

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

My thesis is we have departed from the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy. We have done this by *redefining* the definition of inerrancy from meaning a 100% pure Word of God kept by divine *preservation* to an *almost* pure Bible, through man's *restoration*, as reflected below in the Chicago Statement (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. Yet the verdict of linguistic science is that English-speaking Christians, at least, are exceedingly well served in these days with a host of excellent translations and have no cause for hesitating to conclude that the true Word of God is within their reach.*

*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.”¹*

The [Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy](#) was signed by the who's who of Protestantism. One of its framers, Dr. Jay Grimstead, gives us the account of its formulation in his article, '[How the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy Began](#)':

“We see the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy (ICBI) Statement on Inerrancy as being a landmark church document, which was created in 1978 by the then largest, broadest, group of evangelical protestant scholars that ever came together to create a common, theological document in the 20th century. It is probably the first systematically comprehensive, broadly based, scholarly, creed-like statement on the inspiration and authority of Scripture in the history of the church.”²

The above statements contained in the [Chicago Statement](#) are the basis of the remarks by [Dr. Roger Olson](#), professor of theology at Baylor University's George W. Truett Theological Seminary, who states that conservatives hold to the term 'inerrancy' but have changed its Biblical meaning, thus rendering it an impotent and indefensible doctrine. Quoting from his article: [Why 'Inerrancy' Doesn't Matter](#) (emphasis mine):

*“Think about this: If the Bible's authority depends on its inerrancy but **only** the original manuscripts were **inerrant**, then **only** the original manuscripts were **authoritative**. The logic is impeccable and irresistible. And if “inerrancy” is compatible with flawed approximations, **faulty chronologies**,³ and use of incorrect sources by the biblical authors, it is a meaningless concept.*

*Even its most ardent and staunch proponents admit **no** existing Bible is inerrant; they attribute inerrancy only to the **original** manuscripts, which do not exist. They **kill** the ordinary meaning of the word with the death of a thousand qualifications. If you doubt that, please read the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy, which usually is considered the standard **evangelical** account of the concept.”⁴*

¹ 1978 Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy; Sections III & V, Exposition, C¹, Transmission and Translation

² Grimstead, Jay; 'How the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy Began'

³ See [End note 1: The Identity of the Old Testament Text – The LXX or the Hebrew Masoretic text](#), by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones.

⁴ Dr. Olson, [Why 'Inerrancy' Doesn't Matter](#)

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

I define the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy as one that teaches the Word of God is *100%* pure: *given 100%* pure by God through divine *inspiration* and kept *100%* pure by His divine *preservation*. This definition is taught in the Word of God, witnessed to in the Confessions of Faith of the Reformation as well as our Baptist ancestry.

This historical definition is affirmed by Francis Turretin⁵ (1623-1687), among the most influential pastors and theologians of the Church and Academy of Geneva, and one of the authors of the *Helvetic Consensus Formula Confession of Faith*. He makes it clear that they never thought of the pure, infallible and inerrant Scriptures in terms of the non-existent *autographs* (originals), as does the textual critic, but always the available and accessible *apographs* (copies) when he says (brackets and emphasis mine):

*“By **original** texts, we do not mean the autographs written by the hand of Moses, of the prophets and the apostles, which certainly do not now exist. We mean their **apographs**⁶ [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.”⁷*

What is their witness as to the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy? It's the *copy [apograph]* made from the *original* scriptures, and NOT only the *original [autograph]* itself, is the *100%* pure, inerrant Word of God. So much so that the *Westminster Confession*⁸, the 'mother' of all confessions states:

*“by **His** singular care and providence, kept **pure in all ages**, are therefore **authentic**;^a
^a*Matt 5:18*”*

Observe their choice of words in describing the *copy* of the Word of God as being *authentic*- what a statement! Webster's 1828 dictionary⁹ defines *authentic* as “*having a genuine original*”. They held that their *copy* of the Word of God (i.e. Bible) remained as authentic, identical, and genuine as the *original* and therefore as authoritative as the original. In the above statements by Turretin, and the authors of the Westminster Confession, we have preserved for us their unequivocal witness to the historical doctrine of Inerrancy, which is in perfect harmony with witness of the Word of God; the Bible.

Their testimony stands in stark contrast to that of the *Chicago Statement* which holds:

*“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.”¹⁰*

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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**”.

⁷ 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. <http://www.deanburgonsociety.org/Preservation/barnett95.htm>

⁸ Spurgeon, *Westminster Confession* Chapter 1, Section 8: “*The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore **authentic**; so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them.*”

⁹ Webster's 1828 dictionary

¹⁰ 1978 *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*; Sections III & V, Exposition, C¹⁰, Transmission and Translation

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

The authors of the [Chicago Statement](#) add insult to injury when they claim they stand in the tradition of the saints as memorialized in the Westminster Confession of Faith (brackets and emphasis mine):

*“The verdict of this science [textual criticism], however, is that the Hebrew and Greek text appear to be amazingly well preserved, so that we are amply justified in affirming, with the **Westminster Confession**, a singular providence of God in this matter and in declaring that the authority of Scripture is in no way jeopardized by the fact that the copies [i.e. our Bible] we possess **are not entirely error-free.**”*¹¹

In the above, the authors of the [Chicago Statement](#) have redefined the Biblical and historical doctrine of Inerrancy from the Divine *preservation* of a 100% pure Bible to man’s *restoration* of an **almost** pure Bible. This change in the definition of inerrancy from *preservation* to *restoration* is noted by [Dr. Edward Hills](#)¹²:

Are naturalistic New Testament textual critics providentially guided? Many conservatives have adopted the theory that it is through textual criticism, and especially through the textual criticism of [Westcott](#) and [Hort](#), that Christ has fulfilled His promise always to preserve in His Church the True New Testament Text. In regard to this matter [J. H. Skilton](#) (1946) writes as follows: *“Textual Criticism, in God’s providence, is the means provided for ascertaining the true text of the Bible.”*¹³ And half a century earlier [Dr. B. B. Warfield](#) (1893) expressed himself in a very similar manner. *“In the sense of the Westminster Confession, therefore, the multiplication of copies of the Scriptures, the several early efforts towards the revision of the text, the raising up of scholars in our own day to collect and collate manuscripts, and to reform them on scientific principles—of our [Tischendorfs](#) and [Tregelleses](#), and [Westcotts and Hort](#)s—are all parts of God’s singular care and providence in preserving His inspired Word pure.”*¹⁴

Dr. B. B. Warfield was an outstanding defender of the orthodox Christian faith, so much so that one hesitates to criticize him in any way. Certainly no Bible-believing Christian would wish to say anything disrespectful concerning so venerable a Christian scholar. But nevertheless it is a fact that Dr. Warfield’s thinking was not entirely unified. Through his mind ran two separate trains of thought which not even he could join together. The one train of thought was dogmatic, going back to the Protestant Reformation. When following this train of thought Dr. Warfield regarded Christianity as true. The other train of thought was apologetic, going back to the rationalistic viewpoint of the 18th century. When following this train of thought Dr. Warfield regarded Christianity as merely probable. And this same divided outlook was shared by Dr. Warfield’s colleagues at Princeton Seminary and by conservative theologians and scholars generally throughout the 19th and early 20th century.¹⁵ Even today this split-level thinking is still a factor to be reckoned with in conservative circles, although in far too many instances it has passed over into modernism.

¹¹ Ibid

¹² See PDF page 92 of 233 in Dr. Edward F. Hills book, *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript*, Chapter 4 (A Christian View of the Biblical Text), Section 2 (How the New Testament was Preserved); Sub-section 3 (Alternative Views of the Providential Preservation of the New Testament); (g) **Are naturalistic New Testament textual critics providentially guided.** [Edward Freer Hills](#) (1912-1981) was a respected Presbyterian scholar. Graduate of Yale University and earned the Th.B. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary, Th.M. degree from Columbia Theological Seminary. After doing doctoral work at the University of Chicago in New Testament textual criticism, he completed his program at Harvard, earning the Th.D. in this field. In 1956 he published *The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript*, which devastated the Westcott-Text theories and exposed the rationalistic foundation of the entire modern version superstructure.

¹³ The Authorized Edition of the English Bible, by F.H.A. Scrivener, Cambridge: University Press, 1884, pp. 302-03.

¹⁴ Ibid pp. 1-145;

¹⁵ 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*’.

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

Dr. Warfield's treatment of the New Testament text illustrates this cleavage in his thinking. In the realm of dogmatics he agreed with the Westminster Confession that the New Testament text had been "*kept pure in all ages*" by God's "*singular care and providence*," but in the realm of New Testament textual criticism he agreed with Westcott and Hort in ignoring God's providence and even went so far as to assert that the same methods were to be applied to the text of the New Testament that would be applied to the text of a morning newspaper. It was to bridge the gap between his dogmatics and his New Testament textual criticism that he suggested that God had worked providentially through Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort to preserve the New Testament text. But this suggestion leads to conclusions which are extremely bizarre and inconsistent.

It would have us believe that during the manuscript period orthodox Christians corrupted the New Testament text, that the text used by the Protestant Reformers was the worst of all, and that the True Text was not restored until the 19th century, when Tregelles brought it forth out of the Pope's library, when Tischendorf rescued it from a waste basket on Mt. Sinai, and when Westcott and Hort were providentially guided to construct a theory of it which ignores God's special providence and treats the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book. But if the True New Testament Text was lost for 1500 years, how can we be sure that it has ever been found again?

[Bentley](#) (1662-1742)¹⁶, [Zahn](#) (1838-1933), [Warfield](#) (1851-1921), and countless others have tried to devise a theory of the special providential preservation of the Scriptures which leaves room for naturalistic New Testament textual criticism. But this is impossible, for the two concepts are mutually exclusive. Naturalistic New Testament textual criticism requires us to treat the text of the New Testament like the text of any other ancient book, in other words, to ignore or deny the special providential preservation of the Scriptures. Hence if we really believe in the special providential preservation of the Scriptures, then we cannot follow the naturalistic method of New Testament textual criticism.

As seen above, this error began with [Princeton Seminary](#), once the citadel of Protestant orthodoxy and continues to the present in the Confessions of the 'blue chips' of conservative denominations. This false doctrine is summed up best by none other than the 'Lion' and President of Princeton, [B.B. Warfield](#), considered their last great theologian. He became enamored with naturalistic textual criticism causing him to deviate from the Biblical and historical doctrine of Inerrancy as *handed down unto to us* in the Word of God and witnessed to by the saints in their Confessions, including our Baptist heritage. His following statement expresses the position of 'conservatives' today when he says (brackets and emphasis mine):

*"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 [i.e. our Bible has errors] than the one we have now."*¹⁷

¹⁶ In 1720 Richard Bentley (1662-1742), famous Cambridge scholar, proposed a thoroughly naturalistic method of New Testament textual criticism. What he advocated was the rejection of the printed Greek New Testament text altogether and of the readings of the majority of the manuscripts and the construction of a new text by comparing the oldest Greek New Testament manuscripts with the oldest manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate. Source: F. Hills, [The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript](#), Chapter 3, 'A Short History of Modernism', pp. 53.

¹⁷ Letis, Theodore, Ph.D., *Ecclesiastical TextT*, p. 53. (<http://www.thebluebanner.com/pdf/bluebanner7-6.pdf>)

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

This error is embraced by the [Southern Baptist Convention](#) (SBC) and was articulated by [A.T. Robertson](#), who was an admirer of [Warfield](#). Like [Warfield](#), [Robertson](#) saw the role of man as **restoring** the Word of God to purity through the work of textual critics. He believed the Bible was **99.99%** pure and that the concern of textual criticism was only with respect to a "*thousandth part of the entire text*"¹⁸ of the Bible.¹⁹

The words of the saints clearly *reject* the definition of the Chicago Statement on Inerrancy. Rather, they looked to the Word of God in proof texts like Matthew 5:18 for their belief in a *100%* pure; inerrant Bible. I would like to add one more proof text which gives equal witness to the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy, which promises God Himself will preserve His Word *100%* pure to all ages, and He is not depending upon man's *almost* pure restoration of the Word of God. Note how faithfully the historical witness of the saints in the *Westminster Confession* reflects the Word of God in Psalms 26²⁰ on the **100%** pure divine preservation of the original in the *copy*:

[Psalms 12:6-7](#)

"The words of the LORD are **③ pure** words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, **③ purified seven times**. **① Thou shalt ② keep** them, O LORD, **① thou shalt ② preserve** them from this generation **④ for ever.**"

Westminster Confession

"by **① His** singular care and providence, **② kept ③ pure** in **④ all** ages, are therefore **⑤ authentic**,"^a
^aMatt 5:18;"

This is the historical view of the saints on inerrancy as affirmed by the dean of New Testament textual criticism, Dr. Ernest Cadman Colwell (1901-1974). He was considered the foremost naturalistic textual critic of New Testament textual criticism in North America, and states the saints held a high view of the *copy* of scripture and unashamedly viewed them as the very Word of God as received in its *original* (brackets and emphasis mine):

*"It is often assumed by the ignorant and uninformed – even on a university campus – the textual criticism of the New Testament is supported by a superstitious faith in the Bible as a book dictated in miraculous fashion by God. That is not true. Textual criticism has never existed for those whose New Testament is one of **miracle, mystery and authority**. A New Testament created under those auspices would have been **handed down under them** and would have **no** need for textual criticism."*²¹

¹⁸ Archibald T. Robertson, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Nashville: Broadman, 1925, p.22

¹⁹ See Standard Bearers paper; [A Call to Revival](#).

²⁰ [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*. 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 ([Revelation 3:8b](#); [Psalms 138:2b](#)). 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. Now, we stand decades removed from the Chicago Statement (1978) and even further from Westcott & Hort (1881), whom have lead us to a post-Christian culture which possess a *low* view of Holy Scripture and question the authenticity and authority of the Word of God. The only solution is to return to the Word of God and our Baptist heritage and began teaching anew the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy and a *high* view of Holy Scripture.

²¹ Colwell, *What is the best New Testament? op. cit.*, p.8.

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

Today this **low view** of scripture is touted by the *Chicago Statement* and textual critics- displacing the **high view**. It goes back to when Westcott and Hort (1881) exchanged the historical Greek text of our New Testament, the *Textus Receptus*; which was witnessed to through the ages by the saints, for a text that is now the basis of all our English translations today- except the KJV and NKJV. Again, this is not my opinion, but that of the textual critics like Dr. Merrill M. Parvis, when he affirms (emphasis mine):

*"It [the TR] was the Scripture of many centuries of the Church's life....The Textus Receptus is the text of the Church. It is that form of text which represents the sum total and the end product of all the textual decisions which were made by the Church and her Fathers over a period of more than a **thousand** years."*²²

This issue represents Satan's 'stealth bomber', and explains why it is so difficult to get pastors to see it and correct the error. It seems pastors have literally been frozen by intimidation into silence and inaction by the false claims of textual criticism and science, for fear of what man may do or say. We've arrived at the point where we fear offending man more than we do God.

This is well stated by Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of Far East Bible College in his essay entitled; *'Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology'*, when he says (emphasis mine):

"Textual criticism introduced by Princeton Seminary is the Trojan horse in Reformed, evangelical, and fundamentalist Bibliology today. No Reformed, evangelical or fundamentalist "scholar," without wanting to look stupid or foolish, would dare affirm without equivocation that the Bible in our hands today is infallible and inerrant, without any mistake. This is the tragedy of compromise....

*May God's people not adore and exalt seemingly great scholars or schools of the past and the present, and deem them infallible and inerrant, for only the inspired and preserved words of God in the Holy Scriptures are infallible and inerrant, pure and perfect in every way, and our sole and supreme authority of faith and life to the glory of God."*²³

Which brings me to my secondary thesis: **Pastors need to restore the custodianship of the Word of God back unto them.** They are the ones charged by God to be the *custodians* of His *sheep* and His *Word*, not the textual critics:

"Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I [am] pure from the blood of all [men]. 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 which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." [Act 20:26-29](#)

Recall Jesus' convicting words to Apostle Peter. Jesus says how we feed His sheep is reflective of our love for Him:

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, [son] of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs." [John 21:15](#)

²² Parvis, *The Goals of New Testament Textual Studies, Studia Evangelica 6'* (1973): p. 406. He was Research Associate in the New Testament department of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. He is co-author with Allen Wikgren of the New Testament Manuscript Studies. B.D. degree from Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago.

²³ Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of [Far East Bible College](#) entitle; *'Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles' Heel Of Princeton Bibliology'*.

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

What do you feed God's sheep? The only right answer is the Word of God. The *Word* and the *wool* are intrinsically linked. As a pastor, when we guard His Word- we're guarding His sheep. When we allow His Word to be denigrated- we are denigrating His sheep as well. The Word of God teaches that, as pastors, our faithfulness to His charge of caring for His sheep is the basis of our eternal reward:

"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight [thereof], not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; Neither as being lords over [God's] heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." [1Peter 5:2-4](#)

We are to feed and protect His sheep with a *ready mind* - meaning with eagerness. So much so, that we would willingly defend His sheep at the cost of our lives without hesitation.

"I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." [John 10:11-13](#)

The picture of a faithful shepherd is also beautifully illustrated in the life of King David when he was a young man caring for his father's sheep. Listen to his *ready mind* in discharging his duty of feeding and protecting the flock:

"And David said unto Saul, Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock: And I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered [it] out of his mouth: and when he arose against me, I caught [him] by his beard, and smote him, and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear: and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them, seeing he hath defied the armies of the living God. David said moreover, The LORD that delivered me out of the paw of the lion, and out of the paw of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine. And Saul said unto David, Go, and the LORD be with thee."
[1Samuel 17:34-37](#)

How can we say we're of a *ready mind* if we have taken no account of what we are feeding the sheep? Again, the *Word* and the *wool* are intrinsically linked. How do we discharge our divine calling to feed and protect the sheep in the absence of feeding them the *100%* pure, inerrant Word of God? Is this what we are doing? **Can we say without exception**, "*the Word of God I hold in my hand is 100% pure?*" If not, then we ought to be able to give this witness, otherwise we are neglecting our calling. The purpose of this paper and the [Josiah Initiative: Countering the Assault Upon the Word of God](#) is to show how we can confidently know we are feeding God's sheep His *100%* pure Word.

The office of a pastor is a high calling and it's not always easy. Satan knows, "*man does not live by bread alone*" as Jesus told him. The Word of God stands as a mighty bulwark between His sheep, and Satan seeks every opportunity to "*steal, kill and destroy*" it and its saving effects. If Satan can *steal* God's Word from our hearts, he will *kill* God's light to our eyes, keeping us from God's path which saves us from Satan's destruction. Therefore, as pastors it's our divine duty to point God's sheep to His *100%* pure Word. To stand against all demonic attempts to denigrate its authenticity and authority designed to cause us to wonder as in the garden, "*hath God said*".

"Behold, they say unto me, Where [is] the word of the LORD? let it come now. As for me, I have not hastened from [being] a pastor to follow thee: neither have I desired the woeful day; thou knowest: that which came out of my lips was [right] before thee." [Jeremiah 17:15-16](#)

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation
The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

I have one final question for all who stand in defense of the inerrant Word of God, 100% pure, without error: how would you feel if your Pastor who claims to hold to the Biblical definition of inerrancy stood in his pulpit next Sunday morning and said the following to those whom he has been charged by God to teach and protect as their shepherd? (click on this [link](#) to see the original text collated with my 7 points).

"I would like to be sure I have taught you the truth about the Word of God. Therefore here is what I believe and hope you will follow my example of faith. I believe..."²⁴

1. **...God never promised to preserve a Bible with ‘total truth’;**
 - a. “Since God has nowhere promised an inerrant transmission of Scripture”
2. **...The only ‘total truth’ of the Word of God was in the originals which were inspired by God, but which no longer exist;**
 - a. “It is necessary to affirm that only the **autographic** text of the **original** documents was inspired”
3. **...The Bible is not ‘total truth’ due to the ‘slips’ by those making the copies of them, but not to be concerned since none of the ‘total truth’ has been destroyed that would prevent a reader from being saved;**
 - a. “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.”
 - b. “Indeed, in view of the frequent repetition in Scripture of the main matters with which it deals and also of the Holy Spirit's constant witness to and through the Word, no serious translation of Holy Scripture will so destroy its meaning as to render it unable to make its reader "wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus" ([2Tim.3:15](#)).
4. **...There is no Bible with ‘total truth’;**
 - a. “Similarly, no translation is or can be perfect, and all translations are an additional step away from the *autographa*.”
5. **... It was never the expectation or goal of the saints to have a Bible with ‘total truth’;**
 - a. “Since, for instance, non-chronological narration and imprecise citation were conventional and acceptable and violated no expectations in those days, we must not regard these things as faults when we find them in Bible writers.²⁵
6. **... Since the saints never expected a Bible with ‘total truth’ it is no issue to have a Bible with errors;**
 - a. “When total precision of a particular kind was not expected nor aimed at, it is no error not to have achieved it. “
7. **...The saint’s definition of inerrancy embraced a Bible whose ‘total truth’ contained errors.”**
 - a. “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.”
 - b. “So that we are amply justified in affirming, with the Westminster Confession, a singular providence of God in this matter and in declaring that the authority of Scripture is in no way jeopardized by the fact that the copies we possess are not entirely error-free.”

²⁴ [1978 Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy: Exposition: Infallibility, Inerrancy, Interpretation; Transmission and Translation](#)

²⁵ See [End note 2: The Identity of the Old Testament Text – The LXX or the Hebrew Masoretic text](#), by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones.

Retaking The Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation

The Westminster Confession *Rejection* of the Chicago Statement

Do the above statements alarm you? They should. They represent the essence of the Chicago Statement including its implications which I have distilled and paraphrased into layman's language. This is the **conservatives' and evangelicals' definitive statement** on the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy, signed by the 'blue chips' of Protestantism (including SBC leadership).

Pastors, Teachers, Laymen, who do *you* believe? Do you believe our Bible is **almost** pure or **100%** pure; inerrant? Perhaps this is the first time you've heard of this, if so, become involved in correcting this error by having our Baptist Faith and Message reflect the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy. A revival of the *Word* of God precedes a revival of the *people* of God, as in the days of **King Josiah** and the **Reformation**; "*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.*" (**Roman 10:17**)

You can find more information on this issue at my website, *Standard Bearers*. Under my heading, **Louis Kole**, there's a paper call the *Josiah Initiative: Countering the Assault Upon the Word of God* which explains my objective to get the Biblical and historical doctrine of inerrancy taught from our pulpits and reflected in our BF&M and education curriculum. The resources to accomplish this are published and readily available. I believe this is a hole in our armor which must be repaired while we have the opportunity to appeal to those who appreciate the centrality of this truth and are still in positions to effect this change.

In closing, here are the links to where the documents pertaining to the **Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy** are archived at the **Dallas Theological Library**, the **typed list of signatories** and the **list of signatures**.

God bless,

Louis M. Kole ***Standard Bearers***
louis.kole@standardbearers.net

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

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

END NOTES

1) The Identity of the Old Testament Text – The LXX or the Hebrew Masoretic text (return to p.1)
The statement below contained in the [Chicago Statement](#) can be found in this document on p.1:

“Since, for instance, non-chronological narration and imprecise citation were conventional and acceptable and violated no expectations in those days, we must not regard these things as faults when we find them in Bible writers.”

The discrepancies referenced in the above quote are found in [LXX](#) (Septuagint)²⁶ but not in the [Hebrew Masoretic text](#) Old Testament of scripture. It reveals the danger of identifying the wrong original text of the Word of God and serves as an example of how *not* following the divinely preserved text can undermine the doctrine of inerrancy.

In which case, it's *not* the Word of God at error, but naturalistic textual criticism in its 'neutral' approach which ignores the witness of the Word of God and saints as to the identity of the 100% pure, inerrant text of scripture; maintained by the Divine *Inspiration*, Divine *Preservation* and Divine *Identification*.

This is addressed by [Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones](#), PhD, ThD. in his book, *The Septuagint: A Critical Analysis*. See Chapter One in his book, The History of the LXX under the subheadings, *Discordant Ages of the Patriarchs in the LXX* (p.11) and *The Discordant Ages of the Kings in the LXX* (p.13).

²⁶ The Septuagint or simply "LXX", is an [Ancient Greek](#) translation of the [Hebrew Bible](#).

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) 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.

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](#)¹ 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** ² [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."*³

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](#))

¹Gerstner, 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.

² 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**".

³ 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)