

We have to use our judgment in order to determine what the original text was. But we do not have to use our judgment to determine that what we find in Scripture is correct. If we truly find what is there it is inerrant and can be depended on. That was the attitude of our Lord Jesus toward Scripture, that it is free from error and we can depend upon it.

I picked up an article a few years ago by a man on the inspiration of Scripture in which he said the NT builds an argument on the fact that one word of the OT is singular, not plural, where Paul said, "to thy seed will I give it, and he spoke not of seeds as of many, but of seed as of one."

He went on and said a whole argument is build on Jesus said the OT uses the present tense instead of the past--"I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." Of course "am" there is in italics which would seem to us to mean emphasis unless you realize that in NT and OT in the KJV italics means it is not in the original. So he said Jesus built a whole argument on the fact that the word in the OT was in the present tense, but the OT is in Hebrew which has no present tense! And the word quoted in this place in the NT is not in the original at all, because in Greek and Hebrew where it is "is" or "are" they don't have to express it. They put the two words next to each other.

They say, "the book big." We'd say, The book is Big. He says I (am) God . . . I wrote to the man and pointed out that this is not true. The Bible never builds an argument on one word. We have to compare Scripture with Scripture.

Maybe I should say a word about "seed." In the OT it says to thy seed will I give it. Paul says that refers to Christ, but a vs. or two ~~xxxxxxx~~ translator uses exactly the same word & says that thy seed shall ~~xxxx~~ shall be as the dust of the earth if thou canst count.

The word seed can either be individual or a collective as in English. We don't speak of planting seeds--the farmer planting seeds. We say the farmer planted seed. We use the collective. And in the Greek and Hebrew there is no plural. Paul was not building a argument on one word. He was interpreting and saying that this word is used --- that this word here is not a collective but it points to a person, in this connection.

Hermeneutics or interpretation is very important in connection with our understanding of inerrancy. Because we do not mean that these words can be squeezed until we get the last bit of content out of them. Human words are not that sort. Human words all have various possibilities of interpretation. We need to compare Scripture with Scripture studying passages in relation to context that when we do find what is taught there, and what we find truly taught there is without error. Whether it relates to spiritual matters or whether it relates to scientific matters. Whether it relates to historical matters, whatever its relation is to.

Jesus said that not one jot or one tittle will pass from the law until all is fulfilled. NIV translates it something like this: