



The Burning Bush

ISSN 0219-5984

January 2005

Volume 11 Number 1

Editorial	1
<i>SOLA AUTOGRAPHIA OR SOLA APOGRAPHIA?: A CASE FOR THE PRESENT PERFECTION AND AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES</i>	3
Jeffrey Khoo	
<i>A CRITIQUE OF GOD'S WORD IN OUR HANDS: THE BIBLE PRESERVED FOR US</i>	20
Thomas M Strouse	
<i>THE BIBLE IN A POSTMODERN WORLD</i>	35
Raymond Saxe	
The First FEBC Bachelor of Ministry Convocation at BCEA (May 29, 2004)	44
FEBC 29 th Graduation Service (May 9, 2004)	55
College News	61
Class Notes	63



THE BURNING BUSH

Theological Journal of the
FAR EASTERN BIBLE COLLEGE
Edited for the Faculty

Rev Timothy Tow, MDiv, STM, DD
Principal, and Lecturer in Systematic Theology

Mrs Ivy Tow, BTh
Matron, and Lecturer in Greek

Rev Jeffrey Khoo, BTh, MDiv, STM, PhD
Academic Dean, and Lecturer in New Testament

Rev Koa Keng Woo, BTh
Lecturer in Bible Geography and Church Music

Rev Quek Suan Yew, BArch, BTh, MDiv, STM
Lecturer in Old Testament

Rev Prabhudas Koshy, BSc, BTh, MDiv, ThM
Dean of Students, and Lecturer in Hebrew

Rev Jack Sin, BA, MDiv, DMin (c)
Lecturer in Church History

Mr Tan Kian Sing, BEng, GDBA, MDiv
Lecturer in Biblical Studies

Mrs Jemima Khoo, BTh, MA, MRE
Lecturer in Christian Education

Miss Carol Lee, BBA, DipEd, MEd, MDiv
Lecturer in Christian Education

Editor : Jeffrey Khoo
Publisher : Far Eastern Bible College
Website : www.febc.edu.sg
Permit : MITA (P) 100/03/2004
Printer : Chung Printing

The Burning Bush (ISSN 0219-5984) is published bi-annually in January and July, and contains theological papers, sermons, testimonies, book reviews, College news, and alumni reports. Articles are indexed in the *Christian Periodical Index*. The journal is distributed gratis to the FEBC family and Bible-Presbyterian churches, and available online at www.febc.edu.sg. Local/Foreign subscription rates in Singapore dollars: one year—\$6/\$12; two years—\$10/\$20; back issues—\$3/\$6 per copy. Make cheques payable to “Far Eastern Bible College.”

Please direct all correspondence to:



The Editor, *The Burning Bush*
Far Eastern Bible College
9A Gilstead Road, Singapore 309063
Republic of Singapore

Editorial

Rev Dr Timothy Tow, our Principal, was specially remembered and honoured at the Silver Jubilee (1979-2004) Convocation of Calvary Pandan Bible-Presbyterian Church on July 31, 2004. The citation presented by Eld Dr George Foong reads,

Honorary Conferment

Rev Timothy Tow, DD

Earnest Contender for the Faith

Valiant Soldier of the Cross

Founding Pastor

Bible-Presbyterian Church Movement

On this joyous Silver Jubilee, and with heartfelt thanks to God, we call to remembrance the moving of the Spirit in 1948, raising up a Twentieth Century Reformation Movement in the Far East by the hands of Timothy Tow and Quek Kiok Chiang, who, following in the footsteps of Dr John Sung and Dr Carl McIntire:

- rekindled the flame of the Sixteenth Century Reformation;
- founding the Life Church English Service, Prinsep Street 1950, (forerunner of Life Bible-Presbyterian Church, Gilstead Road 1962), and
- the Far Eastern Bible College, 1962.

By the grace of God these have grown a hundredfold into a global network of Bible-faithful Churches and Bible Colleges, including the Calvary group of Churches. Through these six decades, the Gospel Duo, Tow and Quek, have stood in the international forefront of the battle *for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ*. May their example inspire the present and succeeding generations of Bible-faithful Christians *to earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints*.

“As thy days, so shall thy strength be” (Deut 33:25).

The Board of Elders
Calvary Pandan Bible-Presbyterian Church

In the greatest test and worst crisis of his ministry, which he faced during his old age in the years 2002-2003, the Rev Dr Timothy Tow stood firm to uphold and defend the present perfection of the Holy Scriptures. Just like his Lord who had to leave Nazareth because His own would not have Him, he left Life Bible-Presbyterian Church which he founded and pastored for 53 years to start a new church named True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church.

Rev Tow continues as the principal of the Far Eastern Bible College at 9A Gilstead Road. The Dean Burgon oath which he required of every board and faculty member since the 1970s shall keep both church and college steadfast and true to our immutable Lord and His incorruptible Word in a time of rampant apostasy in the Christian world today. May the Lord protect and preserve His faithful saints and servants until He returns. Amen.



RPG (Read, Pray & Grow) Daily Bible Reading Guide is published quarterly by the Calvary Bible-Presbyterian Church in Singapore. Since 1982, the RPG has been helping Christians around the world to read God's Word regularly and meaningfully. Its writers are conservative Bible-believing pastor-teachers of fundamentalist persuasion, with a "high view" of Holy Scripture. The RPG uses the King James Version of the Holy Bible, the Bible of the Reformation, most loved and trustworthy, and a bulwark in the path of unbiblical ecumenical union.

To subscribe, write to:

TABERNACLE BOOKS
201 Pandan Gardens
Singapore 609337

***SOLA AUTOGRAPH* OR *SOLA APOGRAPH*?: A CASE FOR THE PRESENT PERFECTION AND AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES**

Jeffrey Khoo

The Issue at Hand

What is the use of having a Bible that was only perfect in the past, but no longer perfect today? Only the autographs (the original God-breathed scripts penned by the very hand of the inspired Apostles and Prophets) may claim infallibility and inerrancy but not the apographs (the copies of the autographs), so it is popularly taught. This paper intends to answer the question: Is the view that the Church no longer has the infallible and inerrant autographs but only fallible and errant apographs a tenable view?

The *Sola Autographa* view of infallibility and inerrancy is generally held today by so-called evangelicals and fundamentalists. The Evangelical Theological Society (ETS), despite its name, is mostly populated by neo-evangelicals who deny the total inerrancy of Scriptures albeit in varying degrees. The recent controversy over Open Theism in the ETS is a case in point.¹ The ETS definition of inerrancy is so loose that it allows for all kinds of interpretations with regard to what inerrancy means.² This is due to the ETS belief that inerrancy lies only in the autographs, “The Bible alone, and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written and is therefore inerrant in the *autographs*.” The consensus among evangelical scholars is that the autographs are no longer in existence.³ As such, an individual who believes that the Bible contains mistakes may subscribe to such a statement because it can be said, “I only believe the Scriptures to be inerrant as originally given; I do not believe that they are inerrant today since we no longer have the autographs, the Scriptures as originally given.” It goes without saying that the theological confusion found in evangelical (or neo-evangelical) Christianity today

finds its root-cause in such a denial of Biblical inerrancy in the apographs.

Regrettably, the *Sola Autographa* view of inerrancy is also held by fundamentalist (or neo-fundamentalist) Bible colleges and seminaries. Two recent books—*From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*⁴ and *One Bible Only?*⁵—authored by men from Bob Jones University and Central Baptist Theological Seminary (Plymouth) respectively championed such a position.⁶ Apart from the pro-Westcott/Hort and pro-modern versions stance that they have taken, they also contend that the Scriptures though verbally and plenary inspired in the autographs are *not* verbally and plenary preserved in the apographs. It is their assumption, that since God did not choose to preserve His inspired words perfectly, there can be no such thing as a perfect Scripture today.⁷ Or if there exists a perfect Scripture, there is no sure certainty of where it truly is.⁸

In the years 2002-3, the faculty of the Far Eastern Bible College debated this issue of the present perfection of Scripture which eventually saw the resignation of two of its members who could no longer take the Dean Burgon Oath.⁹ Having rejected the supernatural jot-and-tittle preservation of the Holy Scriptures, they could only affirm biblical infallibility and inerrancy in the autographs, but not the apographs. Such a false view of *Sola Autographa* as opposed to *Sola Apographa* has caused great confusion and hindrance to the evangelistic-fundamentalist cause worldwide.¹⁰ It is “Fundamentalism’s Folly” as one Baptist pastor-scholar has so aptly put.¹¹

Definition of Infallibility and Inerrancy

According to the Chamber’s Dictionary, the word “infallibility” means “incapable of error,” and the word “inerrancy” means “freedom from error.”¹² As such, “infallibility” may be deemed a *stronger* term for the perfection of Scripture than the term “inerrancy.” If the Bible by nature is incapable of error, it goes without saying that it must also be totally free from error.

This paper shall use the terms “infallibility” and “inerrancy” in their pure dictionary sense.

Infallibility and Inerrancy of the *Apographa*

The Scripture when it speaks of its inspiration and preservation and consequent infallibility and inerrancy speaks of them in terms of its

apographs. For instance, when Jesus spoke of the jot-and-tittle infallibility (or verbal inerrancy) of the Scriptures in Matthew 5:18, He was referring to the Scriptures that He had in His hands, which were the apographs of the OT Scripture, and not the autographs which had since disappeared. The canonical OT which was completed by the 5th century BC had been preserved exact and intact until the time of Jesus Christ in AD 27. The Apostle Paul when he spoke of the divinely inspired Scriptures in 2 Timothy 3:16 must have thought of them in terms of the Scriptures then used by the church (AD 64), which were the apographs, for the non-existent autographs could hardly have served as a supreme rule of faith and life that is “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim 3:16-17).

Some say that the Apostle Paul meant the perfect *autographa* when he spoke of the God-breathed Scriptures in 2 Timothy 3:16. If that was what Paul meant, then a question may be raised: how can an intangible and non-existent *autographa* serve as a supreme and final authority? An authority must be existing, present and accessible or else it would be no authority at all. An eye-witness who is already dead and unable to testify is of no use in a court of law.

Others say that Paul meant the *apographa*, but argue that the *apographa* cannot be deemed as perfect or complete. If this be the case, then how can an imperfect and an incomplete *apographa* serve as an all-sufficient guide for the perfect and complete equipping of the Christian towards godly living? If an eye-witness is not of impeccable character, but a compulsive liar, what good is he? His testimony would be utterly discredited. The same goes for Scripture. If the Church does not have an infallible and an inerrant Scripture, and have it today, then her supreme and final authority of faith and practice is all myth. But it is truthful that the Scripture was, is, and shall be God’s infallible and inerrant Word, and thus supremely authoritative (Ps 12:6-7, Ps 119:89, Matt 24:35, Heb 13:8).

Not only does the testimony of Scripture itself affirm the perfection of its apographs, the Reformers of the 16th century, in their declaration of *Sola Scriptura*, always thought in terms of the existing infallible and inerrant apographs rather than the autographs. The great Puritan divine—John Owen (1616-83)—believed in “the purity of the *present original copies* of the Scripture, or rather copies [*apographa*] in the original

languages, which the Church of God doth now and hath for many ages enjoyed as her treasure.”¹³ Francis Turretin (1623-87)—pastor-theologian of the Church and Academy of Geneva—wrote in his *Systematic Theology*, “By original texts, we do not mean the autographs written by the hand of Moses, of the prophets and of the apostles, which certainly do not now exist. *We mean their apographs* 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.”¹⁴

The Protestant creeds reflect the Reformation doctrine of the infallibility of the *apographa* as their *Sola Scriptura*. It was not enough to affirm the infallibility and inerrancy of the *autographa* in the days of the Reformation for the Roman Catholic Church challenged *Sola Scriptura* at the Council of Trent (1545-63) by pointing out the scribal errors, variants and discrepancies in the extant Scriptures. The Reformers met this serious challenge by stating unequivocally that the extant Scriptures were infallible and inerrant by virtue of God’s promise to preserve His words to the last iota. In response to the Council of Trent, the Westminster Confession of Faith (1643-8) produced a most excellent statement on the continuing infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture, “The Old Testament in Hebrew ... and the New Testament in Greek ... being immediately inspired by God, and, *by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages*, are therefore authentical; so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them.” (I:8). The biblical proof-text cited was Matthew 5:18, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.”¹⁵ In the battle for the sole and supreme authority of the Scriptures over against the Roman Catholic dogma of papal and ecclesiastical infallibility, the doctrine of the special providential preservation of Scripture was eventually and necessarily credalised in the days of the Protestant Reformation.¹⁶

Although it is admitted that the Westminster Confession did not specifically use the terms “infallible” and “inerrant” to describe the Scriptures, their use of the word “authentic” said just as much. They did not at all believe that the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures that they possessed were in any way imperfect or errant. J S Candlish rightly observed that the word “authentic” did not mean simply that the Scriptures were “historically true,” but that in a literal sense, the existing Scripture “is a *correct copy* of the author’s work.”¹⁷ William F Orr put it more forcefully, “Now this affirms that the Hebrew text of the Old

SOLA AUTOGRAPHHA OR SOLA APOGRAPHHA?

Testament and the Greek of the New which was known to the Westminster divines was immediately inspired by God because it was *identical* with the first text that God has kept pure in all the ages. *The idea that there are mistakes in the Hebrew Masoretic texts or in the Textus Receptus of the New Testament was unknown to the authors of the Confession of Faith.*"¹⁸

In the local and present context, the Constitution of Life Bible-Presbyterian Church (1950), states, "We believe in the divine, verbal and plenary inspiration of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life."¹⁹ This 20th century statement is in keeping with the ancient Confessions, speaking of the verbal and plenary inspiration, infallibility and inerrancy of "the *Scriptures* (ie, autographs and apographs) in the original *languages* (ie, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek)," as opposed to the "original *autographs*" *per se*.²⁰

Although the above statement is true to the reformed understanding of *Sola Scriptura*, the 21st century contention for the present perfection of Scripture requires a clearer and stricter statement. True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church (2004) has risen to the occasion, and offers a more definitive statement in her Constitution, which reads, "We believe in the divine, Verbal Plenary Inspiration (Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs) of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the perfect Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life (2 Tim 3:16, 2 Pet 1:20-21, Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35)."

It is historically quite clear that the Reformation slogan of *Sola Scriptura* involved a belief in an existing Hebrew OT and Greek NT in their respective apographs that were not only fully inspired but also entirely preserved to their last jot and tittle, and hence absolutely infallible and totally inerrant. The infallible and inerrant apographs could legitimately serve as the Protestant Church's supreme and final authority in all matters of faith and life. It ought to be noted that the 19th-20th century idea of infallibility and inerrancy as residing *only* in the autographs was utterly foreign to the minds of the 16th-17th century Reformation saints and scholars.²¹

Perfect Autographs, Errant Apographs, and Textual Criticism

The current evangelical view of “inerrant autographs” is a relatively new one that began in the 19th century in conjunction with the introduction of rationalistic textual criticism. Conservative theologians have long identified textual criticism (or lower criticism) as a threat to the biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration.²²

Textual Criticism as introduced by Westcott and Hort treated the Scriptures like any ordinary literature, and sought by human reasoning and subjective analysis to judge which part of Scripture is inspired and which part is not.²³ They touted the highly corrupted Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus as the new standard text, and rejected the traditional *Textus Receptus* as the providentially preserved text.²⁴ Their revision of the providentially preserved *Textus Receptus* saw them cutting out a total of 9,970 Greek words from it in their newly edited Greek text of 1881. The Westcott and Hort text deleted such divinely preserved and time-honoured passages as the *Pericope de adultera* (John 7:53-8:11), the last 12 verses of Mark (Mark 16:9-20), and the Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7).²⁵ Their denial of verbal inspiration as seen in their rendering of 2 Timothy 3:16 was soundly castigated by Southern Presbyterian theologian—Robert Dabney—as the work of a Socinian and a rationalist.²⁶

The tragedy in reformed scholarship was in B B Warfield’s adoption of the Westcott and Hort textual critical theory and his redefinition of the doctrine of biblical inerrancy to make it apply only to the autographs. Warfield’s novel concept of *Sola Autographa* unfortunately caught on, and became the new paradigm in the textual critical exercise of reconstructing (or rather deconstructing) the inspired text. The new paradigm of older, harder, shorter readings as the inspired reading is based on false rules.²⁷ Based on such false rules, “A textual critic engaged upon his business is not at all like Newton investigating the motions of the planets: he is much more like a dog hunting for fleas.”²⁸ Indeed!

The uncritical acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s false textual-critical theory by Princeton Seminary, and later evangelical and fundamental seminaries resulted in the *Textus Receptus* being replaced by the United Bible Societies and the Nestle-Aland Critical Texts as the “commonly received” text in NT studies and modern translations.²⁹ Over a hundred modern English versions have been birthed by this mutilated and

corrupted text causing much confusion over the infallibility, inerrancy and authority of the Scriptures. Where is *the* Bible? Do modern textual critics have the answer? They are agnostic!

Who are the textual critics that determine which text is the inspired text that Christians should use? They are the editors of the current Critical texts, viz, Aland and Metzger among others who are modernists.³⁰ Can we expect them to make spirit-guided decisions with regard to the text? “Who shall ascend into the hill of the LORD? Or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart” (Ps 24:3-4). Can the Spirit of Truth be pleased to use men devoid of the Spirit to guide them into all truth concerning His Word of Truth (John 16:13)? Georg Luck of Johns Hopkins University has rightly said, “our critical texts are no better than our textual critics.”³¹ Jesus said it well, “Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch?” (Luke 6:39). Non-spiritual men have produced a non-spiritual text that formed the basis of a plethora of liberal, ecumenical and feminist versions that demote the deity of Christ and deny the veracity of the Scriptures. Is it no wonder that the mainline denominational churches today are in such a pathetic state, plagued by rampant apostasy and immorality?

Fundamentalism’s love affair with Westcott and Hort, the modern versions, and textual criticism is truly a classic case of the unequal yoke (2 Cor 6:14-7:1). The KJV and its underlying inspired and preserved Hebrew and Greek texts ought to be *the* Text of Biblical Fundamentalism.³² But today, certain fundamentalists are speaking with a forked tongue: they pay lip service to the KJV as the “very” (100%) Word of God, but undermine its very source—the underlying Hebrew Masoretic Text and Greek *Textus Receptus*—saying that it is not 100% (with much deference to Westcott and Hort).³³ It goes without saying that this partnership of the KJV with the Westcott and Hort Text in the classrooms of fundamental theological colleges and seminaries is a marriage made in hell. Is it no wonder that fundamentalism today is dying?

The Verbal Plenary Preservation of the Holy Scriptures

There is a vital need today for true biblical fundamentalists to resuscitate the indispensable doctrine of the verbal and plenary preservation (VPP) of the Holy Scriptures, and by so doing, recapture the Reformation battle-cry of *Sola Scriptura* as found in the infallible and

inerrant *apographa* of the traditional Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek *Textus Receptus* on which the venerable KJV is based.

The 19th century Warfieldian concept of the inerrant *autographa* as reflected in contemporary evangelicalism ought to be expanded to include the inerrant *apographa*. According to Richard Muller of Calvin Theological Seminary, “The Protestant scholastics do not press the point made by their nineteenth-century followers that the infallibility of Scripture and the freedom of Scripture from error reside absolutely in the *autographa*, and only in the derivative sense in the *apographa*; rather, the scholastics argue positively that the *apographa* preserve intact the true words of the prophets and the apostles and that the God-breathed (*theopneustos*) character of Scripture is manifest in the *apographa* as well as in the *autographa*. In other words, the issue primarily addressed by the seventeenth-century orthodox in their discussion of the *autographa* is the continuity of the extant copies in Hebrew and in Greek with the originals both *quoad res*, with respect to the thing or subject of the text, and *quoad verba*, with respect to the words of the text.”³⁴ It is quite clear that the Reformation scholars believed in the 100% inspiration and 100% preservation of the *very words* of Scripture that God has breathed out, and not simply the doctrines (2 Tim 3:16, Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35). Without the words, where the doctrines? It must be pointed out that the current neo-evangelical and neo-fundamental view of (1) verbal inspiration and total inerrancy in the autographs alone, and (2) conceptual inspiredness and limited inerrancy in the apographs, contradicts reformed and fundamental dogmatics.

Myron Houghton of Faith Baptist Seminary was precisely right when he wrote, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God” [2 Timothy 3:16]. Another way of saying this would be, ‘all Scripture is God-breathed,’ or ‘all Scripture comes from the mouth of God.’ This means God is directly responsible for causing the Bible writers to put down everything that He wanted written without error and without omission. But what of the Bible I hold in my hand? Is it God’s Word? Can it be trusted? The answer is yes! Both truths—the inspiration and inerrancy of the original manuscripts and the trustworthiness of the Bible in my hand—must be acknowledged. To affirm the inspiration and inerrancy of the original writings while casting doubt on the authority of the Bible that is available to us is just plain silly. Can you *really* imagine someone seriously saying, ‘I have good news and I have bad news: the good news

is that God wanted to give us a message and therefore caused a book to be written; the bad news is that He didn't possess the power to preserve it and therefore we don't know what it said!' A view of inspiration without a corresponding view of preservation is of no value."³⁵

Ian Paisley, renowned leader of the World Congress of Fundamentalists and President of the European Institute of Protestant Studies, wrote likewise, "The verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures demands the verbal Preservation of the Scriptures. Those who would deny the need for verbal Preservation cannot be accepted as being really committed to verbal Inspiration. If there is no preserved Word of God today then the work of Divine Revelation and Divine Inspiration has perished."³⁶

In the battle for the Bible today, there is a need for Bible-believing and Bible-defending churches and seminaries to produce statements of faith that affirm the Scriptures to be verbally and plenary preserved in the apographs; that all the Hebrew and Greek words of the Masoretic Text and the *Textus Receptus* underlying the Reformation Bibles as represented by the Authorised Version are the verbally and plenary inspired words of God, and therefore absolutely infallible, totally inerrant and supremely authoritative.³⁷

There is also a need to be specific in the identification of the preserved text. In his discussion on "How to Combat Modernism—Follow the Logic of Faith,"³⁸ Edward F Hills warned against a false view of preservation that says (1) the doctrines are preserved, but not the words (contra Matt 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33), or (2) the true reading is preserved somewhere out there in the whole body of extant manuscripts. Such a general and uncertain view would imply that God was somehow careless in preserving His inspired words. Hills rightly advised, "It is not sufficient merely to *say* that you believe in the doctrine of the special, providential preservation of the holy Scriptures. You must *really* believe this doctrine and allow it to guide your thinking. You must begin with Christ and the Gospel and proceed according to the logic of faith. This will lead you to the Traditional text, the *Textus Receptus*, and the King James Version."³⁹

It is by this same logic of faith applied consistently that D A Waite concluded that "the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE are the very

WORDS which God has PRESERVED down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS themselves.”⁴⁰ (Note that Waite is speaking of the Hebrew and Greek words underlying the KJV, and *not* the English words, nor the KJV *per se*.)

This is not a new view, but a restatement of an old truth. By believing in the verbally and plenary preserved apographs, we are affirming or reaffirming good old Protestant and Reformation Theology. It is heartening to note that God’s people, filled and guided by the Spirit, are recognising this vital truth of the verbal and plenary preservation of the Scriptures, and not a few theological institutions have already taken a declared position for it.⁴¹

One such institution is the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC). In its 16th World Congress in Jerusalem, 2000, a statement, “On the Word of God Forever Inerrant and Infallible,” was passed: “The first historic doctrine of the Christian Church presented in the doctrinal statement of this Council of churches is its belief in the inerrancy and infallibility of the *entire* Bible ... God’s Word has been given to us directly from heaven by the Holy Spirit and Jesus, while He was here, said that the Father had sent Him and had given Him the words which He had delivered to man. Jesus was explicit when He said, ‘Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away.’ The penalty pronounced on adding to or taking from the Scriptures was severe judgement from God Himself. ... It is this Bible that has brought into existence the ICCC. It is through this Bible that the Holy Spirit has given the faith to the leaders who have established this Council and has helped them maintain a sure and clear witness to the Bible’s *full* truthfulness. It is this Bible and its record of past prophecies that have been seen to be fulfilled in the *smallest* level, and *every* Word of God is true. ... Nothing that the archaeologists have discovered and will discover will contradict this Book. ... This Holy Book is the work of our righteous God in making possible the only salvation that exists and in bringing men and women through the preaching of the Word in all its ‘foolishness’ into God’s everlasting kingdom. The ICCC reaffirms all the statements carefully and prayerfully worked out ..., all of which are based squarely on this holy and *perfect* record which came from heaven, of which God is the Author and that indeed is why it is called the Word of God.”⁴²

The Far Eastern Bible College, in a necessary effort to preserve her original reformed and fundamentalist ethos, has issued a statement on the

SOLA AUTOGRAPHHA OR SOLA APOGRAPHHA?

Holy Scriptures that was unanimously passed by her Board of Directors on December 29, 2003. Article 4 of the College Constitution reads,

- 1.1 The Statement of Faith of the College shall be in accordance with that system commonly called “the Reformed Faith” as expressed in the Confession of Faith as set forth by the historic Westminster Assembly together with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms.
- 1.2 In abbreviated form, the chief tenets of the doctrine of the College, apart from the Doctrinal Position Statement of the College, shall be as follows:
 - 1.2.1 We believe in the divine, Verbal Plenary Inspiration (Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs) of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the perfect Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life (2 Tim 3:16, 2 Pet 1:20-21, Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35).
 - 1.2.1.1 We believe the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament underlying the Authorised (King James) Version to be the very Word of God, infallible and inerrant.
 - 1.2.1.2 We uphold the Authorised (King James) Version to be the Word of God—the best, most faithful, most accurate, most beautiful translation of the Bible in the English language, and do employ it alone as our primary scriptural text in the public reading, preaching, and teaching of the English Bible.
 - 1.2.1.3 The Board of Directors and Faculty shall affirm their allegiance to the Word of God by taking the Dean Burgon Oath at every annual convocation: I swear in the Name of the Triune God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit that I believe “the Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.”

Conclusion

The Burning Bush will continue to publish articles to defend the present perfection of the original language Scriptures on which the Authorised Version is based. Bible-believing and Bible-defending pastors

and scholars do not hide from alleged “discrepancies” in the Bible. In future issues, we shall endeavour to glorify God and edify His saints by explaining these difficult passages according to a faith-based, thoroughly reformed, theological-presuppositional approach to the Scriptures—the *apographa* we possess today contain no mistakes whatsoever!

It is enough just now to close with the words of Dean Burgon: “I hear some one say,—It seems to trouble *you* very much that inspired writers should be thought capable of making mistakes; but it does not trouble me.—Very likely not. It does not trouble *you*, perhaps, to see stone after stone, buttress after buttress, foundation after foundation, removed from the walls of Zion, until the whole structure trembles and totters, and is pronounced insecure. Your boasted unconcern is very little to the purpose, unless we may also know how dear to you the safety of Zion is. But if you make indignant answer,—(as would heaven you may!)—that your care for GOD’s honour, your jealousy for GOD’s oracles, is every whit as great as our own,—*then* we tell you that, on *your* wretched promises, men more logical than yourself will make shipwreck of their peace, and endanger their very souls. There is no stopping,—no knowing where to stop,—in this downward course. Once admit the principle of fallibility into the inspired Word, and the whole becomes a bruised and rotten reed. If St. Paul a little, why not St. Paul much? If Moses in some places, why not in many? You will doubt our LORD’s infallibility next! ... It might not trouble *you*, to find your own familiar friend telling you a lie, every now and then: but I trust this whole congregation will share the preacher’s infirmity, while he confesses that it would trouble *him* so exceedingly that after one established falsehood, he would feel unable ever to trust that friend implicitly again.

“... But I believe that the Bible IS the Word of GOD—and I believe that GOD’s Word must be absolutely infallible. I shall therefore believe the Bible to be absolutely infallible,—until I am convinced to the contrary.”⁴³

“No, Sirs! The Bible (be persuaded) is the very utterance of the Eternal;—as much GOD’s Word, as if high Heaven were open, and we heard GOD speaking to us with human voice ... [T]he Bible, from the Alpha to the Omega of it, is filled to overflowing with the Holy Spirit of GOD: the Books of it, and the sentences of it, and the words of it, and the syllables of it,—aye, and the very letters of it.”⁴⁴ Amen and Amen!

“Help, LORD; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men. They speak vanity every one with his neighbour: with flattering lips and with a double heart do they speak. The LORD shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things: Who have said, With our tongue will we prevail; our lips are our own: who is lord over us? For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the LORD; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him. 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. The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted” (Ps 12).

“Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar” (Rom 3:4). *Soli Deo Gloria!*

Notes

¹ Go to <http://www.etsjets.org> for information on the 2003 ETS Membership Challenge on Open Theism.

² The interpretive nature of the term “inerrancy” has led former ETS President, Millard J Erickson, to describe “inerrancy” as “a reference to the *variously interpreted* doctrine that the Bible is free from error” (emphasis mine) in his *Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology*, sv “Inerrancy.”

³ Modern textual critics assume that “the autographs (originals) of the NT books are a hypothetical source only, since none are extant.” J Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism* (Grand Rapids MI: Wm B Eerdmans, 1964), 33.

⁴ James B Williams, ed, *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man* (Greenville SC: Ambassador-Emerald, 1999), 25-26.

⁵ Roy E Beacham and Kevin T Bauder, eds, *One Bible Only?* (Grand Rapids MI: Kregel, 2001), 102-103.

⁶ For a comprehensive review of both books, see my articles, “Bob Jones University and the KJV: A Critique of *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*,” *The Burning Bush* (2001): 1-34; and “The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: *One Bible Only?* Or ‘Yea Hath God Said?’,” *The Burning Bush* (2004): 2-47. See also “The Leaven of Fundamentalism: A History of the Bible Text Issue in Fundamentalism,” videocassette tape 3, Pensacola Christian College, 1998.

⁷ Beacham and Bauder, *One Bible Only?*, 121.

⁸ Williams, *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*, 182.

⁹ At every annual convocation, the FEBC Board of Directors and faculty swear to uphold the perfection of Scriptures, that “the Bible is none other than

the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike, the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.” Adapted from J W Burgon, *Inspiration and Interpretation* (Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 1999 reprint), 89.

¹⁰ On the infallibility of the apographs, listen to David Allen’s lecture, “The Special Providential Preservation of the Word of God,” delivered to the Scottish Reformation Society, February 2, 2004 at <http://www.bible-sermons.org.uk/audio-sermons/767-special-providential-preservation-of-the-word-of-god>. In a letter to this author dated April 2, 2004, Allen clarified that his lecture was meant “to show that the current ‘Reformed’ position was not a view shared by the Reformers.” The current “Reformed” position is the “inerrant autographs” position originally espoused by B B Warfield of Princeton Seminary. It is however unfortunate that Allen in his message on “The Faithful Keeping and Copying of the Word of God,” at Life Bible-Presbyterian Church, Singapore, on June 22, 2004, undermined the very doctrine of preservation he tried so hard to present when he (1) *dogmatically* asserted that Psalm 12:6-7 does not mean the preservation of God’s words whatsoever, (2) opened the possibility of “scribal errors” in the preserved Hebrew text in places where there are none (eg, 2 Chron 22:2), and then (3) introduced a fallacious hermeneutical rule that Scripture “corrects” Scripture (implying that the Scriptures contain mistakes).

¹¹ Peter W Van Kleeck, *Fundamentalism’s Folly?* (Grand Rapids MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1998), see especially pages 20-27 on “Dogmatic Disjunction.” Van Kleeck offers a historical survey of the interpretation of Psalm 12:6-7 in the days of the reformers (15-19). For an exegetical defence of the verbal plenary preservation of the words of Scripture in Psalm 12:6-7, see Thomas M Strouse, “The Permanent Preservation of God’s Words, Psalm 12:6,7,” in *Thou Shalt Keep Them*, ed Kent Brandenburg (El Sobrante CA: Pillar & Ground, 2003), 29-34.

¹² *Chamber’s Twentieth Century Dictionary*, comp Rev Thomas Davidson, sv “Infallible,” “Inerrable.”

¹³ Quoted by Theodore P Letis, *The Ecclesiastical Text* (Philadelphia PA: Institute for Renaissance and Reformation Biblical Studies, 1997), 43.

¹⁴ Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol 1 (Philipsburg NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1992), 106. Emphasis mine.

¹⁵ *The Westminster Standards: An Original Facsimile* (Audubon NJ: Old Paths, 1997).

¹⁶ Other Protestant creeds followed suit: The Confession of the Waldenses (1655), The Savoy Declaration (1658), The Baptist Confession (1688), Methodist Articles of Religion (1784), The New Hampshire Baptist Confession

(1833), Confession of the Evangelical Free Church of Geneva (1848), The Reformed Episcopal Articles of Religion (1875). In none of them was the term “autographa” used. See Philip Schaff, ed, *The Creeds of Christendom*, vol 3 (Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 1931).

¹⁷ J. S Candlish, “The Doctrine of the Westminster Confession on Scripture,” as cited in Theodore Letis, ed, *The Majority Text* (Philadelphia PA: Institute for Renaissance and Reformation Biblical Studies, 1987), 174. Emphasis mine.

¹⁸ William F Orr, “The Authority of the Bible as Reflected in the proposed Confession of 1967,” as quoted by Letis, *The Majority Text*, 174. Emphasis mine.

¹⁹ *Fifty Years Building His Kingdom*, Life Bible-Presbyterian Church Golden Jubilee Magazine, 1950-2000, Singapore, 51.

²⁰ This historic church in Singapore suffered a split in 2003 due to a non-reformed interpretation of the constitution which applied the terms “inerrancy” and “infallibility” only to the autographs and not apographs, employing anti-preservationist arguments from anti-reformed dispensational Baptists of *One Bible Only?* (op cit) notoriety. Re: “Preserving Our Godly Path,” Life B-P Church Sunday School, December 1, 2002 (lifebpc@pacific.net.sg), and this author’s critique of it (febc@pacific.net.sg).

²¹ Cf Richard A Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca 1520 to ca 1725*, vol 2, *Holy Scripture*, 2d ed (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 300-7.

²² Letis, *The Ecclesiastical Text*, 1.

²³ See B F Westcott and F J A Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* (Peabody MA: Hendricksen, 1998 reprint) for the man-made rules of anti-fedeistic textual criticism.

²⁴ Read J W Burgon, *The Revision Revised* (Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 2000 reprint) for a refutation of the Westcott and Hort’s false Greek text and theory.

²⁵ For a defence of the authenticity of these precious passages, see E F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines IA: Christian Research Press, 1984), 150-68; J W Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Collingswood NJ: Dean Burgon Society, 1871); and Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8* (Tempe AZ: Comma Publications, 1995); Jeffrey Khoo, “A Preliminary Examination of the Antiquity and Authenticity of the Johannine Comma (1 Jn 5:7f),” *Foundation*, May June 2000, 34-5.

²⁶ Cited in Jeffrey Khoo, “Bob Jones University and the KJV,” *The Burning Bush* (2001): 10-11.

²⁷ It is no wonder that scholars today are re-evaluating the textual critical canons of Westcott and Hort. See David Alan Black, ed, *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 2002), 27, 31.

²⁸ A E Houseman, "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism," in *Selected Prose*, ed J Carter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 131-2.

²⁹ Edward F Hills, "A History of My Defence of the King James Version," *The Burning Bush* (1998): 99-105; Theodore Letis, "B B Warfield, Common-Sense Philosophy and Biblical Criticism," in *The Ecclesiastical Text*, 1-29; Jeffrey Khoo, *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation* (Singapore: FEBC Press, 2001), 117-120.

³⁰ David Cloud, *For Love of the Bible* (Oak Harbor WA: Way of Life Literature, 1995), 37-44.

³¹ Cited in Black, *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, 50.

³² "For fundamentalist society as a whole the Authorized Version functioned as the direct and immediate expression or transcript of divine revelation ... The virtual use of only one English version, and it is one originating within very traditional early seventeenth-century Christianity, thus indirectly but very powerfully supported the alienation of the fundamentalist public from, and its opposition to, the positions, interests and methods from which all biblical criticism grew and on which it depended." James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (Philadelphia PA: Westminster, 1978), 210-1.

³³ Cf Thomas M Strouse, "Fundamentalism and the Authorized Version," a paper presented to the National Leadership Conference, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Lansdale PA, February 29, 1996.

³⁴ *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, s v "autographa."

³⁵ Myron J Houghton, "The Preservation of Scripture," *Faith Pulpit* (August 1999): 1-2. Stuart Lease, former president of Lancaster Bible College, likewise said, "Now I believe that God so superintended both the writing and the preservation of Scripture, not only the words, but the very letters."

³⁶ Ian R K Paisley, *My Plea for the Old Sword* (Belfast: Ambassador, 1997), 103.

³⁷ See Jeffrey Khoo, "A Plea for a Perfect Bible," *The Burning Bush* (2003): 1-15.

³⁸ Edward F Hills, *Believing Bible Study* (Des Moines IA: Christian Research Press, 1977), 219.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 220.

⁴⁰ D A Waite, *Defending the King James Bible: A Four-fold Superiority* (Collingswood NJ: Bible For Today, 1996), 48.

⁴¹ See list in Jeffrey Khoo, *KJV Q&A* (Singapore: Bible Witness Literature Ministry, 2003), 18-19; Cloud, *For Love of the Bible*, 269-414.

SOLA AUTOGRAPHHA OR SOLA APOGRAPHHA?

⁴² “ICCC 16th World Congress Statements,” *Far Eastern Beacon* 32 (December 2000): 9. Emphasis mine.

⁴³ Burgon, *Inspiration and Interpretation*, 73-4.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 76.

Dr Jeffrey Khoo is the academic dean of Far Eastern Bible College. The paper above was read to University and Polytechnic students of the Fundamental Christian Ministry at its combined meeting, August 27, 2004, Calvary Pandan Bible-Presbyterian Church, Singapore.

The FEBC Bookroom serves both the college students and the Christian public. It carries not just FEBC Press books and textbooks, but also other theologically conservative books and Biblical reference tools. It has a wide selection of King James Bibles, and specialises in books defending the KJV and its underlying original language texts. Write to the Bookroom for a catalogue. Trade enquiries welcome.

Opening hours:

Mon-Fri: 10:30 am to 7:30 pm

Sat: 10:30 am to 5:00 pm

Sun: 9:30 am to 10:30 am
12:00 pm to 1:00 pm

FEBC BOOKROOM

9A Gilstead Road, Singapore 309063

Tel: (65) 6254-9188

Email: febcbookroom@febc.edu.sg



A CRITIQUE OF *GOD'S WORD IN OUR HANDS: THE BIBLE PRESERVED FOR US*

Thomas M Strouse

Introduction



Books, especially Christian theological works, reveal the authors' biblical knowledge about and belief in divine revelation. *God's Word in Our Hands: The Bible Preserved for Us* (Greenville, SC: Ambassador Emerald International, 2003, 430 pages) edited by James B Williams is no exception. Although the title of this sequel to *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man (MOGMOM)* promises great assurance to the reader about Bible preservation, the book is a commentary on the writers, academicians, professors, etc, who ultimately deny the Scriptural teaching of the preservation of God's Words. The basic "message" of the book is that God has promised to preserve His message but not His Words, and therefore there is no single Bible in the English language (certainly not the KJV) that can make the exclusive claim of being the Word of God. But this should be of no concern to fundamentalists, the book alleges, because Satan's attack on the Bible (Gen 3:1ff) is not in the texts, translations or through Textual Criticism. However, it would not be fair for this reviewer to critique the authors' "message" without looking at their "words."

God's Word in Our Hands (GWOH) is "deja vu all over again." The thesis, arguments, and historical evidence are basically the same as *MOGMOM*, with additional pages being assigned to several *ad hoc* explanations of preservation passages. This reviewer has publicly critiqued *MOGMOM* in *Sound Words from New England*, Volume 1, Issue 2, November-December, 2000 [see also Jeffrey Khoo, "Bob Jones

University and the KJV: A Critique of *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*" *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 1-34], and many of his criticisms may similarly be leveled at this sequel. At the outset, however, it is refreshing that this sequel has on its cover an artist's rendering of a Hebrew text, albeit un-pointed, instead of the liberal *RSV* (blurred in the 3rd and 4th editions) that graced the covers of four editions of *MOGMOM*. This new cover does not mean, however, that the authors warn about the apostasy of many of the architects of their textual theory. In fact, the editor Williams is quick to acknowledge that many non-Fundamentalists find the book profitable (vi), presumably because of this silence. He does make a disclaimer about any blanket endorsement of the textual researchers, but it is difficult to comprehend how unregenerate Bible critics can "benefit or advance" the discussion of truth (xii). After all, the Lord asked of the wicked through Asaph, "*What hast thou to do to declare my statutes...?seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee*" (Ps 50:16-17). The book, with two editors, five additional committee members and contributors, four more contributors, and ten academicians representing ten Bible schools and seminaries (International Baptist College, Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Pillsbury Baptist Bible College, Northland Baptist Bible College, Faith Baptist Bible College and Theological Seminary, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Maranatha Baptist Bible College, Temple Baptist Seminary, and Bob Jones University), is divided into three parts: The Faith of Our Fathers, The Transmission of the Word of God, and The Effect of Preservation on the Faith, to show that God preserved His message but not His words.

In a pastiche of articles such as this, it is expected that different literary styles and skills will be noticed. However, just like its predecessor (*MOGMOM*), the quality of proofreading in *GWOH* has allowed several spelling, grammatical, and format gaffes to escape notice. Misspellings occur throughout (Wrestling for Wresting, 96; *ipsissima* for *ipsissima*, 193; Diety for Deity, 264; Athenasias for Athanasius, 395; steam for stream, 423), split infinitives intersperse the text (xii, 208, 342, 370), grammatical errors appear (lets for let's, 269) and format gaffes happen ("Dr" in front of Paul W Downey in the chapter title and no other author has this designation although several writers have earned doctorates, 365).

GWOH is the outworking of a chain of events in American fundamentalism. Davey discusses “the fracturing of Fundamentalism over preservation” but fails to mention the culprit behind the fracturing (193-194). The “bastion of fundamentalism” in Christian education, Bob Jones University (BJU), has employed Greek professors who have had an affinity for the Critical Text (CT) since the school’s inception. This affinity turned into a love affair with the completed NASV in 1971, as BJU was one of the educational institutions to assist the Lockman Foundation’s publication of this modern translation. By the mid-70’s, BJU promoted the NASV as an alternative to the KJV. Through the years, BJU and many Bible schools influenced by it used the KJV in chapel and the classroom while denigrating the underlying Greek text. In the mid-90’s, Pensacola Christian College exposed this “dirty little secret” of BJU in a series of videos, charging them with bringing the leaven of Textual Criticism into fundamentalism. This charge brought a groundswell of concern among fundamental Baptists pastors and parents as to where to send their “preacher boys” for theological education. The BJU-originated publications *MOGMOM*, *GWOH*, and Schnaiter and Tagliapietra’s *Bible Preservation and the Providence of God (BPPG)* are efforts aimed at these rightfully concerned fundamental Baptists to say there is no difference between the NASV and the KJV and therefore no cause for alarm. In fact, Williams implies that the preservation of the Scriptures is a non-essential (xix) even though he has edited two books about this doctrine. Hutcheson declares “some today are sidetracked from the proper battlefield and have busied themselves fighting their brethren over a particular translation” (28). The coalition of ten schools wants to write voluminously about preservation but expects the KJV Only group to be quiet and non-disagreeable. This hypocrisy suggests the “academic agenda” that will be elaborated upon later in this review.

Neo-Orthodox Tendencies

Neo-orthodoxy developed out of liberalism after World War I as apostates began to redefine Biblically orthodox terms. One major area of redefining was with regard to the Bible. Neo-Orthodox theologians referred to the Word of God but did not identify it with the Scriptures. *GWOH* gives a new and un-Biblical definition to the expression “the Word of God,” coming strikingly close to the claims of the old Neo-Orthodoxy. Neo-Orthodoxy speaks of the Word of God as something

other than the written Bible. One of the academicians, Samuel Schnaiter, has labored under cloud of the charge of Neo-Orthodoxy since 1983 when Charles Woodbridge labeled him thus. Although “Word of God” may mean the spoken or preached message of God, it ultimately refers to the inscripturated canonical Words of God, which definition *GWOH* rejects. The thesis of the *GWOH* is that God has preserved the Word of God, or “the message,” in the totality of manuscripts (xxi-xxii). Harding bemoans that “serious departures from the preserved *message* in Scripture are occurring...” (335). This suggests two Neo-Orthodox affirmations: God’s Word is the message and the message (God’s Word) is in, but not identical to, the Scripture. Furthermore, Downey asserts “God’s Word transcends written documents, even the physical universe, and will be completely and ultimately fulfilled if not one copy remains. The power and effectiveness and duration of the Word of God, and man’s responsibility to obey it, do not demand the presence or even the existence of any physical copy” (376). These surmisings are not Biblical since the Lord identifies the inspired Word of God with the inscripturated canonical Words of God, stating, “*He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words (remata), hath one that judgeth him: the word (logos) that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day*” (John 12:48; cf Rev 20:12). The writers emphasise that not all of Christ’s Words or God’s Words are written down (367). That is true. But that for which mankind will be responsible are the preserved, written canonical Words of God (Matt 24:35). Christ wrote some unknown Words in the sand (John 8:6, 8), but man will not be held responsible for them at the judgment. Christ presumably said things in His teachings that were not written down (John 21:25) and man would not be accountable for those words. Believers will now be accountable for “*it is more blessed to give than to receive*” (Acts 20:35) only because Paul preached and Luke recorded this “*agrapha*” of the Lord. Man will not be held responsible for God’s spoken revelation other than the perfectly preserved and inscripturated canonical Scriptures.

Man-Centered Anthropology

A strange and unhealthy anthropology permeates this volume. Biblical anthropology, or what the Scriptures say about man, teaches that all men are fallible and can contribute nothing to the truth without the Bible and the help of the Holy Spirit. Anthropology that focuses on the exaltation of man at the expense of truth is non-Biblical. This man-

centered anthropology manifests itself in four examples. First, Williams continues his “hero worship” of the Anglican Bible critics Westcott and Hort. In *MOGMOM* he asserted they were in heaven, and in *GWOH* he denigrates those who criticise them as misrepresenting or misinterpreting their commentaries (xv). Williams’ lack of discernment concerning these English Romanists is disconcerting, and to such an extent, that Minnick apparently wants to distance himself from Westcott-Hort when he affirms, “the Westcott-Hort Testament is not the text of modern translations” (273).

A second manifestation of strange anthropology is the incessant barrage of acrimonious vitriol against fundamentalists, and only fundamentalists, who speak out against other translations including the NASV. It would seem that regular warnings against the apostasy of Metzger and Aland, who had gone on record advocating the possibility of reducing the NT canon, and against the drift of the Neo-Evangelicalism of Wallace, Carson and Erickson, should permeate *GWOH*. Instead, the authors seem to have difficulty constraining themselves as they charge fundamentalists with being vitriolic (391). Williams chides, “Although there were those who had strong convictions about the matter, they did not convey the mean spiritedness and use the vitriolic language so often present today in discussions of translations” (xvii). Downey directs this verbal attack against fundamentalist Waite stating: “His outrage toward those who do not accept his theory of perfect preservation seems a bit overdone” (393). Other examples may be observed throughout (cf 2, 28, 110, 272, 365, *et al*).

The third manifestation of faulty anthropology is the repeated plea for “healing” for “this needless division over translations” (xviii). Doctrine divides Christians, and when it does, those with Scriptural authority need to rebuke those who make errant statements about doctrine and expect forthcoming repentance (2 Tim 2:24-28). Professing Christians with doctrinal deviations do not need to be healed, they need to be rebuked with expected repentance or else marked and avoided (Rom 16:17). This faulty anthropology as expressed in *GWOH* does not reflect the Biblical teaching of the fallibility of the believer, and therefore offers the invalid antidote of “healing.”

The most predominant manifestation of un-Biblical anthropology is the exaltation of man and man’s words. Two earlier sections in the book promote what man has to say about preservation. Hutcheson utilises 34

pages and 68 footnotes, in his chapter, “The Heritage of American Orthodoxy,” to give what earlier and later fundamentalists have taught about preservation. He cites men from James Brooks to John Rice to demonstrate that fundamentalists have not countenanced the TR and Bible preservation view. Hutcheson in his historical fundamentalist chart of comparison overlooks men such as W Aberhart, B F Dearmore, and B M Cedarholm who are strong defenders of the preserved text position (29-30). Conley’s chapter entitled “The Voice of the Preachers” continues to exalt man’s words above the Words of God. When will the committee members of *GWOH* recognise that “trusted voices” of men are secondary and therefore inferior authorities concerning revelation? The catena of names the authors have used tend to imply that Protestant fundamentalism was both ignorant of and imprecise about the Biblical doctrine of preservation of the Words of God.

Williams echoes the committee members’ fallacious anthropology by assuring his readers that “The translators of some of the most popular translations are reputed to be good, godly, and scholarly believers who would not purposely corrupt the Bible” (xvi). Hutcheson claims that R A Torrey’s “credentials as a soulwinner are unimpeachable” (25). The authors of *GWOH* would have Christians believe the un-Biblical doctrine that good, godly scholars and soulwinners can be trusted absolutely whenever they speak about the Bible. The student of the Bible should consider that a few years after the good, godly, scholarly and soul-winning Apostle Peter won thousands to Christ (Acts 2:14-41), Paul rebuked him for his hypocrisy concerning the truth (Gal 2:11-14). Even the NT Apostles were fallible except in their inscripturated canonical sermons and writings. Man’s restatement of Scripture must be judged with Scripture to determine its accuracy (1 Cor 14:29; cf Deut 13:1-5). No man, not even a fundamentalist (living or dead), is infallible in his expression of Biblical truth, and such expressions must be scrutinised by the Bible (cf Gal 1:8; 1 Thess 5:21). Paul’s warning to Timothy should be seriously implemented by every Biblical fundamentalist: “*Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee*” (1 Tim 4:16).

The Buried Bible View

Shaylor initially states that God has preserved His written Word “in the totality” of manuscripts (xxi). But the authors contradict their major

thesis throughout *GWOH*, suggesting they do not believe that which they cannot and have not proved. Minnick assures the reader that the significant variations between the TR and CT (in 25% of the NT) is only 1.19% (271), whereas Downey concedes that there is a 7% deviation between the TR and the Westcott-Hort texts (388). Again, Shaylor declares that “we can hold it [God’s Word] in our hands” (401), even though he quotes favourably Harding’s belief that “we do not currently possess a Hebrew manuscript with that reading [“thirty”]” in 1 Samuel 13:1 (414; cf 361). Shaylor continues by stating “Perhaps in God’s own time we will be allowed to discover that manuscript. Our confidence in the perfection of the *autographa* is not shaken by incomplete understating of how and where its wording is preserved” (414). Shades of Neo-Orthodoxy; they hold to the “non-preserved preservation” view! The committee’s affirmation of their position culminates in their declaration concerning Matthew 5:18: “Neither does this passage guarantee that all the words will be always available at all times” (106). Preservation demands availability or the doctrine of preservation is meaningless. Downey asserts that the word “word” has been lost in the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 8:3 but recovered and therefore preserved in the LXX translation (374-375). Finally, Shaylor concludes by stating “confusion arises when Christians assume that they can have the exact words of God in their language” (406).

GWOH teaches the “Buried Bible” position. In effect, the committee and authors argue that we have the Word of God, but we do not have the Words of God because some Words are lost and need to be discovered through archaeological finds and restored through Textual Criticism. The Message is preserved but the Words of the Message are different (from 1.19% to 7% in the two competing texts) and missing but that does not affect the Message. The Bible is out there, but we are not sure where it is or when we will have all of it, and our responsibility is to dig it up through the sciences of archaeology and Textual Criticism. The Christian may have great assurance that God has preserved His Buried Bible somewhere although it might not be available. This message is not spiritually appealing to Biblical Christians who believe the Lord who has assured that His canonical Words will be available to every generation (Matt 24:35; John 12:48).

Ad Hoc Exegesis

God's Word in Our Hands: The Bible Preserved for Us purports to be a book about the Biblical doctrine of preservation as the title suggests. At least two chapter titles and contents continue this promising theme: "What the Bible Really Says," and "What the Preservation Issue Has Taught Us." Yet, the authors are not interested in what the Bible says as much as what others say about the Bible, which in turn influences what the authors think the Bible says. The committee of *GWOH* admits that there is "implicit teaching regarding the preservation of the Word of God" (83) while Davey rightly condemns Glennly for refusing to argue for "an explicit verse" which teaches preservation (207). Since the authors of *GWOH* base their doctrine only on implicit teaching of the Bible, and implicit means something not clearly stated, it follows that they are arguing dogmatically about an unclear teaching in the Bible. This unclear teaching is perpetuated by the scores of scholars who quote one another. In fact, *GWOH* is about what past and present Bible critics have said about the Bible, and the authors admit that their real thesis is not the explicit teaching of the Bible about Bible preservation. In this 430-page volume, the committee states: "Obviously there are dozens of other passages cited by various advocates of the King James Only position that we have not addressed. Space would not permit a thorough exegesis of all of them. Such an exhaustive treatment would require an independent volume on the subject" (117). They have space to cite hundreds of quotations from commentators, scholars, critics, preachers and historical fundamentalists, who support their Buried Bible position, but very little space for meaningful Hebrew and Greek exegesis, and even then that exegesis being *ad hoc*.

Only two sections in *GWOH* give extensive coverage of preservation passages (83-111 and 368-377). It appears that the authors scrambled to find commentators who were as imprecise and inaccurate as they in their exposition. The authors of *GWOH*, many of whom are capable of the exegesis of the Hebrew and Greek, give token explanations of significant passages. The chapter by the Editorial Committee entitled "What the Bible Really Says about Its Preservation" is extremely disappointing. First, 52 of the 63 endnotes in this chapter give the commentaries of others on passages such as Psalms 12:6-7, 119:89, 119:152, Isaiah 40:8, 1 Peter 1:23-25, and Matthew 5:18 (cf 111-117). The greatest problem with citing past and present scholars, including ex-member of the executive

committee of the Dean Burgon Society, Thomas Cassidy, is that they pass on what their predecessors taught *ad infinitum* so that no fresh exegesis is forthcoming. A case in point is Psalm 12:6-7. The committee, authors, and academicians are not aware that their token argument of the supposed gender discordance rule has been rejected by the fresh exegesis of Scripture itself. In trying to argue against the word “them” (masculine plural) having “words” (feminine plural) as the natural antecedent on the basis of gender discordance, the contributors have fallen into their own linguistic snare. It is common in Hebrew poetry for feminine nouns to take on masculine pronouns. The writer of Psalm 119, who dealt with the Words of the Lord, accepted gender discordance as good Hebrew grammar with four outstanding examples in verses 111, 129, 152, and 167. Psalm 119:152 is one of the passages that *GWOH* rejects as teaching the preservation of the Lord’s testimonies or “written words” forever (95). But according to the authors of *GWOH*, their Hebrew rule of good linguistics in Psalm 12:5-7, would not allow “them” (masculine plural) to refer to “testimonies” (feminine plural) in Psalm 119:152. Instead, the antecedent of “them” must go back to the nearest word that is masculine plural, which in this case would be those who “*follow after mischief*” (Psalm 119:150). This of course is ludicrous. The two linguistic obstacles *GWOH* has to overcome to make Psalm 12:6-7 refer to the preservation of the poor and needy are the proximity rule of nearest antecedent and the rule of accepted gender discordance. However, they have not and cannot overcome these linguistic obstacles which guard the truth, and so the exegetical interpretation of Psalm 12:6-7 stands that God has promised the perfect preservation of His Words for every generation from the time of their inscripturation forward.

The authors seek to explain away the doctrine of the preservation of the Words of God in the other aforementioned preservation passages. This hermeneutic practice is based on sophomoric exegesis girded up with straw-man arguments and *ad hoc* explanations. In explaining Matthew 4:4, Downey calls a “theory” the orthodox expression: “God’s justice demands complete availability of every word for which mankind is accountable” (374), in spite of the teaching of Matthew 4:4 and John 12:48. Never once does Downey refer to the perfect tense verb “it is written” (*gegraptai*) which demands that Moses’ book of Deuteronomy, along with the rest of the Torah, had been and still was written in Christ’s day. He bolsters his rejection of the Lord’s bibliology with the straw-man

argument of denying that Christ was “promising the perpetuity of a manuscript” (375). The advocates for the TR/KJV position defend the preservation of His Words, not manuscripts. He argues that the Hebrew word for “word” was lost but recovered in the LXX, undermining what the Lord said about the preservation of every consonant (jot) and vowel (tittle) of every Hebrew word of Scripture (Matt 5:18). Although Davey understands the truth that the Bible must have the last say about itself by stating “all arguments about Scripture and which concern Scripture must—in some respect—rest on exegetical and theological data” (208), *GWOH* for the most part ignores the application of this Biblical necessity.

Unproved Assumptions

The authors of *GWOH* are guilty of perpetuating several unproved assumptions as fact. These include the fallacious assumption that Christ and the Apostles used the LXX (342, 360, 414), that Textual Criticism is a beneficial tool, and that different words in different Greek texts do not affect doctrine. The New Testament teaches explicitly that the Lord Jesus Christ used only the preserved Hebrew text, and that He and His apostles never had the Biblical, theological, or practical necessity to use the LXX for evangelising the Gentiles. The lines of Biblical argument which are normally ignored include the Lord's usage of *gegraptai* for the Hebrew text (Matt 4:4; Luke 4:4), His reference to Hebrew jots and tittles (Matt 5:18), and His reference to the three-fold division of the Hebrew *Tanakh* (Torah, Prophets, and Writings) in several passages (Luke 11:50-51; 24:27, 44). Alleged quotes by the Lord and the Apostles from the OT are usually not *verbatim*, and history cannot prove that there was a pre-Christian LXX nor disprove a post-Christian LXX. The Lord gave inspired targums, or explanatory commentary, on the OT Scripture, producing inspired elaboration on OT texts (cf Luke 4:17-19). As far as the Gentile evangelism necessitated, the Lord Jesus utilised the Hebrew OT for Jews (eg, Matt 5-7) and His authoritative Greek words for Gentiles (Matt 15:21ff). Likewise, the Apostles used the Hebrew OT in evangelising the Jews, and Greek NT words for the Gentiles (cf Acts 13-21). On the day of Pentecost, the Lord used tongues to evangelise various people groups (Acts 2:1ff.).

Gephart expresses the committee's unproved assumption for “The Need for Textual Criticism” (165-166). He declares that “text criticism is mandated” but he does not give a Biblical authority. Somehow, Timothy

ministered at Ephesus without a Pauline course in Textual Criticism (cf 1 Tim 6:3-5). Instead, textual critics (164-165) and historical evidence mandate the use of Textual Criticism. Since Textual Criticism works for secular literature, “reverent textual criticism” must work “to recover the exact form of words and phrases used in the original” (166). Gephart fails to define historically Textual Criticism and uses it anachronistically for Erasmus and the KJV translators. In contrast to this unproved assumption for the need of Textual Criticism, the Lord promised to preserve all of His Words for every generation to recognise and receive by faith (Ps 12:6-7; John 12:48; 17:8, 20). Textual Criticism will never recover what the Lord supposedly chose not to preserve, and has thus far manifested this lack of recovery, and if Textual Critics would ever claim the final restoration of the Lord’s text, how would anyone know authoritatively?

A third unproved assumption is that different words in texts and translations do not mean different doctrine. Minnick’s chapter on “How Much Difference Do the Differences Make?”(229-277) is a blatant example. After a series of charts and analysis, Minnick confidently maintains that even though “only a small percentage of variants affect understanding significantly” (270), “not a single variant in any way alters what Christians believe and practice” (271). Yet, how does he know, since the Bible warns about changes through textual and canonical tampering which began to occur in the first century (2 Pet 3:16; 2 Thess 2:2; cf also Deut 12:32; 13:1-5; Rev 22:18-19). To prove the worthlessness of his whole chapter, all this reviewer would have to do is add or subtract two words, “no” and “not,” to Minnick’s concluding arguments on pages 271-272, and thereby change his position to say exactly the opposite of what he wants to say (two words out of 497 words or .004 difference!).

Uncertain “Certainty”

Williams bemoans the fact “that such large numbers of Americans have lost that confidence in the Bible as the inerrant Word of God” (xi). He fails to give the primary reason for this loss of confidence among Americans, which is the multiplication of translations, including the NASV. When options occur and there is no absolute authority, uncertainty arises. *GWOH* argues that the final authority for the best translation American fundamental Christians should use should come from fundamentalist leaders and their “totality of manuscripts” view. Harding presents this position of “certainty” (336ff) based on the “totality of

manuscripts” view (343), which leads to uncertainty since no one knows which words are the final absolute authority. This uncertain “certainty” position of Harding and company is in contrast with what Solomon told his understudy: “*Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, That I might make thee know the **certainty of the words of truth**; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?*” (Prov 22:20-21).

Academic Agenda

Since this book represents at least ten Bible colleges and seminaries (iv), there seems to be an academic agenda behind *GWOH*. All of these schools would claim to be in the mainstream of historic fundamentalism and consequently need the support of fundamental churches and parents to send their fundamental “preacher boys” to them for theological education. This of course puts the contributors of *GWOH* in an awkward and unenviable position. Most fundamental churches in America, especially independent Baptist churches, still believe in and preach and teach from the KJV. This coalition of ten schools must convince these pastors and parents that the NASV is a viable option to the KJV, that their professors are orthodox even if they teach from the NASV, that there is really no difference between the NASV and the KJV, that they should not listen to the KJV Only “nay-sayers,” and that their preacher boys will be indoctrinated in “the science of textual criticism” and ultimately reject their respective pastors’ and parents’ KJV Only “mentality.”

While dealing with academia, this reviewer noticed several unusual expressions. There seems to be an inference that some of the writers have a loose understanding of what inspired means or to what it refers (3). The terms “balanced” and “orthodox” permeate this volume and are defined from their perspective as referring to *GWOH*’s unproved view of preservation (3). Furthermore, the committee asserts that the “third heaven” is “the eternal abode of God” (92) but Solomon states “*the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee [God]*” (1 Kgs 8:27).

Denial of the Means of Preservation

The contributors of *GWOH* perpetuate the mantra that God has not revealed “how” He would preserve His Words (xix). The Bible is clear that Israel was the means for preserving the OT (Rom 3:2) and the NT churches were the means for preserving the OT and NT (Matt 28:19-20).

The authors of *GWOH* have a faulty bibliology because they have a faulty ecclesiology. They hold to the Protestant universal church reforming the Roman Catholic Church (xiii-xiv) which was a “good movement gone bad.” They maintain that the Church, “the body of believers called ‘the church’” (xiii), must restore (through scholars using Textual Criticism) the Word of God. Their Platonic catholicity (376) in ecclesiology drives their neo-catholic rationalism so that they must have historical proof to believe the doctrine of verbal preservation (cf John 20:29). Paul Downey chides the KJV Only advocates saying, “The Christian faith has never been a blind fideism, but has always relied on both the revelation of God and empirical evidence” (393). But Paul says “*For we walk by faith, not by sight*” (2 Cor 5:7).

The Bible teaches that the local, NT churches must receive and preserve the Words of God. With all deference to lifetime missionary J B Williams, the reviewer is amazed that Williams does not understand “the main purpose for the church’s existence” (xiv; cf 40); he thinks it is merely soul winning. All four Gospels and Acts give the purpose of the Lord’s churches and that is the Great Commission which includes evangelism, baptising, and instructing to observe or “preserve” the Lord’s commandments (Matt 28:19-20). The church, the one with bishops and deacons, and which baptises converts, is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim 3:15). It is the exclusive role of the Lord’s candlesticks to work with Him to preserve His Words for future generations (Rev 22:7-10; cf also Dan 12:4, 9). Those outside the Lord’s churches have no privilege and no authority to be involved in preserving God’s Words (cf Rev 2:1ff).

What the Bible Teaches

The Bible teaches the following truths which *GWOH* mainly rejects, ignores or distorts:

1. God’s Words are preserved in Heaven (cf Ps 119:89; Dan 10:21, 11:2ff; Amos 1:1; Mic 1:1; John 17:8; Rev 1:1).
2. God’s Words were inspired perfectly in the autographs (2 Tim 3:16-18; 2 Pet 1:21).
3. The Lord promised to preserve these inspired Words for each subsequent generation (Ps 12:6-7; Matt 24:35).

A CRITIQUE OF GOD'S WORD IN OUR HANDS

4. He used the Jews to preserve the OT Scriptures (Rom 3:2) and the NT candlesticks to preserve the OT and NT Scriptures (Matt 28:19-20; Rev 22:7-10).
5. NT churches are to recognise, receive and preserve the Lord's Words (John 17:8, 20; 1 Thess 2:13) while rejecting wrested Words (2 Pet 3:16) and forged canons (2 Thess 2:2) offered by Satan (Gen 3:1ff; cf Deut 13:1-5). These same churches have recognised the KJV as the Words of God in the English language and have rejected at the same time modern versions, including the NASV, as embracing Gnostic laced readings in both text and translation.
6. The Lord has given His explicit Words of revelation to man in order that man may be able to demonstrate his stewardship with all of God's Words at his respective judgment (John 12:48; Rev 20:12).
7. The Lord Jesus Christ expects man to receive by faith His revelation and produce accurate translations based on the Received Bible movement which originated with Him (John 17:8, 20; Rom 16:25-26; cf Neh 8:8).

Final Thoughts

1. It is apparent that the Biblical doctrine of the preservation of the Words of the Lord Jesus Christ has not been enunciated or elucidated Biblically by many Christian theologians of the past whose writings are extant.
2. Twentieth century fundamentalism, for the most part, has failed to study the Scriptures for Christ-honouring bibliology. It is apparent that historic fundamentalism, in doctrine and/or practice, is not necessarily the same as Biblical NT Christianity.
3. In spite of this recent spate of books purporting to espouse "Bible preservation," great confusion has arisen, and therefore fundamental Baptist pastors and parents who uphold the KJV need to study the Scriptures for their defence of the TR and KJV.
4. These same pastors and parents are the target of Critical Text Bible schools who want to change their individual and collective position on Bible texts and translations. The next generation of "preacher boys" is at stake.
5. The Bible says Christians should have all of the Words of God available in their own hands. *GWOH* says the Bible does not say this

THE BIBLE IN A POSTMODERN WORLD

Raymond Saxe

The Situation We Face

It is said that we live in the postmodern era, but that term is inaccurate. The era in which we now live is the modern era while every era, which comes after us, can be considered postmodern. Notwithstanding, what is referred to in our day as postmodernism is the condition in which we now find ourselves.

There are many ways to get a hold of the ideas incorporated in postmodernism. Here are a few considerations:

- (1) Postmodernism is a desire to be free from a final absolute antinomy which ends in anarchy. Man is equal with God. Pragmatism reigns with no absolutes, man's independence becomes primary.
- (2) Postmodernism is a desire to be free from responsibility. This leads away from propositional truth. It is thinking outside the box of Scripture and leads to rebellion.
- (3) Postmodernism is a desire to be free from accountability in the future. Pluralism (the belief that everyone is right) and Relativism (the belief that everything is right) prevail in a society where postmodern thinking is the norm.

And that is exactly the society in which we now find ourselves. The postmodern world has blurred the traditional Judeo-Christian value system. Objective knowledge has been supplanted with subjective experience. Our youths, and adults as well, have been subjected to contemporary Christian music which embraces a worldly culture.

The Church has become secularised by a godless world to the point where she has opened her arms to embrace the world's agendas—all in the name of a false soteriology and a futile evangelistic message.

Further description of postmodernism is really beyond the intent of this address. Suffice to say, the condition of our preaching field is quite

clear. The sad disarray in organisations like the Evangelical Theological Society, with its struggles over Open Theism and the inerrancy of Scripture, assaults the minds of those of us who still hold firm the traditional fundamentals of the Faith.

The five cogent affirmations are still worthy to confess. They are:

- (1) The total, inerrant inspiration of Scripture by the Holy Spirit.
- (2) The virgin birth of Jesus Christ.
- (3) The absolute deity of Jesus Christ.
- (4) The salvation of the soul by the blood atonement of Jesus Christ.
- (5) The second coming of Jesus Christ.

Having knowledge of the present situation we face will serve as a backdrop for the call to ministry with which each of you graduates will be confronted.

The Scriptures We Possess

In 2 Timothy, the Apostle Paul is, in essence, writing his last will and testament. Here we find his final instructions to his dear son in the Faith, Timothy (2 Tim 1:2). The young Timothy was the pastor of the church at Ephesus (1 Tim 1:2-3). While Scripture is God's single revelation to every believer in every age and every culture, there are certain portions of particular concern for specific groups. Without serious contradiction or objection, this section of 2 Timothy is addressed to men who have been commissioned as preachers. These men are gifts to the church, presented by the resurrected Lord Himself (Eph 4:7, 12).

Now, these selected men are to know the material on which their commission is based. That is the function of the connective, "therefore," (2 Tim 4:1) in referring Timothy to the Scriptures by which he was saved through faith in Christ Jesus (2 Tim 3:15-17), and the fact that those Scriptures are both inspired and profitable. The Scriptures are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction. Moreover, the Scriptures are effective unto perfecting, furnishing, and living. By using "therefore," Paul points to all that Timothy is to digest before he receives instruction about his commission.

Make no mistake, the Bible is God's inspired, infallible, inerrant Word. What the world of believers, and unbelievers need the most is the

precious—more precious than silver or gold—Word of the Living God (Ps 119:72).

The Commission We Have

The “charge” is *searching*. This is the significance of the verb, “charge.” The prefixed preposition makes it intensive. As a present tense verb, the searching charge is given relentlessly and continuously. Timothy must never forget it. Moreover, the charge is given “before God and the Lord Jesus Christ.” The forceful preposition is in the face of God, or in full view of God. The real issue is, “What does God see in the matter regardless of what men may say or do (Gal 1:10)?”. Any ministry must be exercised “Before Him.” Consider that two members of the Trinity are mentioned here: the Father (God) and the Son (The Lord Jesus Christ—His full title).

The “charge” is *serious*. The Lord Jesus Christ “shall” judge the living and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom. “Shall” is a verb which means He is “about to.” There is no doubt about the judgement but the use of this verb makes the concept imminent. It is as if Paul is instructing Timothy that he cannot afford to waste time.

The “charge” is *solemn*. The judgement will involve both the living—a possible reference to the true believers—and the dead—a possible reference to unbelievers. If this is correct, the former refers to the *Bema* or Judgement Seat of Christ (2 Cor 5:10). The latter would refer to the Great White Throne Judgement at the end of the Millennial Kingdom (Rev 20:11-15). Although both judgements are mentioned in the same verse, they do not occur simultaneously. The first takes place at “His appearing,” and the second takes place in His Kingdom.

Let us review the contents of the Preacher’s Charge: it is *searching*, it is *serious*, it is *solemn*. This single verse, when outlined, shows us the great seriousness that is before us who have been charged to preach. Oh, may you take heed knowing that you will be preaching before the Face of God and you will be judged by Him. Ponder the words of 2 Corinthians 5:20, “We are ambassadors for Christ.” We are speaking in the Name of God Almighty.

We have considered *the situation we face, the Scriptures we possess, and the Commission we have*. Now let us look at the *ministry we practise*.

The Ministry We Practise

There are nine challenging imperatives given from Paul to Timothy, which are key to the responsibility that accompanies the ministry we practise. Today, earnestly and with much concern, I lay them before you. Listen to them. Contemplate them. Meditate upon them. Pack them into your soul. Bind them for a sign upon your hand. Place them as frontlets between your eyes. Write them upon the posts of your house and on your gate. More importantly, perform them as long as God gives you breath.

The nine are these: Preach the Word, Be Ready Always, Reprove, Rebuke, Exhort, Be Watchful, Endure Afflictions, Do the Work of an Evangelist, Fully Perform. Let's take them one by one.

Preach the Word

The aorist imperative use of the verb, "preach," visualises the preacher as an imperial spokesman for the emperor. The herald proclaimed the emperor's message with authority, sincerity, gravity, and dignity. The pattern for the preacher is the same. He is God's herald and like the emperor's herald, he must not withhold, revise or question the Lord's command.

He is to preach the Word. Whose Word? It is God's Word. Nothing will ever take the place of the Word. The man of God, the spokesman, the ambassador, if you will, is not to preach about the Word—he is to preach the Word. His preaching should be: "Thus saith the Lord." He is to be the uncommon crier, heralding his message to the world. Jehovah told his prophet to "Cry aloud. Do not hold back! Lift your voice like a trumpet and declare to My people their transgression."

The preacher's message must be complete. In Acts 20:27 Paul said, "I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole counsel of God." The message covers *all* portions of Scripture without ignoring or omitting any part.

The preacher must preach the Word as it is and not philosophise. Acknowledging that the Scriptures are inspired by God and are "forever settled in heaven" (Ps 119:89), we must never rely on psychology, current topics, cherished programmes, but *only* on God's living, unerring, and ever-abiding Word. It is the Word which God has exalted above His Very Name (Ps 138:2b). That is an unfathomable statement!

The power of God's Word is evident. It is the fire of Jeremiah 23:29. It is the hammer that can shatter a boulder. Through the pages of church history we can see that it was the Word that Luther preached. It was the Word about which Calvin wrote. It was the Word for which Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer went to the stake without fear. So be it, my beloved, preach the Word with urgency now and until He comes!

Be Instant

Again, the verb is in the aorist tense and it is an imperative. It is simple in its meaning, yet it encompasses so much. It means to be at hand, to stand by, to be ever-ready. The preacher is urged, no, commanded, to be on the spot with God's Word, whether the time is opportune (in season) or inopportune (out of season). God's Word is *always* profitable and knows no difference with the season. There is *never* an hour when God's Word is not needed. There is never a moment when God's Word is not appropriate. There is never an instance when God's Word is not convenient. A true servant of God does not have an unavailable hour. He must learn and expect to be inconvenienced. Scripture exhorts us to "buy out" every possible moment because "the days are evil" (Eph 5:16).

There was an appointed time of sacrifice for the Old Testament priests but that is not the case with the New Testament preacher (cf 1 Chron 23-27, Luke 1:8-9). He knows no time that could be considered unseasonable or private, early or late. He is to be a preacher of the Word and must do so with fervency and earnestness, even with his tears (Ps 126:6).

Reprove

Here is another aorist imperative, which means "to correct." Paul has already shown that the inspired Scripture is profitable to do this (2 Tim 3:16). In John 16:8, our Lord said it was one of the functions belonging to the Holy Spirit. As the Word of God is preached, it is the Spirit of God that convicts, convinces, and enlightens the world. Three specific areas are affected by the reproof of the Holy Spirit: sin, righteousness, and judgement. The word "reprove" has the idea of "telling one his faults" (Matt 18:15). Obviously, this is not the easiest task on this planet. It requires us to look also at ourselves (Gal 6:1). Reproof must not lead to the mere denunciation of people just for the sake of it. A bold preacher will trust the Holy Spirit to use His Word in enlightening the hearers of their violations, trespasses, and sins concerning God's revealed will.

Rebuke

This active imperative verb, which is also in the aorist tense, literally means “to give honour.” To blame, to prove guilty and to censure are all legitimate thoughts that are carried by the verb, “rebuke.” It is used in Matthew 8:26 when Christ rebuked the sea. It is used in Matthew 12:16 when Christ warned those He had just healed not to tell who He was.

Here is where the crunch comes. Preachers are to fulfil their God-given responsibility so that the unbeliever and the erring believer will be confronted with their condition before a Holy God. Opposition is to be expected, but men of God are not to fear the face of man, but to declare the Truth. In Galatians 1:10, Paul asks rhetorically, “Do I seek the favour of men, or of God?” Regretfully, the word of rebuke is received as the Lord predicted to Ezekiel, “But you shall speak My Words to them whether they listen or not” (Ezek 2:7, 3:11). But it must be done.

Exhort

Here is another aorist imperative which can mean “beseech,” “comfort” and “admonish.” The verb has a prefixed preposition suggesting, “beside, by the side of, and with.” The main root comes from the verb, “to call.” Here is a verb calling upon the preacher to comfort and encourage the weak, sluggish, and troubled. Surely, there is an unending ministry to be experienced expressing forgiveness for the sinner and strengthening those who yearn for a deeper spiritual life. Early in this country’s history, those committed to the Lord’s work were called “exhorters.”

Having been a missionary in Africa, it frequently happened that one preacher gave the Word and another came along to exhort or encourage based on the text preached. God gave us an example of this ministry in Barnabas whose name means “the son of prophecy.” His manner of prophesying showed itself in exhortation or consolation. May God give us men like Barnabas.

Now Where Have We Arrived?

We have seen that Paul’s charge to Timothy in 2 Timothy 4:1 is soundly grounded in a God-inspired and peerlessly profitable Scripture. It is that upon which the Apostle sets forth his Timothean ministry by the use of the connective, “therefore.” He tells Timothy to “preach the Word.” Obviously, this is the Word carefully and neatly indicated in 2 Timothy

3:16-17. Timothy is commanded to stand by it at all times. He is called to reprove error, rebuke or censure, suggesting a penalty may come and finally, he is to exhort, pointing to comfort and encouragement of the weak, sluggish and troubled. But notice that all these commands are to be exercised in the sphere of and with every possible demonstration of two very important methods.

Longsuffering

The first is *longsuffering*. Robert McCheyne, known to men of his day as, “The Saintly McCheyne,” is reported to have said, “This is the heart of God toward sinners.” 2 Peter 3:9 says that God is patient toward sinners, not wishing for any to perish. Likewise, the preacher who is faithful to preach the Word should possess the characteristics of a Barnabas who was “the son of comfort.” This is a facet of God’s immutable character. Vincent notes that men will not be won to the Truth by scolding. This is in accordance with 2 Timothy 2:24 which says, “The Lord’s bond-servant must not be quarrelsome, but be kind to all, able to teach, patient when wronged.”

Doctrine

In addition to longsuffering, the preacher is one who must perform his duties in keeping with the *Doctrine*. In many quarters, the thought of doctrine is decried. But doctrine is really the meat of the Word (Heb 5:14). Doctrine is the very foundation of spiritual life. Without doctrine, the believer will be tossed about, not knowing what to believe (Eph 4:12-16).

So, my brethren, let us persevere to instruct in the great doctrines of the Bible. Israel was told to do this in Deuteronomy 6. How much more should we of the New Testament times engage in this pursuit? You check it out. The individual or the local church having stability and spirituality with vigour is inextricably linked with effective instruction, doctrine if you will, in the Word of God. Paul practised this and instructed the elders at Ephesus to do the same (Acts 20:20, 28). In Ezra’s day, they read from the Book, from the Law of God, translating to give the sense so that they understood the reading (Neh 8:8). Careful reading of the Pastoral Epistles will reveal the importance of Doctrine (consider 1 Tim 1:3, 10; 3:2).

Before adding to this impressive list of expectations, there is a hiatus in the text. The foolish hearers are described. They *do not* the Truth. They are utterly insensitive to the blessed and precious Word of the Lord (2

Tim 4:3-4). They do not endure sound doctrine. They accumulate to themselves teachers in accordance with their own desires, longing to have their ears tickled. They turn their ears away from the truth and turn aside to myths.

At this juncture, there is a major, abrupt and adversative change. Look at it: “But thou” (an emphatic second personal pronoun). Timothy is dramatically snapped to attention and is to expect something more than what has unfolded in the two previous verses. Four impressionable actions were added to the given commands above. Latch onto them and build them into your system. This is the kind of preacher Paul intended Timothy to be. Each of the verbs is imperative. Only one verb is in the present tense. The other three are in the aorist tense.

Watch Thou in All Things

“Watch” is a present tense verb. The word is used of abstaining from wine and warrants watchfulness and alertness. By ever being sober and not stupefied, Timothy is commanded to maintain strict discipline and keep himself from the invasion of sin. This one verb contrasts established thoughts with those who aspire to novelty. The singular pronoun zeroes in on every single “thing,” or item. This is a huge matter. It demands that God’s Word be dwelling richly in the heart so as to be kept free from spiritual drunkenness.

Endure Afflictions

Next is the willingness to suffer hardships. Being in the aorist tense, the thought is carried like a military command. It says, “Suffer hardship!” Do not shrink from it. The compound verb connotes serving the Lord against opposition, ridicule, prejudice, and unfortunate indifference. Taking a stand against false doctrine or unbiblical witness may cause excruciating suffering but *you* are to be solid as granite. Never sell or barter the Truth to save yourselves from hurt. Be a dependable witness, whatever the sacrifice. And in the midst of your suffering, *fear not*. He holds you fast. Furthermore, you have not resisted unto blood (Heb 12:4). Nor have you found yourself sunk and dying in a muddy pit (Jer 38:6). The same verb is used earlier to encourage Timothy (2 Tim 2:3).

Do the Work of an Evangelist

An additional thought is “do the work of an evangelist.” The crispness of the aorist imperative exclaims, “do it!” Be one who carries

the Gospel. The anarthrous construction of the phrase suggests the *type* of work rather than the specific office. Believe Paul when he says that this is work. All that ergonomics entails is in this phrase. This is a specific purpose, which is to be done with urgency and with the warm objective of reaching lost and condemned souls. A burning house, a drowning friend, a perishing soul—all must be addressed with full-hearted effort. Paul had a burden like this (Rom 9:1-2, 10:1). Do we have the same burden? Oh, to keep our feet to the fire of evangelism.

Make Full Proof of Thy Ministry

Wrapping up the nine qualities of Paul's commission to Timothy is another aorist imperative: Perform the ministry fully, all the way to the end. It means to bring in full measure. To accomplish completely. Paul commands Timothy to never give up. The Holy Spirit must control the man who has this as his objective (Gal 5:16): "Walk in the Spirit and you will not fulfill the desires of the flesh."

There can be no idleness, laziness, procrastination, and in the end, no regrets. Our Lord had this testimony when He said in John 17:4, "I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." Similarly, Paul said, "I have fought the good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith" (2 Tim 4:7). Notice that all the verbs here are in the present tense, meaning they are done and continued forever.

Conclusion

Oh, may the charge of Timothy be experienced by every one of you dear brethren. Follow diligently what Paul wrote to Timothy. It was searching. It was serious. It was solemn. It was described by nine imperatives: preach the Word, and when you preach, be instant. Reprove, rebuke, exhort. And do not forget to do it with longsuffering and sound doctrine. Moreover, watch in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist and make full proof of your ministry. What a charge! Go for it, my brother. Go after it. Strive for the mastery. Strive for the Master. He is worthy of you all.

Dr Raymond Saxe is pastor of Fellowship Bible Church in Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA. The above was the sermon he preached at FEBC's 29th Graduation Service in convocation at Calvary Bible-Presbyterian Church, Pandan Gardens, May 9, 2004.

The First FEBC Bachelor of Ministry Convocation at BCEA (May 29, 2004)

Convocation Address by Dr Jeffrey Khoo: The Need for a 21st Century Reformation Movement

Rev Dr Mark Kim, principal of the Bible College of East Africa, lecturers, graduands, students, and friends, I bring you warm greetings from the directors and the faculty of the Far Eastern Bible College in Singapore, and we wish you God's precious blessings in the mighty name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Bible College of East Africa was founded in 1965 by the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, USA. The Independent Board was the missionary arm of the 20th Century Reformation Movement that was spearheaded by the late Rev Dr Carl McIntire and the International Council of Christian Churches. You have a precious heritage and a rich history indeed.

Likewise, the Far Eastern Bible College has the same heritage and history. It was founded in 1962 by a disciple of Dr Carl McIntire, namely, the Rev Dr Timothy Tow who has taught many of us here who are now lecturers at BCEA and at FEBC. Since we have such close ties, we in FEBC count it a joy and privilege to have a small part in your vital ministry here in this international city of Nairobi, and this great country of Kenya in training young men and women to become faithful servants of the almighty God.

How did BCEA and FEBC come into such a partnership in theological education? It is all by the grace of God that the Holy Spirit should work within the hearts of like-minded brethren who love the Lord Jesus Christ and who love His Perfect Word. We have the same Reformation and Reformed Spirit and Doctrine, and that is why we have come together to promote the Bible College movement. How I pray the Lord that through the graduates of BCEA more Bible Schools and Colleges would be established not just in East Africa, but in all Africa.

The 21st Century Reformation Movement has already been set in motion by the International Council of Christian Churches in the 16th World Congress held in the year 2000 in Jerusalem. In an outstanding Bible resolution which states that the Holy Bible is “forever infallible and inerrant,” the following statement was adopted:

Believing the Holy Scriptures on the originals to be fully inspired with its words and genders and being complete as God’s revelation to man without error;

Believing that God not only inspired the Bible without errors in fact, doctrine and judgment but preserved the Scriptures in all ages for all eternity as the Westminster Confession of Faith standard says— “the O.T. in Hebrew and the N.T. in Greek ... being immediately inspired by God and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages are therefore authentical They are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come;”

Believing the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, gave us a supernatural gift, and both inspired and preserved it. By inspired we mean that the Holy Spirit moved in the hearts of its human authors that they recorded the very words that God wanted written in the Bible using the personality and background of its writers but without error. “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.” II Pet 1:21;

Believing God safeguarded the Bible in times past and will continue to do so in the future and all eternity. He preserved one Scripture, the Bible. “Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away;” Matt 24:35;

Believing the O.T. has been preserved in the Masoretic text and the N.T. in the Textus Receptus, combined they gave us the complete Word of God. The King James Version in English has been faithfully translated from these God-preserved manuscripts. ...

We the International Council of Christian Churches meeting in Jerusalem, 8-14 November 2000 strongly urge the churches in their pulpits and people at large, to continue to use the time honoured and faithful longer translations and not the new shorter versions that follow in too many places the short eclectic texts. These are very similar to the shorter Westcott and Hort texts that remove or cast doubt on so many passages and words. Furthermore we are not against new versions as such but believe all true and faithful versions must be based on the traditional longer texts that the Holy Spirit preserved through the early century versions, the early church fathers and the faithful Textus Receptus.

Does the above resolution for a forever infallible and inerrant Scripture have biblical and historical support? The answer is most definitely yes. For biblical support, please turn with me to:

Psalm 12:6-7: The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Matthew 5:18: For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Matthew 24:35: Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away (Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33).

1 Peter 1:23-25: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

For historical support, let me quote from the Westminster Confession of Faith (I: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 authentical.

Let me now cite the doctrinal Constitution of the Far Eastern Bible College:

We believe in the divine, Verbal Plenary Inspiration (Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs) of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the perfect Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life (2 Tim 3:16, 2 Pet 1:20-21, Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35).

We believe the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament underlying the Authorised (King James) Version to be the very Word of God, infallible and inerrant.

We uphold the Authorised (King James) Version to be the Word of God—the best, most faithful, most accurate, most beautiful translation of the Bible in the English language, and do employ it alone as our primary scriptural text in the public reading, preaching, and teaching of the English Bible.

The First FEBC BMin Convocation at BCEA

The Board of Directors and Faculty shall affirm their allegiance to the Word of God by taking the Dean Burgon Oath at every annual convocation: I swear in the Name of the Triune God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit that I believe “the Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.”

To safeguard the college, to strengthen the faith of many, and to glorify the almighty God our Lord and Saviour, may I humbly beseech the principal and faculty of the Bible College of East Africa to take the Dean Burgon Oath at every annual convocation.

Now let me give a charge to the class of 2004. It is taken from Joshua 1:7-9:

Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe **to do according to all (not some, not most, but all) the law**, which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not from it to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest **observe to do according to all that is written therein** (and if the Lord requires us to do according to all that is written, surely He must have ensured that all His words remain forever written and available to us): for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success. Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the LORD thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

Remember this important principle: “God says it, that settles it, I believe it!” Indeed, we must never doubt, we must never question, we must never criticise the Word of God. We must never say the Bible contains mistakes, we must never say the Bible is imperfect, we must never say we do not have God’s perfect Word today.

Dear friends, do you remember the words of Jesus? The Lord Jesus said, “*Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God*” (Matt 4:4). If Jesus says we must live by His every word, surely we must have each and every one of His words today, yes, even to the jot and tittle. Jesus promised us a 100% Bible and surely we have a fully inspired and fully preserved Bible today

in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures underlying the good old Authorised Version.

The crisis we face today is a crisis of F-A-I-T-H. God says it, that settles it, and our duty is simply to believe it. The problem is never with the Bible; the problem is always with us—we simply *do not believe* what God so plainly says in His Word. Unless we truly, I mean truly believe that God is not lying to us when He said that He will preserve His words to the jot and tittle, we will not be able to say we have an infallible Bible today! “The Law of the LORD is *perfect*, converting the soul” (Ps 19:7).

This convocation to confer the Bachelor of Ministry degree to 8 from the pioneer batch of BMin students is a milestone in the history of the Far Eastern Bible College and the Bible College of East Africa. It is my prayer that this joint cooperation and fellowship that we have will grow from strength to strength as we earnestly contend for the Word of God and the Testimony of Jesus Christ towards a 21st Century Reformation Movement to the glory of God. As our Lord Jesus Christ—the Living Word—is 100% God and 100% Man in One Person, so also is the Written Word 100% inspired and 100% preserved in the Hebrew OT and Greek NT in one Book which we call the Holy Scriptures.

May God give us holy courage to hold fast to the pure Word of God and the true Testimony of Jesus Christ until He returns. Amen.

Testimonies of the BMin Graduates



Ibrahaim Kiarie

Pastor, Liberty Gospel Church, Kapcherop

Glory to God for His guidance throughout the BMin programme. Through the programme, I learned to be disciplined in my time management, to do my assignments and at the same time my church work. I was blessed by studying the doctrine of Bible preservation. I came to understand that if the Word of God was not divinely preserved 100%, then we have nothing to call the infallible Word of God. In practical terms, I learned that it is my responsibility as a Bible student to teach the truth always, to teach and reteach and never be tired to teach the same truth. I was made to do many assignments and in the process improved my writing skills. Thus, the BMin programme is a godsend for us

ministers of the gospel to help us to be better equipped to stand up “for the Word God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.”



Patrick Matheka

**Pastor, Ngomongo Bible-Presbyterian Church
Lecturer, Bible College of East Africa, Nairobi**

Through the intensive and systematic courses, I have been able to acquire a diversity of knowledge to benefit my spiritual life as well as the flock of God. I benefited much from the course on Charismatism. After the course I straightaway began to teach the truths that I had learned to my church members. Many were fully challenged and thanked God for such teachings. It is my prayer that God may help me to commit such truthful teachings to faithful men who will teach others also (2 Tim 2:2).



Daniel Muindi

Pastor, Bethel Sanctuary, Kibwezi

The BMin programme has been an eye-opener for me; it has enabled me to see things in the biblical way. Through the course on the KJV-NIV Debate, I could see that many heresies of modern-day Christianity come from the corrupted translations of the Bible. I have taken a bold step to teach my congregation to use the King James Bible.

Before I entered the BMin programme, I supported the charismatic way of preaching and worship because I thought it to be very dynamic and led of the Holy Spirit. When Dr Jeffrey Khoo taught on Charismatism, I had my eyes opened. I discovered that the Charismatics employed wrong hermeneutics which led to wrong interpretations from the Scriptures, thereby misleading their followers.

The BMin programme has caused me to be mature in the knowledge of the Word. Through this experience, I am geared to defend the faith, not giving the devil a chance, but proving through the Scriptures what I believe. This experience has reformed me to be a defender of the faith in the 21st century in line with the 16th century and the 20th century reformers. I therefore appreciate what God has done to me through FEBC.



Julius Mulili
Pastor, Africa Church, Nairobi

The lectures in class have been a blessing to my heart. The new lessons on the KJV Debate have opened my eyes to defend the Bible. The humility of Dr J Khoo challenged me a lot for it is a virtue I want to emulate.

Moreover, his memory verses exam challenged me to have a scholarly attitude. I also learned much about the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the OT through the study of Genesis and Exodus under Rev Quek Suan Yew. The seriousness and strictness of Rev Quek raised our concentration level in class and made us to pray a lot more that we might pass our exams. I also appreciate the pastoral heart of Rev Das Koshy.



Nelson Mwangi
Principal, Fundamental Bible College, Machakos

Since entering this BMin programme, I have improved so much in my personal devotions and study of God's Word. It has helped me so much in the teaching ministry as well as in evangelism. It has turned out to be a great help and edification to my family and the church of God as well. May the Almighty Father continue to give my teachers more strength to continue to help others.



Richard Nduva
Pastor, Africa Church, Katituni
Lecturer, Fundamental Bible College, Machakos

One of the important things I have learned in this programme is how the work of missions should be properly done. It has also given me the recipes of holy living that pleases God. I have learned the maxims of Dr Carl McIntire which are very encouraging. I have also learned that making a vow is a serious thing. Rev Dr Timothy Tow is a son of his mother's vow. His mother's vow was fulfilled in his life.

My prayers are for this BMin programme to continue so that many other ministers might be helped to live righteously in these perilous and deadly days.



Peter Ngao

Pastor, Glory Bible Church, Kangundo

The independent study assignments that I had to do while in ministry required much discipline. It humbled me to seek the Lord's help because in the ministry, resources are lacking. When I worked on my research paper, I discovered that I could learn a lot of things, that even without a lecturer, I can still study the Scriptures independently. The independent work encouraged me to do all things keenly because the papers were all checked for accuracy, theologically and grammatically, even the spellings. I give God all the glory.



Robert Nzomo

Pastor, Africa Church, Kathaana

Lecturer, Fundamental Bible College, Machakos

Praise be to the Lord God Almighty who used the Far Eastern Bible College lecturers and Rev Dr Timothy Tow to offer the Bachelor of Ministry programme at the Bible College of East Africa. I have grown much in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. All my lecturers were very devoted, spiritual, and even the books which we used were very spiritual. Concerning the Bible, I have come to know that there are many translations like the NIV, RSV, and TEV that are not good for they are based on the Westcott and Hort text.

I have received great blessings. I would like to thank my teachers who have come from so far—Singapore—to teach me.



The Burning Bush 11/1 (January 2005)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Processional led by Rev Dr Mark Kim (BCEA Principal); Graduation Service; Rev Stephen Masila, Academic Dean (centre); Miss Collins, Mrs Kang & Mrs Khoo; next 3 photos — conferment of degrees & presentation of gifts; prayer for graduates.

The First FEBC BMin Convocation at BCEA



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Pastor Daniel Muindi & family; Rev Koshy (2nd from right); Rev Masila, Miss Collins & Bishop Kivai; Francis & Violet; Thanksgiving lunch; Tanzanian students; Christine Kendagor, Nelson Were & Francis Onyango; Ephrem & Gete with baby Daniel.

The Burning Bush 11/1 (January 2005)



The building of BCEA, Arusha, Tanzania with Mt Kilimanjaro at the background; bottom left: Rev Mshana, Pastor Zachariah, Pastor Elibariki & Dr Khoo; bottom right: Pastor Elibariki & family.

FEBC 29th Graduation Service (May 9, 2004)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Rev Koshi & Dr Khoo; Pr Tan Kian Sing; Processional; FEBC Choir; Dr Raymond Saxe (2nd from left); Board Members; Dr S H Tow; Dr Timothy Tow.

The Burning Bush 11/1 (January 2005)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Graduands; Dr George Foong; Elds Han, Boon & Wee; Faculty; View from top; Dr Saxe; Conferment of degrees; Anenla Joyce Jamir (CertRK).

FEBC 29th Graduation Service (May 9, 2004)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Lillian Chan (CertRK); Chin Hoi Yin (CertRK); Adrienne Choa (CertRK); Jenny Foo (CertRK); Alice Kee (CertRK); Khin Cear Ouy (CertRK); Patrick Law (CertRK); Pang Su Yuan (CertRK).

The Burning Bush 11/1 (January 2005)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: James Tan (CertRK); Chhun Sonida (CertBS); Nguyen Doan Hau (MRE); Salai Tha Luai (MRE); Charlene Tan (MRE); Michael Koech (MDiv); Recessional.

FEBC 29th Graduation Service (May 9, 2004)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Loreni Tsopoe (MRE) with Rev & Mrs Tow; Bai Eun Young (MRE) & Kang Hyeon Joo (BRE); Rev Quek Suan Yew & Eld Boaz Boon; Paul Cheng (BRE); Korean graduates & students; Srun Chivan (BTh); Edsel Locot (DipTh) & Paul Cheng (BRE); Rasmalem (ThM).

The Burning Bush 11/1 (January 2005)



From top, L-R, zig-zag: Filipino graduates & students; Peter Elibariki (BTh); Gethsemaneans; Doan Hau (MRE) & Thanh Phan (MDiv); Nelson Were (BTh); Michael Koech (MDiv); Indonesians; Song Suk Kyoung (BRE), Eun Young & Seo Young.

College News

The College in cooperation with the Bible College of East Africa, Nairobi, Kenya, graduated its first batch of 8 **Bachelor of Ministry** students on May 29, 2004.

FEBC reopened with a **day of prayer and registration** on July 19, 2004. The principal—Rev Dr Timothy Tow—spoke from Hebrews 11:6 on the need to have faith in an all-powerful God and His perfect Word. There were 15 new students from 8 countries—**China**: Sun Dawei; **India**: Justin Paul; **Indonesia**: Kiantoro Lie, Linda Yohana Kurnia, Tjung Joan Manlin, Merlin; **Korea**: Oh Sung Hwa; **Myanmar**: J Lal Lian Uk, Maung Cin Lam Mung; **Singapore**: Lek Aik Wee, Kelvin Lim, Ruth Low Mei Ern; **Thailand**: Weerapong Harichaikul; **Vietnam**: Hyunh Khanh Nha Uyen, Tran Thi Minh Dieu. There is a total of 114 students from 15 countries taking the regular day-time classes. Countries represented are Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Korea, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, and Vietnam.

The **Basic Theology for Everyone** night courses continue to be a boon for church members who wish to study God’s Word in a Bible College setting. Not a few are working towards their Certificate of Religious Knowledge (CertRK). On Mondays, the Principal—Rev Dr Timothy Tow—conducts a course on “Pattern for Church Growth and Missions: A Study of the Book of Acts,” with 120 students, and on Thursdays, the Dean of Students—Rev Das Koshy—continues with the second part of his course on Proverbs with 198 students.

The **FEBC Lord’s Day Worship Service** has become **True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church** (ROS 0146/2004 REL, wef July 2, 2004, re: Singapore Government Gazette, Notification #1834, Friday, July 23, 2004). The church continues to worship at the auditorium of the Regional Language Centre (RELC), 30 Orange Grove Road, Singapore 258352. The pastor is Rev Dr Timothy Tow.

The Principal led his **11th Pilgrimage to the Holy Land**—Egypt, Jordan, Israel—from August 26-September 11, 2004. There was a total of 47 pilgrims from FEBC and True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church. FEBC students earn two credits when they submit a research project.



Dr Arthur E Steele is the latest distinguished member of the Board of External Examiners in FEBC’s Doctor of Theology (ThD) programme. Dr Steele is Founder and Chancellor of Clearwater Christian College, Florida, USA. In a letter to the academic dean dated July 21, 2004, he wrote, “I am glad that Dr Timothy Tow is well enough to be active in the Lord’s work. He is such an encouragement to many as myself who believe God means everything that He has said, every word. Too many of the next generation have in fact joined the new evangelical and ecumenical-leaning ‘thinkers’ who long ago said, ‘The Bible contains the word of God’ but is not ‘God’s very Words.’ The ‘new fundamentalists’ will surely go in the direction in which they are leaning. Dr Tow and I have lived long enough to see the leaning become a movement. I praise the Lord for the vision and the direction of those in the next generation who believe that God means what He says and are determined to obey Him as did the prophets in the OT.” We are so privileged and honoured to have such a devout and faithful man of God to be one of our external examiners.

Class Notes

Rev Dr **Bob Phee** (BTh 77) has started a new church called Herald Bible-Presbyterian Church, 8 Lorong 27A Geylang, #02-01, Guilin Building, Singapore 388106. It was registered on February 28, 2004.

Rev Dr **Jeffrey Khoo** (BTh 89) has been appointed a member of the Advisory Council of the Dean Burgon Society, USA. Website: www.deanburgonsociety.org.

Han Jae Seog (BTh 98) has completed his Master of Theology course at Biblical Theological Seminary, USA. Jae Seog can be reached at 400 Carpenter Lane, Hatfield PA 19440, USA.

Rev **Ahn Jung Kee** (MRE 00) has been sent as a missionary to the Korean Peace Church of Auckland. His address: 2/10 Casabella Court, Howick, Auckland, New Zealand 1705 (Tel: 649-537-6300, Email: johnann@hanmail.net).



Jang Sae Kwang (BTh 00) graduated with a Master of Divinity degree from Pensacola Theological Seminary, Florida, on May 5, 2004. He is now working towards his Master of Theology (Bible Exposition) at The Master's Seminary. His address: The Master's Seminary, Box #279, 13248 Roscoe Blvd, Sun Valley, CA 91352, USA.

David Weng (BTh 00) was conferred the degree of Master of Arts (Bible Exposition) by Pensacola Theological Seminary on July 22, 2004. David is currently working towards his Master of Education degree. His wife, **Susan Suryati** (BTh 01), was conferred the Master of Science (Elementary Education) by Pensacola Christian College on the same graduation day. Their address: 1615A Creighton Road, Pensacola, FL 32503, USA.

Ellyzabeth (MRE 00) graduated with a Master of Church Music from Singapore Bible College on May 16, 2004. She is currently teaching at the Calvary Batam Bible College (Principal: Rev **Kiantoro Lie**, BTh 92, MRE 98).

Leonard Musyoka (BTh 00) heads the Gospel Light Institute (GLI) which provides low-cost theological training, and serves as a resource centre to supply books, video tapes, CDs and Sunday school materials to churches. Address: Gospel Light Institute, P O Box 3, Mwingi, Kenya.

Joshua Cheng (BRE 01) visited his alma mater from July 10-14, 2004. Joshua is currently a final year MDiv student at Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Lansdale, Pennsylvania. His email: joshuachengqh@hotmail.com.



Francis Onyango Nyamiwa (BTh 01) and **Violet Mukavali Malongo** (BRE 03) have been blessed with a baby girl named Hannah who came in June 2004. Francis and Violet continue to lecture at the Bible College of East Africa, Nairobi, Kenya.

Sun Sokha (DipTh 02) and his wife **Lee Nam Soon** (DipTh 04) are serving at the Battambang B-P Church in Cambodia. In their letter of June 26, 2004, they reported that the area is infiltrated by the cults and their wrong teachings, and they are doing their best to teach God's truth to the Cambodian pastors and members there. Their address: House #358 Kompong Kroibey Village, Suay Pou Commune, Battambang Province, Cambodia.

Johnyanto (MDiv 03) and **Phoa Ang Liang** (BTh 97) have started a new ministry called Philadelphia Fellowship in Batam, Indonesia. They have a neighbourhood outreach to 40-50 children to win them to Christ.

Reggor Galarpe (DipTh 03) got married recently, and then started the Gethsemane B-P Mission Church in Cebu, Philippines. Rev **Das Koshy** (BTh 92, MDiv 94, ThM 02), the pastor of Gethsemane B-P Church (Singapore) preached at the inauguration service on July 18, 2004.

Nguyen Gia Hien (MDiv 03, ThM 04) has been blessed with a baby boy named Timothy, born on August 16, 2004. Gia Hien and his family are serving the Lord in Brisbane, Australia.

Christine Kendagor (BTh 03, MRE 04) has joined the teaching faculty of the Bible College of East Africa, Nairobi, Kenya.

Lillian Chan Li Lan (CertRK 04) is employed as a staff worker of Calvary Pandan Bible-Presbyterian Church.

FAR EASTERN BIBLE COLLEGE
29th Graduation Exercises
May 9, 2004



**FEBC & True Life BPC 11th Pilgrimage to the Holy Land
August 26 — September 11, 2004**

