (2 Sam. 23:2). We should not forget the words of our Lord in reference to Psalm 110:1 when he questioned the Pharisees, “How is it then that David, **in the Spirit**, calls him Lord, saying” (Matt. 22:43). David recognizes that he’s an instrument through which the Spirit of Yahweh speaks to him and to His people. The apostle Paul recognized that the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophet Isaiah in Acts 28:25-28. In Isaiah 6:8-9, we see that the words quoted by Paul were actually spoken by “the voice of the Lord” (v. 8), but Paul sees them as words which the Holy Spirit said through Isaiah. Hebrews 3:7; 9:8 likewise shows the activity

of the Holy Spirit in the authorship of Scripture. As long as it is in Scripture and it is spoken by the prophets of God, the authors of the NT do not shrink back from calling the words of men God's, or vice versa.

In Romans 9:17, the apostle says, "For the Scripture says to Pharaoh", but no Scripture said anything to Pharaoh. Rather, in actuality, it was the words of the LORD delivered through Moses (Ex. 19:13, 16), which are here called Scripture and identified with the words of God.

The testimony of the Scripture to itself is that it is all God-breathed and produced by God's Spirit. We thank the God of the universe, Who has not only condescended to covenant with us, but has sent His Son to die in our place, and has given us His self-revelation in written form, in the Holy Scriptures, His God-breathed, infallible and inerrant Word.

## The Rule of Faith and Life

The Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and life. They teach us the ways of God and the way that we should live as faithful servants. In them, we find the Word of life. They are our daily bread. Through them, our Redeemer speaks to us and sanctifies us. This is the doctrine of *sola scriptura*. The Scripture is the highest and only infallible authority for the church. This does not mean that we cannot benefit from non-Scriptural writings, as the Confession, for example. Rather, the final court of appeal is to the Scriptures because only they are given by God and inspired by God, and therefore, speak the words of God, the highest authority in the universe. They are the only God-breathed words in possession of the church, therefore, they are the only rule of faith and life. God exercises His lordship over us through the Scriptures. He speaks with us, admonishes us, corrects us, rebukes us, and encourages us through the Scriptures. If we want a word from God, we open Holy Writ and hear God speaking in there. To have the Bible as the rule of faith and life is the most rational thing that a Christian can do, for we claim that the Bible is the very Word of God, therefore, it is divine wisdom and divine teaching, and why should we withhold ourselves from such a blessing? To have the God of the universe speaking to us and instructing us is an immense blessing. Certainly, the Bible does not directly speak about every particular situation, but it gives us general and specific guidelines to follow. The Word of God touches upon all subjects and is not to be withheld from any subject. We must be students of Scripture to know how we should apply the Word as the rule of faith and life in our lives and in our churches. We cannot merely believe this, and yet not study Scripture and not seek to interpret Scripture properly and apply the Word of God to our own lives. That is hypocrisy. Rather, we should be diligent students of Scripture, in prayer studying the Word of God and asking the Spirit to reveal to us truths from the Word which we have not seen. Praying to God to teach us His ways through the Word and His Spirit, to give us the wisdom to apply His Word to all areas of our lives, so that He would exercise His lordship over all areas of our lives.<sup>37</sup>

### §3 The Apocrypha and Canon of the Old Testament

3 | The books commonly called **Apocrypha**, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon or rule of the Scripture, and, therefore, are of no authority to the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings. 1

1. Luke 24:27, 44; Rom. 3:2

§2 defined what is Scripture by enlisting the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments. This paragraph goes on to reject those books which are accepted by the Roman Catholic Church within the scope of Scripture, namely, the Apocryphal writings. They are to be rejected because they are not **of divine inspiration**. The reason for the rejection of the Apocrypha is because God has not given it. It is not because it contains heresies or false teaching (which it does), but it is to be rejected because God did not give the Apocryphal writings. God has not given the Apocryphal writings and therefore they are **no part of the canon or rule of the Scripture**. In other words, they are not to be used to establish doctrine or practice because they are not from God and therefore have **no authority in the church of God**. There may be godly things in them and even biblical things, but they are still not God-breathed.

<sup>37</sup> See *sola scriptura* above on pp. 8-10 above.

Those who read them may benefit from them just like from any other **human** book, but the Apocryphal writings are to be read and tested by Scripture.

Therefore, the Apocryphal writings are to be regarded merely as human products and to be used just like any other human writing.



## The Canon of the Old Testament

The word *canon* is from the Greek *κανών* (*kanōn*), which means a measuring rule, and a standard. The canon of Scripture is the list of the inspired and authoritative books of the Old and New Testaments, which are the standard given to us by God. The canon of Scripture is not *created* by men, rather it is *recognized* by men. The canon was created at the moment that God gave the prophets and apostles the words to write.

The canon of the OT is a matter of controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics. The latter accepts several other books in their OT canon, while the former deny that these books are given by God. The Roman Catholic Church has an OT canon of 46 books:

The Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, **Tobit**, **Judith**, Esther, **1 and 2 Maccabees**, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, **the Wisdom of Solomon**, **Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)**, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, **Baruch**, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah and Malachi.<sup>38</sup>

There are also additions to Esther, additions to Daniel (History of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, the Song of the Three Children), Letter of Jeremiah. Why do Protestants reject these as Scripture? Sometimes they are referred to as Deuterocanonical by Catholics, meaning *second canon*; while Protestants like to call them Apocrypha, meaning *hidden writings*. In summary, the additional books and portions are:

1. The Wisdom of Solomon (Book of Wisdom)
2. Ecclesiasticus (Sirach)
3. Tobit
4. Judith
5. 1 Maccabees
6. 2 Maccabees
7. Baruch (including the Letter of Jeremiah)
8. Additions to Esther (10:4-16:24)
9. Prayer of Azariah (Daniel 3:24-90)
10. Susanna (Daniel 13)
11. Bel and the Dragon (Daniel 14)<sup>39</sup>

Whence came these additions to the OT canon? Were they written by prophets? Did they have Hebrew originals? These and similar questions must be asked to determine whether these books belong to the OT canon. The fact is that to date, none of these apocryphal works has a Hebrew manuscript. All these works were translated from Greek, as they were only existent in Greek and not Hebrew. These books resided in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the OT. Beginning around 300 years before our Lord, a large portion of the OT, as well as other Jewish writings, were translated into Greek to help the Jews who were forgetting their language in reading their histories and also for their histories and doctrines to be available to the world.<sup>40</sup> The NT writers often quoted from the Greek Septuagint, which is also abbreviated as LXX, which is the Roman numeral 70 (the word Septuagint likewise means 70),

<sup>38</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, p. 40, article 120. Emphasis added.

<sup>39</sup> Aaron Blake, *Is the Apocrypha Scripture?* Retrieved from <https://veritasfidei.org/en/apocrypha-inspired-scripture/>.

<sup>40</sup> See Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture*, pp. 43-44, and the whole chapter for more on the LXX. He gives a round date for the composition as 250-150 BC.

after the legend that 70 or 72 rabbi's in Alexandria, Egypt went separately from each other to translate the Pentateuch and after 72 days, they had identical translations. This legend is fanciful, but this is the way people came to refer to this volume of books. It was a Jewish library of sorts including their Scriptures, and from here did the apocryphal writings creep into the OT canon. The apocryphal writings came to be written *after* the last prophet of the OT, Malachi and have no Hebrew originals, unlike all the OT books which are in the Protestant Bible. At this time, we must inquire what the general thought of the Jews was concerning the canon of Scripture.

### Romans 3:2

In Romans 3:2, Paul says that the foremost advantage of being a Jew is that “the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God.” The oracles of God were the words of God. It is to them, the Jewish nation, that the words of God were entrusted. John Calvin notes, “Now the oracles were committed to them, for the purpose of preserving them as long as it pleased the Lord to continue his glory among them, and then of publishing them during the time of their stewardship through the whole world: they were first depositories, and secondly dispensers.”<sup>41</sup> This means that when our Lord and His apostles spoke of the Scriptures with their opponents, there was an identifiable body of literature to which they were referring. The word γραφή (*graphē*), as we observed above, is used 51 times in the NT. In all its references it is used of the OT (e.g., Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:42; Luke 4:21; 24:27; John 5:39; 7:42; 10:35; Acts 1:16; 8:32; 17:11; 18:28).<sup>42</sup> If we look at the passages wherein our Lord or His apostles use these words, or even their opponents, there is never a discussion on what they mean by “Scripture” or “Scriptures.” F. F. Bruce observes that “Our Lord and his apostles might differ from the religious leaders of Israel about the meaning of the scriptures; there is no suggestion that they differed about the limits of the scriptures.”<sup>43</sup>

### Jewish testimony to the canon

It was their foremost advantage and honor to possess the Word of God and to guard it. Therefore, we must now ask the question, “What did the Jews believe to be the inspired OT canon?” We go to a person who lived near to the time of our Lord, Josephus, who wrote various histories of the Jewish people after the destruction of Jerusalem. Concerning the sacred writings, he wrote:

For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have,] but only **twenty-two** books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine; and of them five belong to **Moses**, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of **Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes** king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in **thirteen** books. The remaining **four books contain hymns to God**, and precepts for the **conduct of human life**. It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath **not been esteemed of the like authority** with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add any thing to them, to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews immediately, and from their very birth, to **esteem these books to contain Divine doctrines**, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be willingly to die for them. For it is no new thing for our captives, many of them in number, and frequently in time, to be seen to endure racks and deaths of all kinds upon the theatres, that they may not be obliged to say one word against our laws and the records that contain them; whereas there are none at all among the Greeks who would undergo the least harm on that account, no, nor in case all the writings that are among them were to be destroyed; for they take them to be such discourses as are framed agreeably to the inclinations of those that write them; and they have justly the same opinion of the ancient writers, since they see some of the present generation bold enough to write about such affairs, wherein they were not present, nor had concern

<sup>41</sup> Calvin, *Commentaries*, on Rom. 3:2.

<sup>42</sup> In 1 Timothy 5:18, it is used to reference to Luke 10:7, too! See pp. 15-16 above.

<sup>43</sup> Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture*, p. 28.

enough to inform themselves about them from those that knew them; examples of which may be had in this late war of ours, where some persons have written histories, and published them, without having been in the places concerned, or having been near them when the actions were done; but these men put a few things together by hearsay, and insolently abuse the world, and call these writings by the name of Histories.<sup>44</sup>

Several things are to be noted. Josephus speaks about the Jews in general, who only received 22 books, which span from the time of Moses until the time of Artaxerxes king of Persia who reigned from 464-423 BC. This is very significant considering that the composition of the last OT book, Malachi, to be around that same period. Basically, what Josephus is saying is that OT books stopped to be written with the death of Malachi. But there seems to be a problem. We Protestants accept 39 books of the OT, but Josephus speaks of 22, how is this to be reconciled? This is easily reconciled by the fact that the Jews bundled many books together, which we, both Protestants and Catholics, have separated. The number 22 is based upon the number of the Hebrew alphabet (just like how Psalm 119 is divided into 22 groups of 8 verses, each beginning with a letter of the alphabet). For example, the books of Nehemiah and Ezra were considered one; the books of 1st and 2nd Kings, as well as 1st and 2nd Chronicles, were considered as only two books; Ruth belonged to Judges. Also, the single book of the Twelve Minor Prophets contained 1) Hosea, 2) Joel, 3) Amos, 4) Obadiah, 5) Jonah, 6) Micah, 7) Nahum, 8) Habakkuk, 9) Zephaniah, 10) Haggai, 11) Zechariah, and 12) Malachi. What we have as twelve separate books, the Jews had in one book. This explains the difference between the ordering and grouping of the canon of the OT. Gregg Allison explains:

The books of Moses were the traditional Pentateuch [1-5]. The prophetic books were [6] Joshua, [7] Judges — Ruth, [8] Samuel, [9] Kings, [10] Isaiah, [11] Jeremiah — Lamentations, [12] Ezekiel, [13] the Minor Prophets (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi), [14] Job, [15] Daniel, [16] Ezra — Nehemiah, [17] Chronicles, and [18] Esther. The last category consisted of [19] Psalms, [20] Proverbs, [21] Ecclesiastes, and [22] Song of Songs. Note that the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, while appearing as two books in our Old Testament, were considered one book each in the Hebrew canon of Josephus. Also, Judges and Ruth, Jeremiah and Lamentations, and Ezra and Nehemiah, while separated in our Old Testament, were joined together and considered one book in this ordering.<sup>45</sup>

The books of the OT were divided into the Law, the Prophets and the Writings (e.g., Luke 24:44), and could be shown in this way:

<b>The Law</b>	<b>The Prophets</b>	<b>The Writings</b>
1) Genesis	6) Joshua	13) Psalms
2) Exodus	7) Judges (including Ruth)	14) Job
3) Leviticus	8) Samuel (1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> )	15) Proverbs
4) Numbers	9) Kings (1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> )	16) Ecclesiastes
5) Deuteronomy	10) Jeremiah (including Lamentations)	17) Song of Songs
	11) Ezekiel	18) Lamentations
	12) Isaiah	19) Daniel
	13) Twelve Minor Prophets (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi)	20) Esther
		21) Ezra-Nehemiah
		22) Chronicles (1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> )

It is significant that these were the books for which the Jews were ready to die, and which were laid

<sup>44</sup> Flavius Josephus, *The Complete Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998), *Against Apion* 1:8, pp. 929-930. Verse divisions omitted and emphasis is mine.

<sup>45</sup> Allison, *Historical Theology*, p. 38n3.

at the temple. But notice that Josephus acknowledges that there are other writings: “It is true, our history hath been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time”. Josephus does not deny that there were actually books after Malachi and the period of Artaxerxes I (464/5-424 BC), this will include a lot of books from the Apocrypha, especially Maccabees which records the time of persecution, among other things, of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Yet, these are books which “hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former [books]”. Clearly, these books were not considered to have the same authority as the 22 books of the Jewish canon or the 39 books of the OT in the Protestant canon.

The Jews, who according to Romans 3:2, were entrusted with the Word of God, did not receive the apocryphal books which came after the writing of Malachi, four centuries before Christ, as having the same authority as the books written by the prophets from Moses to Artaxerxes. Josephus acknowledges the existence of the Apocrypha and other writings besides the OT canon, which may be beneficial, yet they are not writings which are worthy to die for or possess the same authority. The reason that the books after Artaxerxes are not to receive the same authority is “because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time”. There were no prophets to write Scripture. The prophets ceased to be with the death of Malachi and only with the ministry of John the Baptist, four centuries later, did the Spirit of prophecy come back. This is acknowledged by the Jews themselves. *The Babylonian Talmud* writes:

After the later prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi had died, the Holy Spirit [of prophecy] departed from Israel, but they still availed themselves of the Bath Kol.<sup>46</sup>

Corresponding to Josephus’ account, after the death of the last prophet, Malachi, who lived at the time of Artaxerxes I, prophecy came no longer. Since there were no prophecies or prophets, Scripture could not be given. People may claim to have had revelations, but if they did not meet the criteria of authenticity as laid in Deuteronomy 18, they were to be perceived as false prophets. Moreover, even 1 Maccabees acknowledges that there were no prophets in Israel. We read:

1 Macc. 4:41-46 Then Judas ordered some of his soldiers to attack the men in the fort, while he purified the Temple. 42 He chose some priests who were qualified and who were devoted to the Law. 43 They purified the Temple and took the stones that had been defiled and put them in an unclean place. 44 They discussed what should be done with the altar of burnt offerings, which had been desecrated 45 by the Gentiles, and decided to tear it down, so that it would not stand there as a monument to their shame. So they tore down the altar 46 and put the stones in a suitable place on the Temple hill, where they were to be **kept until a prophet should appear** and decide what to do with them. (Good News Translation)

By the admission of the Apocrypha itself, these books were not written by a prophet, and therefore, could not be the word of God, as the prophet functioned as the mouthpiece of God (e.g., Ex. 7:1-2). The people could not have a word from God, or directly know the will of God because there had not been a prophet. Also, we read in chapter 9:

1 Macc. 9:23-27 After the death of Judas [Maccabees], the lawless traitors began to reappear everywhere in Judea, and all the wicked people returned. 24 Also at that time there was a severe famine, and the whole country went over to the side of the renegades. 25 Bacchides deliberately appointed some renegade Jews as rulers over the country. 26 These men hunted down the friends of Judas and brought them all before Bacchides, and he subjected them to torture and humiliation. 27 It was a time of great trouble for Israel, worse than anything that had happened to them **since the time prophets ceased to appear among them**.

From the sound of it, it has been a long time since there was a prophet. Maccabees was written around a century before our Lord’s incarnation. This is in agreement with Josephus’ testimony as well as the Talmud’s testimony that no Scripture came after the death of Malachi, the last prophet.

---

<sup>46</sup> Babylonian Talmud, *Mas. Yoma 9b*. The words of R. Abba. Words within bracket added by me because of the footnote attached. Retrieved from <http://juchre.org/talmud/yoma/yoma1.htm#9b>.



## Luke 11:49-51

Another argument for the Protestant canon of the OT comes from the lips of our Lord:

Luke 11:49-51 Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, 'I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute,' 50 so that the blood of all the prophets, shed from the foundation of the world, may be charged against this generation, 51 from the **blood of Abel** to the **blood of Zechariah**, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, it will be required of this generation. (Parallel in Matt. 23:34-35)

What on earth has this passage to do with the canon of Scripture? Let us first remember the testimony of Josephus (cited above) concerning the extent of the OT canon that it is identical to our canon. Although the Jews and our Lord disagreed many times, yet their disagreements were upon the interpretation of Scripture, never about the canon or authority of Scripture. Both our Lord and the Jews accepted the full inspiration, inerrancy, and canon of Scripture. In no conversation did the Jews or our Lord bring anything outside the accepted canon of the OT. This is very significant that neither the Lord nor the Jews used the Apocrypha to argue against each other. Moreover, while several OT books are quoted authoritatively as "it is written," "Scripture says," "God said" and various variants of those expressions, the Apocrypha is never referred to as such. There may be an allusion to the Apocrypha (e.g., in Heb. 11:37-38), but they are never quoted as Scripture. Mere quotation does not equal Scripture, otherwise, we will include several Greek writers within our Scripture (e.g., Titus 1:12; Acts 17:28). Rather, the form of authoritative quotation or allusion to Scripture is never applied to the Apocrypha. Dr. Grudem writes:

According to one count, Jesus and the New Testament authors quote various parts of the Old Testament Scriptures as divinely authoritative over 295 times, but not once do they cite any statement from the books of the Apocrypha or any other writings as having divine authority. The absence of any such reference to other literature as divinely authoritative, and the extremely frequent reference to hundreds of places in the Old Testament as divinely authoritative, gives strong confirmation to the fact that the New Testament authors agreed that the established Old Testament canon, no more and no less, was to be taken as God's very words.<sup>47</sup>

Now we return to the passage which we referred to above, Luke 11:49-51. The relation of this passage to the extent of the canon of the OT has to do with the Jewish ordering of the canon. The Jewish canon began with Genesis and ended with Chronicles, unlike ours (see the table above). It is significant when our Lord wants to say that the blood of all the slain prophets in the OT will come upon the generation of the first century, that he refers to the blood of Abel to Zechariah. This is significant because Abel was the first martyr recorded in Genesis 4, while Zechariah was the last martyr recorded in 2 Chronicles 24:20-22. Why is this significant? Because the book of Chronicles (both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> were seen as a single book) was placed as the last book of the Jewish canon. The Jewish canon did not end with Malachi, as ours does, since Malachi was included in the Twelve Minor Prophets, but ended with Chronicles. Therefore, for a Jew to say something like "I believe all the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation" he would say, "I believe all the Bible, from Genesis to Chronicles." The statement of the Christian communicates that he believes all the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments, naming the first and the last book in the canon. While the Jewish statement has a similar connotation, that the Jew believes everything in his canon of the OT which was ordered and grouped differently than the Christian's while containing the same books of the OT. Therefore, the Lord's statement has the import of saying that all the blood of the slain prophets and saints of God, from Genesis, the first book of the Jewish canon, which records the death of Abel, to Chronicles, the last book of the Jewish canon, which records the death of Zechariah, will come upon this generation. It is significant that the Lord does not, for example, mention the martyrs in the period of the Maccabees who were killed by that vicious Antiochus Epiphanes. It is not because He did not acknowledge them as martyrs, rather, their recorded martyrdom was not included in Scripture. The blood of the prophets from the first book to the last book of the Jewish canon will come upon the Jews in 70 AD.

"Chronologically," writes John Piper, "the last martyr in the Old Testament was Uriah the Son of

<sup>47</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, p. 57. Footnote references removed.

Shemaiah, whose death is described in Jeremiah 26:20–23. He died during the reign of Jehoiakim, who reigned from 609 to 598 BC. That was about two hundred years *after* the Zechariah that Jesus refers to.<sup>48</sup> But in the order of the Jewish canon, Zechariah was the last martyr. F. F. Bruce explains this:

There is evidence that Chronicles was the last book in the Hebrew Bible as Jesus knew it. When he said that the generation he addressed would be answerable for ‘the blood of all the prophets, shed from the foundation of the world’, he added, ‘from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary’ (Luke 11:50f.). Abel is the first martyr in the Bible (Gen. 4:8); Zechariah is most probably the son of Jehoiada, who was stoned to death ‘in the court of Yahweh’s house’ because, speaking by the Spirit of God, he rebuked the king and people of Judah for transgressing the divine commandments (2 Chron. 24:20-22). Zechariah (c 800 BC) was not *chronologically* the last faithful prophet to die as a martyr; some two centuries later a prophet named Uriah was put to death in Jerusalem because his witness was unacceptable to King Jehoiakim (Jer. 26:20-23). But Zechariah is *canonically* the last faithful prophet to die as a martyr, because his death is recorded in Chronicles, the last book in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>49</sup>

## Melito of Sardis

In confirmation of the Jewish testimony and to the testimony of our Lord, we add the words of Melito, bishop of Sardis from 170 AD. The church historian Eusebius writes the following about Melito and then quotes his words:

In his *Extracts*, the same author begins in his preface with a list of the recognized writings of the Old Testament, which must be cited here:

Melito to Onesimus his brother, greeting. In your fervor for the Word you have often wanted extracts from the Law and the Prophets regarding the Savior and all of our faith, as well as the accurate facts about the ancient book, especially their number and order. I was eager to do this for you, knowing your fervor for the faith, the Word, and your eternal salvation. So when I visited the East and reached the place where all these things were proclaimed and done, I gained accurate information about the Old Testament books that I send you herewith:

Five books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua (son of Nun), Judges, Ruth, Kings (four books), Chronicles (two books), The Psalms of David, the Proverbs (Wisdom) of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, The Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve in a single book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra.

I have taken extracts from these and compiled them in six books.<sup>50</sup>

This canon includes all books of the OT except Esther. The book called “Jesus Nave” is the book of Joshua the son of Nun. “Kings” included first and second Kings and also first and second Samuel. The four books were included under one because they all spoke about the kings of Israel and Judah, though Samuel, especially of David. The book called “Wisdom” is not the Wisdom of Sirach, which is also known as Ecclesiasticus, but the book of Proverbs. In chapter 22 of the same book, Eusebius writes, ‘Irenaeus too and all early writers used to call Solomon’s Proverbs “All-virtuous Wisdom.”’<sup>51</sup> Clement of Rome prefaces his citation of Proverbs 1:23-31 with “For thus speaks all-virtuous Wisdom”<sup>52</sup> in his letter to the Corinthians. The book of Ezra included not only our Ezra but also Nehemiah. The book of Lamentation was one with the book of Jeremiah. The only missing book is that of Esther, and the difficulty was understandable, as that is the only book which does not mention the name of God. It does sound very strange for a book to be inspired by God not to mention His name, but it goes to show how God is sovereign in circumstances even when His name is not explicitly mentioned, though it

<sup>48</sup> John Piper, *A Peculiar Glory: How the Christian Scriptures Reveal Their Complete Truthfulness* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016), p. 48. Retrieved from <http://document.desiringgod.org/peculiar-glory-en.pdf?1459274602>.

<sup>49</sup> Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture*, 31. Italics are original.

<sup>50</sup> Eusebius, *The Church History*, pp. 144-145; book 4:26. Formatting for listing the books has been adjusted.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 140, book 4:22.

<sup>52</sup> *First Clement* 57.3 in Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007, 3rd edition), p. 121.

cannot be doubted that they prayed and depended upon God. The book of Esther is not a point of contention between either Catholics and Protestants, or Christians and Jews. It is interesting why it is omitted by Melito. Some say that the omission is accidental, either on the part of Eusebius or Melito. Either case, Esther is not a point of dispute.

Do you notice what else is missing from the list? Any apocryphal book. By 170 AD, when Melito went to the East, i.e., Jerusalem, to inquire of the authoritative books, he only came back with our OT canon, with the possible exception of Esther. Melito's canon is said to be the first canon of the OT and it agrees with the Josephus' canon, which agrees with the Protestant canon of the OT.

## The Apocrypha

### The LXX, the Apocrypha, and Jerome

Now we return to our initial comments about the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the LXX. We see that the Jews, who were entrusted with the Scripture, did not accept the Apocrypha in their canon. The inclusion of the Apocrypha among the Scriptures in the early church was due to Jerome's translation of the Bible into Latin. But even Jerome himself acknowledged that the Apocrypha was not Scripture and was not to function as an authority in the church to establish doctrine. Gregg Allison writes that

Jerome first translated Samuel and Kings, and in his preface to these books he composed a list of canonical Scripture. It included only the writings in the Hebrew Bible; these alone were Scripture. He then commented: "This preface to the Scriptures may serve as a 'helmeted' [general] introduction to all the books which we turn [translate] **from Hebrew into Latin**, so that we may be assured that **what is not found in our list must be placed among the apocryphal writings.**" These were Wisdom (of Solomon), the Book of Jesus Ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Judith, Tobit, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. Elsewhere, Jerome indicated his rejection of Baruch, and though he did translate the additional stories in Daniel of the LXX, he placed them in an appendix to the book. Thus, he relegated the Apocrypha to secondary status in comparison with canonical Scripture.

In commenting on two of the apocryphal writings (Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus), Jerome indicated the role or purpose of the Apocrypha: "As then the church reads Judith, Tobit, and the books of Maccabees, but **does not admit them among the canonical Scriptures**, so let it read these two volumes for the edification of the people, **not to give authority to doctrines of the church.**" That is, the church could read the apocryphal writings for its growth, but they could not be consulted in the establishment of church doctrine.<sup>53</sup>

The Apocrypha may benefit some people but was not to be viewed as Scripture. The LXX was considered as a library of Jewish writings, and not as the canon containing only the authoritative books of the OT. The books laid in the temple were acknowledged by the Jews to be consisting of only 22 books, corresponding to our 39 books of the OT, written from the time of Moses to Malachi, from Genesis to Malachi in the Protestant canon. These were the authoritative God-breathed books of the OT. Just because a book is contained within a collection does not mean it is Scripture.

### The Apocrypha is not of God

Although the above observations are sufficient proof that the Apocrypha is not Scripture and is not of God, yet it is interesting to note that there are false doctrines taught by the Apocrypha, which certainly puts them out of Scripture. The Roman Catholic Church officially recognized the Apocrypha in 1546 at the Council of Trent, prior to that no official church-wide statement was made upon that subject. Here below, I will quote some statements as to why Protestants, besides reasons for the recognized canon of the Jewish church, do not accept the Apocryphal writings as Scripture. Roy E. Knuteson writes that

it will be granted that a couple of the Apocryphal books contain accurate history, especially 1st

---

<sup>53</sup> Allison, *Historical Theology*, pp. 48-49. Footnote references removed. Content within brackets is Dr. Allison's. Emphasis added.

Maccabees with its account of the wars of the inter-testamental period of Jewish history. However, elsewhere they abound in historical, geographic, and chronological errors. Many of them, such as the books of Tobit, Judith, and Bel and the Dragon, are pure fiction without any factual support whatsoever. For example, the book of Tobit is a short story which gives directions for casting out a demon by the burning of the heart and liver of a fish from the Euphrates River. It also includes an account of how Tobit regained her eyesight by applying the gall of the fish to her eyes. Bel and the Dragon is another fictitious story of how wicked priests were consuming food offered to the idol called Bel and how Daniel exposed their deceit which resulted in the destruction of the idol and its many priests. It also records how Daniel killed the “great dragon” that was worshiped in Babylon by feeding it balls made of pitch, fat and hair, which caused it to explode internally. Obviously such myths cannot be put on a par with the writings of Scripture and therefore must be rejected.<sup>54</sup>

We are not atheists or materialists to reject supernatural things, but there are things which are supernatural and miraculous, and there are things which are absurd. In all of God’s holy book, we don’t read of any such “healing” techniques. Also, the story of Daniel with Bel and the Dragon are likewise fictitious, although encouraging in that they show Daniel as worshiping only the true God. The end of the story is Daniel in the lion’s den with several additions, such as Habakkuk being carried by an angel to give food to Daniel in the den.

In **Baruch 1:7-8**, it is said that the vessels of the temple were received in Jerusalem by Joakim the priest in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. But this is in direct contradiction to Ezra 1:7, which states that Cyrus, king of Persia, had possession of the vessels of the Lord’s house. Cyrus had commanded that they should be brought back to Jerusalem, yet this was neglected (Ezra 5:13-17). As this was brought to the attention of Darius, he granted Ezra to get the vessels and continue the work on the temple. Artaxerxes likewise gave Ezra and the Israelites free leave in everything that they needed in rebuilding the temple, including the “vessels that have been given you for the service of the house of your God” (Ezra 7:19; 8:25-30). This is a direct contradiction to what Ezra, who actually lived at the time of these things, wrote.

The **book of Judith** begins with an amazing historical inaccuracy:

Judith 1:1 NRSV It was the twelfth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, who ruled over the Assyrians in the great city of Nineveh. In those days Arphaxad ruled over the Medes in Ecbatana.

Nebuchadnezzar, the great king of Babylon, ruled from ca. 605-562 BC. But there is a problem with the very first sentence. Nebuchadnezzar did not, in fact, rule over Assyria, neither did he rule in “the great city of Nineveh.” The 12<sup>th</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzar would have been around 593 BC. It is interesting to read what the *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops* (USCCB) notes on this passage: “His [Nebuchadnezzar’s] depiction here as an Assyrian is an **invention** of the author, **as is the description of Arphaxad**, an otherwise **unknown king** of the Medes, in Ecbatana.”<sup>55</sup> So, the author presents a historical invention as a fact, yet this does not cast doubt upon the authority, canonicity, and inspiration of this book? Obviously, any book which has such an absurd and not only contradictory to history but contradictory claims to the Bible, cannot be trusted. Bruce Metzger notes the following on Judith:

One of the first questions that naturally arises regarding this book is whether it is historical. The consensus, at least among Protestant and Jewish scholars, is that the story is, sheer fiction...the book teems with chronological, historical, and geographical improbabilities and downright errors. For example, Holofernes moves an immense army about three hundred miles in three days (2:21). The opening words of the book, when taken with 2:1ff. and 4:2f., involve the most astonishing historical nonsense, for the author places Nebuchadnezzar’s reign over the Assyrians (in reality he was king of Babylon) at Nineveh (which fell seven years before his accession!) at a time when the Jews had only recently returned from the captivity (actually at this time they were suffering further deportations)! Nebuchadnezzar did not make war on Media (1:7), nor capture Ecbatana (1:14)...The rebuilding of the Temple (4:13) is dated, by a glaring anachronism, about a century too early. Moreover, the Jewish state is represented as being under the government of a high priest and a kind of Sanhedrin (6:6-14; 15:8), which is compatible only

<sup>54</sup> Roy E. Knuteson, *Why We Reject The Apocrypha*, p. 6. Retrieved from <https://www.thecalvinist.net/files/books/Roy-E-Knuteson-Why-We-Reject-The-Apocrypha.pdf>.

<sup>55</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/bible/judith/1>. Emphasis added.

with a post-exilic date several hundred years after the book's presumed historical setting.<sup>56</sup>

Could we imagine the same being said concerning Genesis, Exodus or Jeremiah?<sup>57</sup> If a book contains historical and factual errors then it cannot be from God.

Dr. Knuteson likewise writes that the Apocrypha is a source of some Roman Catholic doctrines:

the books in the Apocrypha endorse many false doctrines that are totally at variance with the clear teaching of the Word of God. Suicide is justified in 2 Maccabees 14:41-46. Prayers to the dead are encouraged in chapter 12, verses 41-45. Almsgiving is considered efficacious for the forgiveness of sins according to Tobit 12:9. The Book of Wisdom teaches the heresy of the pre-existence of souls in 8:19-20. The Book of Judith portrays her as using deception, guile and outright lying with the apparent approval of God (9:10-13). It is in these books that the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory is found along with many other unscriptural concepts.<sup>58</sup>

In light of these things, even when these books contain historical, geographical, and even theological errors, they are accepted by the Roman Catholic Church because they lend support to her false doctrines.

The Apocrypha should not only be rejected because it was not received by those to whom the Word of God was entrusted, neither appealed to by our Lord or His apostles, but also because it contains historical, geographical, and theological errors and contradictions.

## §4 The Authority of the Holy Scripture

4 | The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, **dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, 1** but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; therefore **it is to be received because it is the Word of God. 2**

1. 2 Tim. 3:15; 3:16; John 10:35; 13:18, 34-35; 19:34-36, 24; 1 John 5:9; Rom. 1:2; 3:2; 9:17; 15:4; Acts 1:16; 2:16, 24ff; Matt. 5:17-18; 4:1-11; 13:35; 22:32; 22:41ff; 26:54; Gal. 3:8, 16; 1 Cor. 10:11; Luke 16:17; 22:37; 2 Pet. 1:19-21
2. Luke 15:27-31; Gal. 1:8-9; Eph. 2:2

The **authority of Holy Scripture** does not depend upon the testimony of the early church fathers, godly men or the **church**. This is against the Roman Catholic idea that the “church” establishes the canon and scope of Scripture. Furthermore, only the “church” can properly interpret Scripture. The **authority** and truthfulness of **Holy Scripture** depend upon **God**, its **Author**. It is interesting to note the parenthetical “**who is truth itself**”. This is said to further confirm the truthfulness of Holy Scripture. If an author is truthful by nature, it is logical and obvious to expect that his writings will likewise reflect his nature. This is exactly the case with God. The truthfulness of the Bible depends upon the truthfulness of God. If God is not wholly truthful then we have no reason to believe the Bible is true. But God is, in fact, wholly truthful. In fact, He is “the God of truth” (Isa. 65:16). It is because of the character and authorship of God (“**therefore**”) that Scripture is to be received as truthful and authoritative.

God lays His claim upon His Word, therefore, to bring another standard aside from God Himself to test the truthfulness of His Word is to make God and His Word subordinate to that standard. In that scenario, God and His Word are no longer the ultimate standard and rule of all faith and obedience. The ultimate standard is whatever we use to “prove” or make Scripture authoritative for people. In the case of the Roman Catholic Church, it is itself the ultimate standard because it stands above Scripture by defining its scope and also by claiming to be the only one who could properly interpret it. Furthermore, all practices and doctrines of the church do not need to be derived from or based on Scripture according to the Roman Church. Sacred Tradition also plays an important role. In the Roman Church,

<sup>56</sup> Bruce Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University, 1957), pp. 50-51 as cited in Brake, *Is the Apocrypha Scripture?*

<sup>57</sup> I'm obviously aware that critical scholarship has doubted the authorship and authenticity of these books and many of the books in both testaments. But I'm speaking here to normal Bible-believing Christians.

<sup>58</sup> Knuteson, *Why We Reject The Apocrypha*, p. 6.