

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

*“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.”<sup>1</sup>*

The next few pages will present for us all we need to know to understand textual criticism in order for us to confidentially identify the divinely preserved *copy* of the *original* text of the Word of God; kept 100% pure, inerrant, authentic; a genuine original. First, let’s start with stating our challenge by a question, then we’ll provide the answer. Why have Pastors succumbed to naturalistic textual criticism as evidenced in the above quote?

The test whether or not we have, can be easily diagnosed by asking one question: is there any Bible to which we can confidently point and boldly say, *“this is the 100% pure; inerrant Word of God?”* If our answer is no, then we’ve been infected with the ‘bug’ of natural textual criticism and have already succumbed to the disease, as evidenced by its manifesting symptom: our unbelief in the 100% purity of the *copy* of the Word of God, the Bible Now let’s see how we contracted the virus and prescribe a remedy.

I submit there are two reasons we’ve lost faith in the authenticity and thereby authority of the Word of God:

1. The methods of naturalistic textual criticism are beyond our knowledge, so we defer to its claims of ‘scientific’ scholarship.
2. Its validity is affirmed by our peers whose counsel we’ve come to trust, therefore we ‘believe’ on their faith (professors, fellow pastors).

In doing so as Pastors, we conceded our divine role as the custodians of the Word of God to which we’re to give faithful witness. This commission is illustrated by Apostle Paul in his charged to the young pastor Timothy, as well as by Apostle Peter to the elders:

*“And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.”<sup>2</sup>*

*“The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: **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.**”<sup>3</sup>*

What is the Pastor to feed the flock of God? The answer is obvious: the ‘food’ or Word of God as Jesus said: *“Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”<sup>4</sup>* It falls to the Pastor to identify the 100% pure text of scripture ‘that proceedeth out of the mouth of God’ and not man’s, whereby he may lead the sheep to good pasture.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of Far East Bible College entitled; *‘Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary Preservation?: The Achilles’ Heel Of Princeton Bibliology’*,

<sup>2</sup> 2Timothy 2:2

<sup>3</sup> 1Peter 5:1-4

<sup>4</sup> Matthew 4:4

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

However, today Pastors have sheep- but no sure pasture which they may confidently point to as the *100%* pure Word of God. Rather, Pastors have placed the custodianship of scripture into the hands of the rationalistic textual critic, who deny that we possess the *original* text of the Word of God, in asserting that our *copy*. the Bible has *not* been divinely preserved *100%* pure, inerrant, authentic; a genuine original. Even though God promised He would; as revealed through the pen of King David when he wrote under the divine inpiration of the Holy Spirit:

*“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.”<sup>5</sup>*

In the above scripture, [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 loses 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.

This belief of the rationalistic textual critic: that our *copy* of the Word of God, the Bible is not *100%* pure, has also been adopted by the leadership of ‘conservatives’, including the SBC <sup>6</sup> as reflected in the [Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy](#), which they authored (emphasis and brackets mine):

*“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>5</sup> [Psalms 12:6-7](#). For proof texts that God promised to preserve is Word *100%* pure, see the [Standard Bearers](#) paper; [God’s Standard Bearers: The Josiah Initiative ~ Witnesses to the 100% Pure Copy of Word of God](#) (pages 6-9). Also, seven is the Biblical number for perfection. For example, the [golden Candlestick](#) which God commanded Moses to make for the Tabernacle ([Exodus 27:40](#)) had seven lamps (lights), symbolizing the perfect light- God, which Jesus applied to Himself as being ‘*the light of the world*’ ( [John 8:12](#); [9:5](#)); meaning Jesus was God *manifested* in the flesh ([1Timothy 3:16](#)).

<sup>6</sup> An important distinction needs to be made regarding the belief of the purity of the Word of God between the Chicago Statement as compared to the Naturalistic textual critic. The Chicago Statement affirms the Word of God was given *100%* pure by the doctrine of Divine Inspiration ([2Timothy 3:16](#) & [2Peter 1:20-21](#)). However, the Chicago Statement denies the Word of God was preserved *100%* pure by the Doctrine of Divine (Providential) Preservation as revealed in [Psalms 12:6-7](#), rather it affirms the *copy* of the Word of God, our Bible is being restored to its original purity by man’s search for the *original* text, an effort the Naturalistic textual critic admits has been unsuccessful. On the other hand, the Naturalistic textual critic believes the Word of God was neither given *100%* pure nor kept so. The distinction between the beliefs of the Chicago Statement and the Naturalistic textual critic on the purity of the Word of God is perhaps a distinction without a practical difference, since we have *no original*. Therefore the issue of the purity of the Word of God revolves around the *copy*. Today, there is *no* witness to the *100%* purity of the *copy* of the Word of God by the SBC or its churches. However it was articulated in our Baptist heritage and by the saints of the Reformation. Is it any wonder the church and the culture are confused? 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.

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

“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.**”

“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.”

“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.**”

“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.”<sup>7</sup>

*Naturalistic* textual criticism is to be distinguished from *Theological* textual criticism. *Naturalistic* textual criticism denies that our *copy* of the Word of God, the Bible is *100%* pure: as being supernaturally received by Divine *Inspiration* and kept so by Divine *Preservation*, hence the term *naturalistic*; rejecting the supernatural.

The *Naturalistic* (*Rationalistic*)<sup>8</sup> approach claims to approach scripture ‘*neutral*’ in its attempt to establish the identity of the *original* text of the Word of God. Treating it no differently than any other book of literature; **not** taking into account any reference to its supernatural nature (divine inspiration or divine preservation). Believing their ‘objective and scientific’ method will inextricably lead them to the *original* text. This is the same technique used with classical literature called **Stemmatics**, (meaning ‘Family Tree’), which draws upon the **Cladistic method**, originally designed to address Biology classifications. Hence, the *Naturalistic-Rationalistic* textual critic considers their method ‘scientific’; free of bias, as opposed to the *Theological, Faith-based* one.

On the other hand, the *Theological, Faith-based* approach to the identity of the *copy* of the *original* text of scripture begins with a conviction, a holy bias; not neutral. A belief founded upon scripture and the testimony of the saints, that God has given His Word *100%* pure in the *original* by Divine *Inspiration*, kept it so in the *copy* by Divine *Preservation* and provides us its Divine *Identification* through the two-fold witness of the saints, ‘*as hand down unto them*’. Using this method we’re easily, quickly and confidently directed to the *100%* pure, inerrant *copy* of the *original* text of the Word of God.

Now let’s test the premise of the *Theological, Faith-based* approach by history. Does the record reflect, that the saints believed their Bible was *100%* pure; in; errant; as received in the *original* by Divine *Inspiration*, as kept so in the *copy* by Divine *Preservation* and as “*hand down unto them*” by Divine *Identification* in the two fold witness of the believers?

---

<sup>7</sup> 1978 Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy: Exposition: Infallibility, Inerrancy, Interpretation; Transmission and Translation.

<sup>8</sup> The two opposing terms; *Naturalistic* and *Theological* are also interchangeably referred to as the *Rationalistic* versus a *Faith-based* approach; again highlighting the difference in their approach to the nature of scripture; whether it’s to be treated as any other word of *man* or as the Word of God.

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

This question is answered in the affirmative by the two of the most renowned naturalistic textual critics in the field (emphasis & brackets mine):

- **Kurt Aland (1915-1994)**<sup>9</sup>

Professor Kurt was among the most renowned Biblical textual critics of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and acknowledges the saints believed they possessed an authentic *copy* of the Word of God, **100%** pure; a genuine *original*, when he states (emphasis mine):

*"It is undisputed that from the 16th to the 18th century orthodoxy's doctrine of verbal inspiration assumed ... [the] Textus Receptus. It was the only Greek text they knew, and they regarded it as the 'original text'."*<sup>10</sup>

- **Ernest Cadman Colwell (1901-1974)**

Dr. Colwell was considered the foremost naturalistic textual critic and "dean" of New Testament textual criticism in North America. He says the theological view is the only logical choice for those who believe in the divine inspiration of scripture (emphasis & brackets mine):

*"It is often assumed by the ignorant and uniformed – even on a university camp – 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 [i.e. Divine Inspiration].*

*That is not true. Textual criticism has never existed for those whose New Testament is one of **miracle, mystery and authority** [i.e. Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification]. A New Testament created under those auspices would have been **handed down under them** and would have **no** need for textual criticism."*<sup>11</sup>

Therefore on what justifiable basis do we reject the witness of the Word of God and the saints in light of this historical evidence? First, considering that rationalistic textual criticism by its own admission has had no success in recovering the *original* text of scripture and secondly, the approach lacks the 'scientific' creditability ascribed to it.

First, let's hear the testimony of two rationalistic textual critics as to their success in arriving at the *original* text of scripture, then a review by Zane Hodges as to its 'scientific' approach (emphasis and brackets mine):

- **Kirsopp Lake (1872-1946)**

Dr. Lake was a New Testament scholar and Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Harvard Divinity School and considered a pioneer in the study of New Testament textual criticism and Christianity's origins with his best known five-volume work *The Beginnings of Christianity*.

*"In spite of the claims of Westcott and Hort and of von Soden, we do not know the original form of the Gospels, and it is quite likely that we **never** shall."*<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Aland, His 26<sup>th</sup> edition of the Nestle-Aland text is the bases of the United Bible Societies version of the Greek New Testament of which Dr Aland was a principal editor. It is also the bases for all modern English versions of the New Testament—the Revised Standard Version, the New American Standard Version, the New International Version, and the English Standard Version.

<sup>10</sup> Aland, "The Text Of The Church?", Trinity Journal 8 (Fall 1987): p. 131.

<sup>11</sup> Colwell, *What is the best New Testament?* op. cit., p.8.

<sup>12</sup> Kirsopp, *Family 13, (The Ferrar Group)*, (Philadelphia PA: Uni. of PA. Press, 1941), p. vii., Professor of early Christian literature at Harvard University from 1915 to his retirement in 1938.

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

- **David C. Parker**

Dr. Parker is considered one of the world's foremost specialists in the study of the New Testament text and the manuscripts in which it was copied until the invention of printing.

*“The text is changing. Every time that I make an edition of the Greek New Testament, or anybody does, we change the wording. We are maybe trying to get back to the oldest possible form but, paradoxically, we are creating a **new one**. Every translation is different, every reading is different, and although there's been a tradition in parts of Protestant Christianity to say there is a definitive single form of the text, the fact is you can never find it. There is **never ever** a final form of the text.”<sup>13</sup>*

Now, the review by Zane Hodges as to its ‘scientific’ approach (emphasis and brackets mine):

- **Zane Hodges** (1932-2008)

Dr. Hodges was a Pastor, Seminary professor, and Bible scholar; chairman of Dallas Theological Seminary New Testament Department and Professor of New Testament Greek & Exegesis (1960–1987). He affirms the absence of justification for abandoning the text which was the historical witness of the saints, for one which lacks its credibility.

*“Modern textual criticism is psychologically ‘addicted’ to Westcott and Hort. Westcott and Hort, in turn, were **rationalists** in their approach to the textual problem in the New Testament and employed techniques within which **rationalism** and every other kind of bias are free to operate. The result of it all is a methodological quagmire where objective controls on the conclusions of critics are nearly nonexistent.*

*It goes without saying that no Bible-believing Christian who is willing to extend the implications of his faith to textual matters can have the slightest grounds for confidence in **contemporary critical texts**.”<sup>14</sup>*

The claim of *Rationalistic* textual criticism that it is *neutral* in approaching the identity of the text of scripture is an oxymoron; a *‘neutral-believer’*.<sup>15</sup> In addition, its tenets undercut the assertion of objectivity by discounting the fundamental doctrines on the nature of scripture<sup>16</sup>. It signals an undisclosed bias which blinds one to accept such a position in the first place. Just what is that bias, we will address in a moment. This position is not justified by either the Word of God or common sense; its’ equivalent to defending yourself with both hands tied behind your back in the name of fairness. Why would you?

As a believer we *must* begin with a conviction, a *holy bias*, and rather than ignoring the trail of Divine *‘bread crumbs’*; we ought to be following it, as did the saints! Why not look in the direction to which the Word of God points? The *high view* of scripture, approaches the identity of the *original* text with the conviction from revelation in the truths of; *Divine Inspiration*, *Divine Preservation* and *Divine Identification*.

---

<sup>13</sup> [David C Parker](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_C._Parker#cite_note-BBC-0), Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology, Director of the Institute for the Textual Scholarship and Electronic, Editing. University of Birmingham UK. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David\\_C.\\_Parker#cite\\_note-BBC-0](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_C._Parker#cite_note-BBC-0). Parker is considered one of the world's foremost specialists in the study of the New Testament text and of Greek and Latin manuscripts.

<sup>14</sup> Zane Hodges, *Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism*, Bibliotheca Sacra, January 1971, p. 35.

<sup>15</sup> The Word of God does not allow for use a position as a ‘neutral-believer’. The concept is a ‘fig leaf for our unbelief: [Rev 3:15-16](#) - “I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.” [Luke 11:23](#) - “He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.”

<sup>16</sup> That it is God-breathed, (divine inspiration); God-protected (divine preservation) and God witnessed (divine identification).



## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

Otherwise, we're navigating without a compass and will arrive at the same *dead end* of naturalistic textual criticism in its 'neutral' approach to scripture; with a *low view* of the Word of God, believing the *copy* has errors with no way of establishing the *original* to confirm the authenticity and authority of the Bible.

This is what [Dr. Edward F. Hills](#)<sup>17</sup> refers to as a *believing* versus a *neutral* approach to the Word of God. Meaning, we *do not* put aside what we know to be true about God and His Word and start with a *neutral* mind. What would have happened to Abraham's faith had he done that when God called him to offer Isaac, the seed of promise? Instead, the Bible says Abraham 'reckoned', meaning he '*did the math*',<sup>18</sup> and kept God in the equation, in the '*loop*' of his thinking:

*"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: **Accounting** [reckon, counted, 'did the math'] that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."*<sup>19</sup>

We do not put aside our faith at '*crunch-time*',<sup>20</sup> that's when we are to lay hold to it with a firm hand as Abraham. Yet, naturalistic textual criticism seeks to convince us if we will only take God out of our equation we will find the *original* text by the means of 'science'. Therefore we're to ignore the promise of God to keep His Word 100% pure in the *copy* by the agency of; Divine *Inspiration*, Divine *Preservation* and Divine *Identification*. This is the equivalent of going into battle without a sword, if I were Satan that would be plan A. On what basis does naturalistic textual criticism suggest we embrace such a position, when by employing this method for a century they have failed by their own admission? Dr. Hill addresses this thinking in his book, [The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript](#),<sup>21</sup> as follows (emphasis mine):

**Why should we Christians study the New Testament text from a neutral point of view rather than from a believing point of view?** The answer usually given is that we should do this for the sake of unbelievers. We must start with the neutral point of view in order that later we may convert unbelievers to the orthodox, believing point of view. [Sir Frederic Kenyon](#) expressed himself to this effect as follows:

*"It is important to recognize from the first that the problem is essentially the same, whether we are dealing with sacred or secular literature, although the difficulty of solving it, and likewise the issues depending on it are very different. It is important, if for no other reason, because it is only in this way that we can meet the hostile critics of the New Testament with arguments, the force of which they admit. If we assume from the first the supernatural character of these books and maintain that this affects the manner in which their text has come down to us, we can never convince those who start with a denial of that supernatural character. We treat them at first like any other books, in order to show at last that they are above and beyond all other books."*

Dr. Hills rightly concludes, "*if we adopt a **neutral** approach to knowledge, we will soon lose ourselves in a wilderness of details and grow more and more **chaotic** in our thinking.*" Does this not describe the state of naturalistic textual criticism in its efforts to recover the *original* text of scripture with a neutral approach?

---

<sup>17</sup> [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.

<sup>18</sup> For a fuller explanation see [End Note 1](#) on page 12; 'Do the Math Principle'.

<sup>19</sup> [Hebrew 11:17-19](#)

<sup>20</sup> [Merriam-Webster](#), "A critical moment or period when decisive action is needed."

<sup>21</sup> [The King James Version Defended: A Christian View of the New Testament Manuscript](#), Chapter 4 (3)(g) 'New Testament Textual Criticism and Evangelism' (h) and 'Believing Bible Study on the Graduate Level-Christ and Grammar'.

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

Then why do ‘conservative’ seminaries and leaders continue to lead us down this path to no where? It’s a sign of the *profoundness* of our error when we have to convince those once known as ‘*the people of the Book*’, who live in the so-called ‘*Buckle of the Bible-belt*’, that they possess the *100%* pure Word of God in our *copy* of the scriptures, the Bible!

The challenge for ‘conservatives’ is while we may *profess a high view* of scripture, we in fact *possess a low view*, in light of the [Chicago Statement](#). To make the point abundantly obvious, I have taken the essence of the [Chicago Statement](#) including its implications and distilled them into layman’s language and framed it as we’re talking to our congregation (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...”<sup>22</sup>*

- 1. ...God never promised to preserve a Bible with ‘total truth’;**
  - “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;**
  - “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;**
  - “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.”
  - “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’;**
  - “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’;**
  - “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.<sup>23</sup>
- 6. ... Since the saints never expected a Bible with ‘total truth’ it is no issue to have a Bible with errors;**
  - “When total precision of a particular kind was not expected nor aimed at, it is no error not to have achieved it. “

---

<sup>22</sup> [1978 Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy: Exposition: Infallibility, Inerrancy, Interpretation; Transmission and Translation.](#)

<sup>23</sup> For a fuller explanation see [End Note 2](#) on page 13; *The Identity of the Old Testament Text* – The LXX or the Hebrew Masoretic text, by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones.

**7. ...The saint's definition of inerrancy embraced a Bible whose 'total truth' contained errors."**

- "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."
- "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."

I have a question for all of us, especially Pastors. Next Sunday morning, before we preach our sermon, would we be willing to read the above to our congregation? If not, then why do we privately hold it as our Doctrinal Statement on Biblical Inerrancy as it's entitled?

This is the definitive statement of 'conservatives' and 'evangelicals' on the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy. It's signed by the 'blue chips' of Protestantism (including SBC leadership). One of the framers of the *Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy*, 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."*<sup>24</sup>

Why have 'conservatives' erred on the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy? The same reason man usually errs; the reason Nicodemus erred; because of the fear of man; '*The same came to Jesus by night*'...<sup>25</sup>, "*Howbeit no man spake openly of him for fear of the Jews*"...<sup>26</sup> "*Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: For they loved the praise of **men** more than the praise of **God***."<sup>27</sup>

Have we lost the Fear of the Lord?<sup>28</sup> 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:

*"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."*<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Grimstead, Jay; '*How the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy Began*'

<sup>25</sup> [John 3:2; 19:39.](#)

<sup>26</sup> [John 7:13.](#)

<sup>27</sup> [John 12:42-43.](#)

<sup>28</sup> For more see the paper by [Standard Bearers](#); *The Fear of The Lord: Restoring the Biblical Doctrine of Inerrancy ~ The Fear of Man versus the Fear of the Lord.*

<sup>29</sup> Dr. Jeffery Khoo, Principal of [Far East Bible College](#) entitled; '*Can Verbal Plenary Inspiration Do Without Verbal Plenary*



## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

Just what is that undisclosed bias, which blinds us so that our divided and darkened hearts<sup>30</sup> accept the position of naturalistic textual criticism? The answer is; we want to be ‘accepted’ by academia, our peers; we’re “*psychologically addicted*” in the words of Hodges. Therefore to maintain the ‘praise of man’ we must offer **more** than a Theological, Faith-based reason for why we believe the *copy* of the Word of God is inerrant, as advocated by [Sir Frederic Kenyon](#). It must be ‘proven’ by ‘science’; hence the reason in a nutshell for rationalistic, naturalistic textual criticism.

It would be bad enough if this unbelief was limited to ourselves, but to make matters worse, we continue to advance it, as it undermines the faith of those we have been charged to build. While we wring one hand in despair over our cultures’ *unbelieving* and lax attitude toward the Word of God, with the other, we distribute the eclectic texts produced by naturalistic textual criticism to our students which undermines their faith in the authenticity and authority of the Word of God. We *must* repent of this error if we desire to see the favor of our Lord upon our families and land!

A revival of the *Word* of God preceded a revival of the *people* of God, as in the days of [King Josiah](#) and the [Reformation](#); “*Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.*” ... “*The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe.*”<sup>31</sup> As Pastors we hold the key to the problem we lament. We must become part of the solution and not the problem, by once again teaching the Biblical and Historical of Inerrancy, and restore faith and the Fear of the Lord to God people. Let’s make this the year we take the mantle of the custodianship of the Word of God and begin teaching the doctrine of Divine *Preservation* along side the doctrine of Divine *Inspiration*.

God has made the Pastors the custodians of Word of God, affirmed by the witness of the saints. We do not need to master the tenets of naturalistic textual criticism in order to embrace Biblical Inerrancy. All one must do is know the Word of God, on the doctrines of Divine *Inspiration*, Divine *Preservation* and Divine *Identification*, which is easily understandable by all. Using this method we’re easily, quickly and confidently directed to the 100% pure, inerrant *copy* of the *original* text of the Word of God.

When it comes to sound doctrine, *simple-certainty* attained by faith is the signature of God, while *confusing-uncertainty* due to the pseudo-science of man<sup>32</sup> is the fingerprint of Satan. Where in scripture did God make any of His truths complicated; whether it’s how to be saved or live a godly life? His doctrines never get bigger than two points, which all can understand. For instance, when Jesus was asked, ‘*what is the greatest commandment*’, His answer is within the grasp of a child and comforting to our souls in its simplicity; “*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.....Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*”<sup>33</sup> How long would have been our answer?

So it’s with all God’s truths, including the Biblical and Historical doctrine of inerrancy, it’s all within our grasp; “*thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.*” Therefore, let’s go forth boldly, teaching those with whom we’ve been charged; that we hold the 100% pure, inerrant *copy* of the Word of God in our hands, the Bible.

---

*Preservation?: The Achilles’ Heel Of Princeton Bibliology’*

<sup>30</sup> [Matthew 6:22-23](#), “The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!”

<sup>31</sup> [1Corinthians 10:6](#); [Proverbs 29:25](#)

<sup>32</sup> [1Ti 6:20-21](#)- “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, **and oppositions of science falsely so called**: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen.” (see [1Cor 1:18-31](#))

<sup>33</sup> [Matthew 22:35-40](#)

## Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic *Believing or Neutral* ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?

---

A truth we can know for ourselves, absence of naturalistic textual criticism and even the counsel of our Professor; “*Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.*”<sup>34</sup>

Our generation’s challenge and privilege is to restore the *high view* of scripture. We must begin by teaching it in our churches and schools and memorializing in our Doctrinal Statements of Faith. Perhaps the [Trinitarian Bible Society](#) offers us an encouraging example and starting point for how we may consider revising our Baptist Faith and Message to reflect the Biblical and Historical doctrine of Inerrancy; that holds the *copy* of the Word of God is *100%* pure; inerrant and in our hand; by the doctrines of *Divine Inspiration*, *Divine Preservation* and *Divine Identification* as revealed in the Word of God and witnessed to by the saints. If needful, Floyd and I are available to help, let us know by contacting me at [louis.kole@standardbearers.net](mailto:louis.kole@standardbearers.net).

### Trinitarian Bible Society Statement of Doctrine of the Holy Scripture

“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 summarize the historical position of the Society. It will be noted that the following documents have the unanimous support of the whole of the Society’s General Committee. The Statement has therefore been signed by all the Members of the General Committee, the Vice-Presidents and the General Secretary. Copies are being given to all the Society’s staff and speakers, and are being circulated to all the Society’s personnel in each of its Branches and Auxiliaries.”

D.P. Rowland  
General Secretary

### Preface

#### 1 (7)

##### 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.

---

<sup>34</sup> [Acts 4:13](#), compare [Amos 17:14-16](#), “*Then answered Amos, and said to Amaziah, I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet’s son; but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: And the LORD took me as I followed the flock, and the LORD said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel.*”

**Textual Criticism 101: Theological, Faith-Based versus Naturalistic, Rationalistic**  
*Believing or Neutral ~ as to Divine Inspiration, Divine Preservation, Divine Identification?*

---

**Note 3**

Translations made since New Testament times must use words chosen by *uninspired men* to translate *God's* words. For this reason no *translation* of the Word of God can have an absolute or definitive status. The final appeal must always be to the original languages, in the Traditional Hebrew and Greek texts (as defined in Note 1).

**3**

**Note 1**

The Society accepts as the best edition of the Hebrew Masoretic text the one prepared in 1524-25 by Jacob ben Chayyim and known, after David Bomberg the publisher, as the Bomberg text. This text underlies the Old Testament in the Authorised Version.

**Note 2**

The Greek Received Text is the name given to a group of printed texts, the first of which was published by Desiderius Erasmus in 1516. The Society uses for the purposes of translation the text reconstructed by F.H.A. Scrivener in 1894.

Approved by the General Committee at its meeting held on 17th January, 2005, revised 25th February, 2005 and including amendments approved by the General Committee at its meeting held on 21st November, 2005.

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](#). For more, see the [Standard Bearers](#) website, particularly the paper, *Retaking the Hill of Biblical Inerrancy: The Next Reformation - The Westminster Confession Rejection of the Chicago Statement*.

God bless,

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

**Louis Kole [Standard Bearers](#)**

[Louis.kole@standardbearers.net](mailto:Louis.kole@standardbearers.net)

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

## End Notes

### 1) Do the Math Principle (return to page 6)

The principle of a loving Father's heart is helpful in understanding God and His Word. It can clear-up the fog of winding theological arguments. There are times we are called to 'calculate' in our relationship with God based on His character as a loving Father, whose word is sure and will lead us right. This is what Abraham did when God asked him to doing something seemingly contradictory to what he had been previously told by God.

*"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: **accounting** that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."* (Hebrews 11:17-19, see full story in [Genesis 22](#))

It says Abraham did *accounting* when confronted with seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God. The Greek word used for *accounting* is translated, count in the New Testament five times and a synonym would be 'to calculate'. On what was Abraham *counting* or *calculating* to navigate these seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God? It was on the character of God Himself!

Abraham *'did the math'*; taking *inventory* of God's character and came up with the right answer and response! If we follow Abraham's faith, and do the same when faced with seemly contradictory and confusing statements from God, we'll discover the right response as well!

Oswald Chambers has a very good quote on this point: "*All our fret and worry is caused by calculating without God*"<sup>35</sup> and in another place, "*We have nothing to do with the afterwards of obedience*".<sup>36</sup> I might add, "*Confusion is calculating **without** God*" or as Dr. Charles Stanley states in number two, *The Life of Obedience* in his *30 Life Principles*, "*Obey God and leave all the consequences to Him*".

This is easier to *confess* than to *possess*; it's a process. The starting point is to know that, "*God hath said!*" rather than wondering, "*Hath God said?*" This is why the issue of the doctrine of Bible Inerrancy is so vital to our faith; "***Above all**, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked*";<sup>37</sup> "*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the **word of God***";<sup>38</sup> "*But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him*";<sup>39</sup> "*For we walk by faith, not by sight*".<sup>40</sup> [Selah](#)

---

<sup>35</sup> Oswald Chambers, *My Utmost For His Highest*, One of God's Great Don't, July 4

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*, *After Obedience-What?*, July 28

<sup>37</sup> [Ephesians 6:16](#)

<sup>38</sup> [Romans 10:17](#)

<sup>39</sup> [Hebrews 11:6](#)

<sup>40</sup> [2Corinthians 5:7](#)

## End Notes

### 2) The Identity of the Old Testament Text – The **LXX** or the **Hebrew Masoretic text** (return to page 7)

The statement below contained in the [Chicago Statement](#) can be found on this document at p.4, point 5:

*“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)<sup>41</sup> 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).

**2Timothy 3:16**, “**All scripture is given by inspiration of God**, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:”; **2Peter 1:20-21**, “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: **but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.**”

---

<sup>41</sup> 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](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)