

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now?

### *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

***“The Baby boomer generation went from father knows best,<sup>1</sup> to father knows nothing,<sup>2</sup> to no father.<sup>3</sup> As pastors, we’re dismayed over our ‘post-Christian’ culture; lamenting its lax attitude toward the Word of God.<sup>4</sup> The problem is our leadership is adrift and rudderless regarding the Biblical and historical doctrine of the inerrancy of the copy of the Word of God, our Bible. Think about it, if pastors, professors and publishers can have their own “private interpretation”<sup>5</sup> like Westcott-Hort, and our seminaries in their eclectic<sup>6</sup> Greek texts, then why cannot the pew do the same? We have led by example, however one which has diminished faith in the authenticity and authority of the Word of God;<sup>7</sup> producing a self-inflicted loss.<sup>8</sup> We’re ‘winning the world’, but losing our homes, “the time is come that judgment must began at the house of God”.<sup>9</sup>***

In light of the above; how did it happen and what are we to do? Let’s begin with an examination; an ‘autopsy’ of our situation to determine the cause and the solution to our error; which is: *the pulpits of the SBC have not taught the Biblical and historical doctrine of the inerrancy of the copy of the Word of God, our Bible as preserved in our Baptist heritage.* Why this happened can be easily understood and quickly remedied.

In this paper we will briefly review our Baptist heritage on the doctrine of inerrancy at four pivotal points of its history:

- Beginning in 1845 with our Confession at the inception of the SBC which specifically affirms the inerrancy of both the *original* and *copy* of the Word of God;
- To 1925 and the formal adoption of our first Baptist Faith and Message at the SBC Convention which affirmed the inerrancy of the *original* of the Word of God, but makes *no* specific mention to the inerrancy of the *copy*;
- To 1978 and the signing of the Chicago Statement which affirmed the inerrancy of the *original* of the Word of God, and for the first time memorialized the SBC error on inerrancy by affirming that our *copy* of the Word of God had errors;
- Concluding with today, proposing how we may remedy the error and put ourselves, families, churches and nation back on a sound footing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Young, the respected father character in the radio and TV series, *Father Knows Best* (1949-60)

<sup>2</sup> Archive Bunker, the *dufus* father character in the TV sitcom, *All In the Family* (1971-79)

<sup>3</sup> Murphy Brown (1988-98) the single mother character and, Ann Romano in, *One Day at a Time* (1975-84)

<sup>4</sup> Barna Group, *Christianity is No Longer Americans' Default Faith*

<sup>5</sup> 2Peter 1:19-21

<sup>6</sup> Dr Wilbur N. Pickering, *What is Eclecticism? The Identity of the New Testament Text*

<sup>7</sup> See paper by Standard Bearers; *The Fear of The Lord: Restoring the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy ~ The Fear of Man verses the Fear of the Lord*

<sup>8</sup> Hosea 8:7 – “For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind: it hath no stalk: the bud shall yield no meal: if so be it yield, the strangers shall swallow it up.”

<sup>9</sup> 1Peter 4:17

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

**1845**

### SBC POSITION ON INERRANCY AT ITS INCEPTION

The Southern Baptist Convention's first 'adopted' Confession, the [Philadelphia Confession of Faith 1742](#), embraced the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy like those of the Reformation; which holds the Word is 100% pure in the *original* as given by Divine Inspiration and kept 100% pure in the *copy* by Divine (Providential) Preservation, to all ages.

*"Being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages<sup>10</sup>, are therefore **authentic** [a genuine original]"<sup>11</sup>*

Observe the choice of words of our Confession in describing the *copy* of the Word of God as being **authentic**- what a statement! Webster's 1828 dictionary<sup>12</sup> defines *authentic* as "**having a genuine original**". The authors of this Confession ascribe the same authority to their *copy* of scripture as to the *original*; both were 100% pure, 'authentic'- genuine originals.

The [Philadelphia Confession](#) was embraced by the all the churches that comprised the SBC at our inception in 1845 as confirmed by Timothy and Denise George, a couple prolific in the history of the Southern Baptist history when they state (emphasis mine):

*"The Philadelphia Confession of Faith was transplanted to the Charleston Baptist Association in South Carolina. It soon became the most widely accepted, definitive confession among Baptists in America, both North and South. Each of the 293 "delegates," as they were then called, who gathered in Augusta to organize the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845, belonged to congregations and associations which had adopted the Philadelphia/Charleston Confession of Faith as their own."<sup>13</sup>*

**1925**

### SBC POSITION ON INERRANCY AT THE ADOPTION OF OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> FORMAL CONFSSION

In 1925 the SBC Convention formally adopted our first [Baptist Faith and Message](#) which affirmed the inerrancy of the *original* of the Word of God, but makes *no* specific mention to the inerrancy of the *copy*.

*"We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men **divinely inspired**, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, **without any mixture of error**, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and will remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and religious opinions should be tried."*

Observe, unlike the [Philadelphia Confession](#) the [Baptist Faith and Message](#) has no specific reference to the Divine Preservation of the *copy* of the Word of God. It contains a nebulous statement on inerrancy when it says; 'without any mixture of error', but whether is it referring to the *original* or the *copy* of the Word of God, or both; it's not clear.

---

<sup>10</sup> [Psalms 12:6-7](#): "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever." [Psalms 12](#) does not say God's Word was pure, but *is* pure. Nor does it say it is pure *today*; rather it is pure *forever*.

<sup>11</sup> [1742 The Philadelphia Confession](#); For more, see the paper by [Standard Bearers](#); [Divine Preservation? How We Lost the Doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the Word of God](#), by [Standard Bearers](#)

<sup>12</sup> Webster's 1828 dictionary

<sup>13</sup> Timothy and Denise George, Introduction, [Baptist Confessions, Covenants, and Catechisms](#), Broadman & Holman, 1996

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

**1978**

### SBC POSITION ON INERRANCY AFTER THE APPROVAL OF THE CHICAGO STATEMENT

The [Chicago Statement](#) was signed in 1978 by the who's who of conservatives and evangelicals. Unlike our [Baptist Faith and Message](#), it's not *silent* on inerrancy of the *copy*, but *rejects* the [Philadelphia Confession's](#) doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the *copy* of the Word of God, 100% pure when it states (emphasis and brackets mine):

*"Since God has **nowhere** promised an inerrant transmission of Scripture, it is necessary to affirm that **only** the **autographic** [original] text of the original documents was inspired and to maintain the need of textual criticism as a means of detecting any slips that may have crept into the text in the course of its transmission.*

*Similarly, **no** translation [Bible] is or can be **perfect**, and all translations are an additional step away from the autographa.*

*When total precision of a particular kind was not expected nor aimed at, it is **no error** not to have achieved it. Scripture is inerrant, **not** in the sense of **being absolutely precise** by modern standards, but in the sense of making good its claims and achieving that measure of focused truth at which its authors aimed."*<sup>14</sup>

Since the [Chicago Statement](#) is embraced by our SBC leadership, it has become our *default* statement which interprets our [Baptist Faith and Message](#) and ends our *silence*; disclosing the change in our doctrine on the inerrancy of the *copy* of the Word of God. In October 20, 2009, the [Chicago Statement](#) was adopted by the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary Board of Trustees:

*"We, the Trustees of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, resolve to support our current President in his position with regard to The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy and The Danvers Statement on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. It is our understanding that these statements are used as a model with reference to biblical ecclesiology.*

*It is also our understanding that modern culture has migrated away from these ideals, therefore, the training of future churchmen and women is well served by including these statements in the development and implementation of processes that lead to this end. This resolution is an affirmation of our support."*

For the first time in our SBC history, our doctrine on inerrancy changed; from the belief in the *Divine* (Providential) Preservation of a 100% pure copy of the Word of God to a *Conceptual*<sup>15</sup> Preservation of a 99% almost pure copy.

---

<sup>14</sup> 1978 [Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy](#); Sections III & V, Exposition, C<sup>14</sup>, *Transmission and Translation*

<sup>15</sup> The theology of [Princeton Seminary](#) was shaped by [Archibald Alexander](#) (1772-1851), the first professor of theology at Princeton, and by his successors, [Charles Hodge](#) (1797-1878) and [B.B. Warfield](#) (1851-1921).<sup>1</sup> These men remain highly respected by reformed and evangelical scholars today. But before we decide to bow to their scholarship, we need to examine what they believed about the Scriptures. Archibald Alexander promoted the Westminster Standards to be the orthodox expression of faith. He also upheld the power of human reason. What of the Bible in his hands? Well he believed that the Bible was indeed preserved "**by God's singular care and providence**" as spelled out in the Westminster Confession of Faith quoting [Matthew 5:18](#), but his human mind could not accept the idea that the *apographs* (ie, copies of the originals) could be infallible and inerrant. It ought to be noted that Alexander's preserved text manifested no less than 60,000 scribal errors, but in his opinion, these did not affect doctrine in any way. In his inaugural sermon at his installation as Princeton's first professor of theology, he spoke positively of textual criticism, and posited the theory of *conceptual* preservation: "**For though the serious mind is at first astonished and confounded, upon being informed of the multitude of various readings ... yet it is relieved, when on careful examination, it appears that not more than one of a hundred of these, makes the slightest variation in the sense, and that the whole of them do not materially affect one important fact or doctrine.**" From paper by Dr. Jeffery Khoo,

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

This means we believe it was too hard for God to preserve every word as He promised;<sup>16</sup> therefore He only preserved the important concepts instead.<sup>17</sup>

### WHY WE CHANGED OUR 1925 BF&M TO DROP DIVINE PRESERVATION

So in light of the foregoing, what are we to do? To address that question, let's us look closer at the forces which produced a 'perfect storm'<sup>18</sup> and caused the SBC to weaken its previous witness to the Divine Preservation of the copy of the Word of God; as being 100% pure.

The SBC felt the need to modify our adopted Confession of 1845, as stated in the [Preamble of our 1925 BF&M](#):

*"Your committee beg leave to report as follows:*

*Your committee recognize that they were appointed "to consider the advisability of issuing another statement of the Baptist Faith and Message, and report at the next Convention.*

*In pursuance of the instructions of the Convention, and **in consideration of the general denominational situation**, your committee has decided to recommend the New Hampshire Confession of Faith, revised at certain points, and **with some additional articles growing out of present needs**, for approval by the Convention, in the event a statement of the Baptist faith and message is deemed necessary at this time.*

*The present occasion for a reaffirmation of Christian fundamentals **is the prevalence of naturalism in the modern teaching and preaching of religion**. Christianity is supernatural in its origin and history. We repudiate every theory of religion which denies the supernatural elements in our faith."*

In order to understand why the change in our Confession, we will need to explain what the authors of the BF&M meant when they said: "... in consideration of the general denominational situation"...*"and with some additional articles growing out of present needs."* In the climate at 1925 the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy was under a fierce assault from the pseudo-science of evolution<sup>19</sup> which was attacking both the doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of the original of the Word of God, not to mention the Divine Preservation of the copy, our Bible.

In light of this pressure, the SBC felt the need to consolidate and create as broad of a consensus as possible among its constituency. This was accomplished by avoiding any potential divisive issue; such as the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the copy, our Bible; 100% pure, as articulated in our first doctrinal statement, the [Philadelphia Confession](#).

---

Principal of [Far East Bible College](#) entitled; *'Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology'*.

<sup>16</sup> For proof texts see pages 6-7 of the paper by [Standard Bearers: God's Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God](#)

<sup>17</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: A Call To Revival: Restoring the Foundations ~ If the Foundations Be Destroyed What Can the Righteous Do?](#)

<sup>18</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: Divine Preservation? How We Lost the Doctrine of the Divine Preservation of the Word of God](#).

<sup>19</sup> The "general denominational situation" is articulated in the May 15<sup>th</sup> resolution following the May 14<sup>th</sup> adoption of the 1925 Baptist Faith and Message Statement during the Southern Baptist Convention in session in Memphis, Tennessee. M.A. Phillips, Louisiana, offered the following resolution which under suspension of the rules, was adopted;

*"Whereas the action of the convention yesterday upon the Statement of the Baptist Faith and Message is being interpreted by some as an endorsement of Evolution, Therefore be it resolved: 1. That such an interpretation is a misinterpretation. 2. That no paragraph, sentence or word in our Statement of Faith and Message can truly be cited as an endorsement of Evolution."* (<http://www.reformedreader.org/cc/1925bfam.htm>)

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

However, you would think with the “...prevalence of naturalism in the modern teaching and preaching of religion...” as noted in our 1925 Preamble, we would have echoed the clear witness of the [Philadelphia Confession](#) in its affirmation of the 100% purity of the *copy* of the Word of God, rather than weakening it as we did.

Now we stand almost a century removed from our [Baptist Faith & Message of 1925](#), and two generations have not heard the doctrine of *Divine Preservation*. Today, the Biblical and *historical* doctrine of inerrancy, which includes the doctrine *Divine of Preservation*, is not even a memory, and many do not even know that the doctrine was ever a tenet of the faith.

Where would we be today if this had happened to any doctrines of the faith we take for granted; for instance the ‘*Security of the Believer*’? Like the doctrine of *Divine Preservation*, there would be similar uncertainty, because scripture instructs us how God imparts faith; “*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*”.<sup>20</sup> So what was happening in 1925 to cause us to concede our doctrine of *Divine Preservation*?

### SUMMARY

The 1925 BF&M was an academic confession written to form a consensus to provide doctrinal boundaries for our educational institutions to counter Evolution. Our *silence* on the doctrine of the *Divine Preservation* of the *copy* of the Word of God was a casualty in our pursuit to create as broad of a constituency as possible through a “*milder and gentler*” Confession which sought to avoid further divisiveness.

Furthermore, its *silence* signaled we had *already* conceded this doctrine as articulated in our [Philadelphia Confession](#), and replaced it with the doctrine of *man’s restoration* as advocated by Westcott and Hort; the proponents of the then emerging pseudo-science of naturalistic textual criticism. One can see this fact in the book by [Dr. A.T. Robertson](#)<sup>21</sup>, *Studies In The Text of New Testament*, published in 1926, just a year after the BF&M was adopted.

By 1925, the SBC leadership had already succumbed to the claims of ‘scholasticism’ by naturalistic textual criticism and therefore was unwillingly to spend any capital defending the inerrancy of the *copy* of the Word of God as contained in our first Confession. They were struggling just to maintain the inerrancy of the *originals* in the face of the onslaught by the naturalistic textual critics of Germany; therefore, going *silence* was a win-win situation. However, this is not where the story ends.

In 1978, the [Chicago Statement](#) repeated the actions taken by the SBC in 1925 on the inerrancy of the *copy* of the Word of God for the same reason, but taking it a step further. For the first time in our Baptist heritage, the [Chicago Statement](#) clearly affirms what our BF&M only implied by its silence; which is that the *copy* of the Word of God, our Bible has errors.

---

<sup>20</sup> [Romans 10:17](#)

<sup>21</sup> Dr Robertson was an admirer of [B.B. Warfield](#) (1851-1921), the President and ‘Lion’ of [Princeton Seminary](#) (1887-1921); once considered the citadel of Protestant orthodoxy. Warfield was considered its last great theologian, however he dropped the baton on Biblical Inerrancy as ‘*hand down unto us*’ by the saints when he writes: “*The inerrant autographs were a fact once; they may possibly be a fact again, when textual criticism has said its last word on the Bible text. In proportion as they are approaching in the processes of textual criticism, do we have an ever better and better Bible than the one we have now.*” [Letis, Theodore](#), Ph.D., *Ecclesiastical Text*, p. 53. Institute for Renaissance and Reformation Biblical Studies, 1997; (<http://www.thebluebanner.com/pdf/bluebanner7-6.pdf>). For more see these two excellent resources (click on links): Dr. Edward F. Hill’s excerpt from; ‘A History of My Defence of the King James Version, *Dr B. B. Warfield and the Providential Preservation of the New Testament*’. Dr. Jeffrey Khoo, Principal of [Far East Bible College](#); ‘[Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles’ Heel of Princeton Bibliology](#)’.



## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now?

### *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

As previously stated, since the [Chicago Statement](#) is embraced by our SBC leadership and adopted by the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary Board of Trustees, it has become our *default* statement which interprets our [Baptist Faith and Message](#); disclosing the change in our doctrine on the inerrancy of the *copy* of the Word of God.

### CONCLUSION

Let me be brief and to the point. The watchmen of the Baby boomer generation failed to completely prosecute their divine calling and commission on two critical issues of our day. We did not satisfactorily stand in the face of the two fierce headwinds of; *Feminism* and *Inerrancy* to the degree we ought to have, whether out of ignorance or the fear of man. I know, because I was in the pulpit teaching these things, I can tell you first-hand how difficult it was for me to address these issues. However, it yielded lasting fruit in those who heard; and *some* did (more than who decided to get on the [Ark with Noah](#)<sup>22</sup> [1Peter 3:20](#)).

Now, please allow me to talk to the grey-haired Pastors who failed this test for whatever reason. We have a second chance; let's not allow it to pass us again. This is a call to join the arena from our places of comfort, and not let our concerns for our *reputation* dying, our *wealth* dying, our *health* dying, our *relationships* dying, our *future opportunities* dying; our *access* dying, in short – our '**standard of living dying**' to which we have grown accustomed. The same comforts we enjoy by God's hand; caused us not to obey His voice; unless we repent we will lose it all. Our faithfulness to our divine commission will be our enduring legacy, eternal treasure and finest hour! Let's take encouragement from our Shepherd through the words and life of His faithfulness servant and witness, Apostle Paul:

*"Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: **for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ,**"* ([Philippians 3:8](#))

*"Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men.<sup>23</sup> **For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.** Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."* ([Acts 20:26-28](#))

*"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: **But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.**"* ([Philippians 2:5-8](#))

We now stand as the Shems' of our day, who have lived on '*the other side of the flood*' of this post-Christian culture. Now, realizing what we know and what the next generation does not, how can we as shepherds neglect teaching our children these truths and providing them the armor to protect them from the wolves already howling at their door?

---

<sup>22</sup> [Matthew 24:37](#); "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, **And knew not until the flood came**, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

<sup>23</sup> [Ezekiel 3:19-21](#); [34:1-12](#); [Jeremiah 23:1-41](#)

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

I like to close my comments with an appreciation for those on whose shoulders we stand. In examining any differences, I do not question their motives or sincerity of heart; rather commend, embrace and proudly own them as brothers, elders<sup>24</sup> and companions in labor in the work of the ministry. I write this in service to the church and our Lord; whom we all sacrificially love. I stand open to be corrected, but in the words of [Martin Luther](#), “*I am but a man and can err, only let my errors be proven by scriptures.*”<sup>25</sup> To that end, I offer [Psalms 12](#) as an excellent proof text<sup>26</sup> for the doctrine of the Divine (Providential) Preservation, 100% pure, of the copy of the Word of God, our Bible.

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

[Psalms 12:6-7](#) does not say God’s Word was pure, but is pure. Nor does it say it is pure today; rather it is pure forever. When King David penned this scripture, he was referring to the *copy* of scripture and not the *original* as being 100% pure; there was no original text of the Word of God other than that being penned. There are only two things which are eternal: God’s *people* and His *Word*, and [Psalms 12](#) refer to both and comfort us in the assurance God looses neither; meaning God’s *people* and His *Word* are opposite sides of the coinage of our Heavenly Father’s character and purpose, and He stands as equal surety for the preservation of both: His *people* and His *Word* ([Matthew 5:18](#); [John 10:29](#); [John 18:9](#)). Equally true is, when one denies God’s *Word*, they deny His *name*; His *Word* and His *Name* are also opposite sides of the same coin; when you denigrate one, you denigrate the other:

*“I know thy **works**: behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my **word**, and hast not denied my **name**.”* ([Revelation 3:8b](#); [Psalms 138:2b](#)).

As Pastors, we must answer the question for ourselves, “*hath God said*” that He will keep His Word 100% pure forever; “*purified seven times .... preserve for ever.*” If we’re comfortable with a 99%, almost pure Word; would we feel equally confident with a 99% assurance of our salvation as well? The plain, literal witness of God in [Psalms 12](#) to the preservation of His Word is no less clear than the one contained in [John 3:16](#) as to the assurance of our salvation; **1%** does make a difference, especially if it contradicts God. Our doctrine of inerrancy like salvation must rest by faith on the Word of God, not man; just as our understanding of creation; “*Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.*”<sup>27</sup>

If God says it, then that settles it, regardless what man say otherwise; no matter how ‘scientific’ their arguments, impressive their scholastic credentials and grand their numbers. While the distinction in the efforts of the authors of the Chicago Statement may have temporally saved our institutions, it came at the price of not imparting a *high* view of Holy Scripture to those with whom we’ve been entrusted to teach.<sup>28</sup> Even worst, it teaches a false doctrine which plays into the hands of the attacks by our culture upon the authenticity and authority of the Word of God. How can we as Pastors, with clear conscience ignore not correcting this error on our watch? I believe we should support our dear friends, colleagues and institutions, but not at the expenses of our loyalty to God and his calling on our lives to teach His sheep sound doctrine.

---

<sup>24</sup> [1Timothy 5:17](#)

<sup>25</sup> Click on link for a short YouTube clip of [Martin Luther’s Appeal at the Diet of Worm](#).

<sup>26</sup> I understand the conventional objections to [Psalms 12](#) as a proof text, which are as hollow as those who challenge the plain and literal reading of [Genesis 1](#) for the Biblical account on Creation. For the edification if those who are not familiar with the objections to [Psalms 12](#), I offer the paper by Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of [Far East Bible College](#) entitled: [The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: One Bible Only? Or “Yea Hath God Said?”](#)

<sup>27</sup> [Hebrews 11:3](#)

<sup>28</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation - The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement](#).

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

### WHAT ARE WE TO DO NOW?

As Pastors we must restore the custodianship of the Word of God back unto ourselves and cease being intimidated by the false claims of scholarship and science by the naturalistic textual critics.<sup>29</sup> Then we must learn and embrace the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy for ourselves.<sup>30</sup> Next, we must begin teaching it to our church leadership and congregation.<sup>31</sup> Last, we must articulate and memorialize it in our Confession of Faith<sup>32</sup>, remembering, a revival of the *Word* of God precedes a revival of the *people* of God; “*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.*”<sup>33</sup>

As you can see this approach is straight-forward and simple and well within our grasp. If my thesis is correct, that we have departed from the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy, then this is a serious issue and deserves our serious attention. Let me state it another way. As Pastors, are we prepared to stand in our pulpits next Sunday morning and declare to our congregation that we believe our Bible is 99% not 100% pure? If not, then why do we hold to a Confession of Faith that teaches our Bible has errors?

Do we think our congregations believe regarding the *copy* of the Word of God; is 99% not 100% pure? What do we think our congregations think we believe as their Pastors about the *copy* of the Word of God? There is no place for *double-speak*<sup>34</sup> among God’s shepherds; rather a certain and clear trumpet with plainness of speech.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: Letter to a Pastor: How Shall They Hear Without a Preacher? ~So then Faith Cometh By Hearing, and Hearing By the Word of God](#)

<sup>30</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic ~ Believing or Neutral as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?](#)

<sup>31</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: God’s Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure COPY of the Word of God.](#)

<sup>32</sup> An example of a Confession of Faith which articulates the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy is the [Statement of Doctrine of the Holy Scripture](#) by the [Trinitarian Bible Society](#).

<sup>33</sup> See the paper by [Standard Bearers: Preaching and Loss: Peer Pressure and the Fear of the Lord ~ Why the Tempest? The Foolishness of Preaching](#)

<sup>34</sup> [Wikipedia](#) defines Doublespeak as; “*Language that deliberately disguises, distorts, or reverses the meaning of words.*” To *Double-speak* is to use the nuance in the meaning of a word in order to make the hearer think you believe one thing, when in fact you do not. For instance, as Pastor I may stand in my pulpit and hold up my Bible and declare the Bible is without error. The hearer will rightfully think I’m referring to the *copy* in my hand, when in fact I’m referring to the *original* of the Word of God, the autographs. This is *double-speak*, since per my Confession of Faith I believe the *copy* I hold in my hand has errors. In some case, Pastor are the victims of *double-speak*, not realizing their Convention and seminaries are not referring to the *copy* of the Word of God as being inerrant. *Double-speak* was the charge conservation made against the moderates in the [Conservative Insurgence](#) as noted by [Dr. Paige Patterson](#); “*Two major events of 1986 and 1987 contributed significantly to the ultimate moderate defeat. The first was the Glorieta Statement prepared and issued in 1986 by the presidents of the six seminaries. Presidents Roy Lee Honeycutt of Southern, Russell Dilday of Southwestern, Landrum Leavell of New Orleans, Randall Lolley of Southeastern, Bill Crews of Golden Gate, and Milton Ferguson of Midwestern, met at the Sunday School Board’s National Assembly in Glorieta, New Mexico. They sensed that the only way to defuse the ticking bomb in Baptist life was to issue a reassuring statement. Among other things, the statement affirmed that the Bible contained no error “in any area of reality.” The response was anything but what they anticipated. Moderate faculties in at least three seminaries descended upon their returning presidents with the charge that they had “given away the store.” Conservatives, wary because of years of “double-speak,” were not much more enthusiastic, wondering aloud what this kind of language implied. In the end, however, conservatives took the statement at face value and held the presidents’ feet to the fire.*” From the book by [Dr. Paige Patterson, Anatomy of a Reformation](#), page 9.

Have conservatives unwittingly fallen into a kind of ‘*doublespeak*’ in their definition of the inerrancy of scripture? Dr. Ralph Elliott, head of the Old Testament department of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1958 addresses this issue. In his book published in 1992, the ‘*Genesis Controversy*’ he explains what he means by the term ‘*doublespeak*’ when he says: “*Doublespeak*’ has become an insidious disease within Southern Baptist life. Through the years, the program at Southern Seminary has acquainted students with the best in current research in the given fields of study. Often, however, this was done with an eye and ear for the ‘*gallery*’ and how much the ‘*church trade*’ would bear. Professors and students learn to couch their



## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch

---

Have the SBC pulpits outrun the pew on the doctrine of inerrancy? Observe the following quote by James A. Sanders, a member of the United Bible Society which published the New Revised Standard Version, regarding the 100% pure Word of God, our Bible when he says:

*“The NRSV is not the Bible; no translation is the Bible. So what is the Bible? What and whence these texts? I think it is time for us to stop fooling the people, making them think there is just one Bible and that our Bible committee got closer to it than their committee did.*

*...I have been told by some that this would just destroy the Bible because lay folk still want to think of the Bible as somehow inerrant. It may well be that if there should ever be the possibility of discussing the text of Isaiah with Isaiah, he might very well say, ‘but I did not say that.’”<sup>36</sup>*

Again, have the SBC pulpits outrun the pew on the doctrine of inerrancy? It appears so, in light of the Chicago Statement’s definition of inerrancy; teaching our *copy* of the Word of God has errors, and our BF&M interpreted in light of the same; we’ve indeed departed from the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy as illustrated in the chart below.

<b>The Differences Between Historic Fundamentalism and Neo-Fundamentalism in Their Respective Views on Biblical Inspiration and Preservation</b> <sup>37</sup>	
<b>Historic Fundamentalism</b>	<b>Neo-Fundamentalism</b>
The perfect, infallible and inerrant Bible is not only in the <b>Autographs</b> but also in the existing and tangible <b>Apographs</b> (the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based).	The perfect, infallible and inerrant Bible is <b>only</b> in the non-existent and intangible <b>Autographs</b> (the actual Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures penned by the Prophets and Apostles).
The Autographs are <b>entirely</b> preserved. We have all of God's Word today (100%). Every word and every doctrine preserved (i.e. verbal preservation).	The Autographs are <b>essentially</b> preserved. We have most of God's Word today (99%). Every doctrine preserved, but not every word (i.e. conceptual preservation).
The biblical basis for the doctrine of <b>100% preservation</b> of the Scriptures is found in <a href="#">Matthew 5:18</a> as stated in the <a href="#">Westminster Confession</a> . Other verses are <a href="#">Psalms 12:6-7</a> , <a href="#">Matthew 24:35</a> , <a href="#">Mark 13:31</a> , <a href="#">Luke 21:33</a> .	There is <b>no</b> biblical basis for the doctrine of <b>100% preservation</b> of the Scriptures. All Scripture verses supporting preservation like <a href="#">Matthew 5:18</a> are explained away.
There are <b>no</b> mistakes whatsoever in the Bible. Discrepancies like the one found in <a href="#">2Kings 8:26</a> / <a href="#">2Chronicles 22:2</a> are only apparent and not actual errors. <sup>38</sup>	There are no mistakes in the Bible <b>that should cause any worry</b> [conceptual preservation]. Allows for insignificant mistakes or minor errors (e.g. <a href="#">2Kings 8:26</a> / <a href="#">2Chronicles 22:2</a> ).

---

*beliefs in acceptable terminology and in holy jargon so that although thinking one thing, the speaker calculated so as to cause the hearer to affirm something else.”* (The ‘Genesis Controversy’; Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1992; 33-34)

<sup>35</sup> Apostle Paul exhorts to plainness of speech. [2Corinthians 3:12](#) :”Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech:”; [1Corinthians 14:8](#): “For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?”

<sup>36</sup> Sanders, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years*, 1991, p.60,71; published by Biblical Archeology Review.

<sup>37</sup> From paper by Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of Far East Bible College entitled: [The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: One Bible Only? Or "Yea Hath God Said?"](#)

<sup>38</sup> [2Kings 8:26](#) / [2Chronicles 22:2](#) are not errors as supposed. See [Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, Th.D., Ph.D.; Ahaziah's Age Upon His Accession](#), and excerpt from his book, [Chronology of the OT: A Return to the Basics](#); also see his accompanying resources; [Chart 5: Kings of the Divided Monarchy](#). Please allow a moment for these document to open.

## How SBC Pastors Erred: What Do We Do Now? *Reviving the Pulpit and the Pew on Our Watch*

---

This is a good place to make an important point. The Biblical doctrine of inerrancy stands on its own as supported by the Word of God. The appeal to our Baptist heritage is only to demonstrate this position is not novel, rather it's the Chicago Statement and our BF&M interpreted in light of the Chicago Statement which is the newcomers. This is echoed by the Trinitarian Bible Society when they state:

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

NOTE 1. The Trinitarian Bible Society maintains that the providentially preserved true and authentic text is to be found in the Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek Received Texts. In so doing, it follows the historic, orthodox Protestant position of acknowledging as Holy Scripture the Hebrew and Greek texts consistently accessible to and preserved among the people of God in all ages. These texts had remained in common use in different parts of the world for more than fifteen centuries and they faithfully represent the texts used in New Testament times.

NOTE 2. Errors, omissions, and additions in particular manuscripts do not impinge upon the qualities of *Scripture*, including inerrancy, because the errors are, in fact, no part of inerrant Scripture. " 39

I do not think it is an overstatement to say, the absence of teaching a *high* view of scripture which grounds believers in the authenticity and authority of the Word of God has hastened our slide to a post-Christian culture. In following the *neo* interpretation of inerrancy these last 132 years, <sup>40</sup> we've neglected to fulfill our divine commission in teaching the sound doctrine of the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy to our generation, for which we will be held accountable. <sup>41</sup> However, teaching the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy is not an ends in itself. Rather, it's the essential step<sup>42</sup> necessary to prepare believers to be able to receive the other important doctrines; such as God's design for the family, which we have also ignored on our watch.

These two neglected doctrines lay at the core of our nation's problems today; Faith (inerrancy) and Family (feminism). Our silence in not boldly teaching what the Word of God has to say regarding these two is the legacy of the Pastors of the Baby boomer generation. Let's not let it remain so. To this end, Floyd and I are available to help in whatever way we may in providing resources to Pastors in assisting them to address these critical issues. We can help Pastors quickly understand the issues and answer your questions as well as provide presentations which are readily understandable to the layman. For more information contact me at my email address below.

God bless,

Louis M Kole  
kolelm@gmail.com

---

<sup>39</sup> [Trinitarian Bible Society](#) Confession of Faith articulates the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy in its [Statement of Doctrine of the Holy Scripture](#).

<sup>40</sup> Beginning in 1881 with the new Greek text of Westcott & Hort, to 1925 with the BF&M silently endorsing the same and to 1978 with the Chicago Statement publicly embracing this error in which the historical text of the saints was overthrown.

<sup>41</sup> [Hebrews 13:17](#); "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: **for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account**, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." See: [Titus 1:9](#); [2:1](#)

<sup>42</sup> [1Peter 2:2](#); "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:" see [Hebrews 5:112-13](#)

## Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

---

### Vision

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

### Share

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

### Teaching

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

### Exhort

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

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

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

[Francis Turretin](#)<sup>1</sup> 1623-1687 (brackets and emphasis mine):

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

God bless,

Louis M Kole

[Hymn ~ Come, Gracious Spirit- Heavenly Dove!](#)

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

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Apograh means "**a perfect copy, an exact transcript**". This is the same witness of the authors of the Westminster Confession when they described their *copy* of the Word of God as '**authentic**', which [Webster's 1828](#) dictionary defines as "**having a genuine original**".

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

## Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

---

### Resources

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

### **Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones**

- [Works of Dr Jones](#)

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

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

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

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' [Chronology of the Old Testament](#)

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

- [Chronology Charts](#) by Dr. Jones

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

Individual Charts by Dr. Jones from, [Chronology of the Old Testament](#)

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

- [Which Version is the Bible?](#)

Excerpts from Dr. Jones' [Which Version Is The Bible?](#)

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

## Standard Bearers Browser

Louis Kole

---

### Louis M Kole

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

### Dr. Jeffrey Khoo

- [Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology \(FEBC\) a must read](#)

### Dr. Edward F Hills

- [Scholasticism Versus the Logic of Faith ~ Excerpt from \*A History of My Defence of the King James Version\* \(FEBC\)](#)
- [The King James Version Defended](#)

### Dr. Wilbur N Pickering

- [What Is Eclecticism? ~ Excerpt from \*The Identity of the New Testament Text\*](#)
- [The Identity of the New Testament Text](#)

### More...

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

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

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