

IS THE BIBLE FROM GENESIS TO REVELATIONS

INERRANT?

This is a question often asked by sincere Christians who do not want to fall into the trap of questioning God's Word and especially Him as sovereign, almighty God. Paul's statement, namely that the Scriptures are Holy Spirit breathed is then eagerly quoted, however, not giving it a thought, and even coming from popular theologians, that Paul had the Greek Septuagint, read in the assemblies (the prized "Old Testament"), in mind as our New Testament was still in the making.

Although some of the New Testament Gospels and books must already then have been written at the time (e.g. the *Gospel according to Matthew* – in its original form - the *Gospel according to Mark*, also some of the Pauline Letters like his *First Epistle to the Thessalonians*, the one text referring to the inerrancy of the Scriptures - he could then not have had our New Testament in mind. So, if we can accept this, we will be able to begin making progress in the right direction.

There seemingly was, at the time, some believers who had questioned the authority of the "Scriptures" (the Septuagint version of the OT and which state of affairs of course had spurred some of the learned, also from the Ebionite camp, on to produce new translations of the Old Testament). It of course seems that the traditional Jews, even some of those who had already accepted Christ as Messiah, have vehemently objected to the lack of their type of "accuracy", i.e. of the first Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint). It was especially the prophecies pertaining to the coming of Messiah that were questioned, e.g. the virgin birth (Isa 7.14).

We should know by now that the two main (early) versions of the Old Testament (the Hebrew Bible and the Leningrad version) differ on Zech. 13.6, the one (HB) referring to the "marks between (in) the hands" and the other, remarkably, having a quite different wording (see ARTICLES/TRACTATES on this web site for a discussion thereof).

It then seems that there was nothing wrong with the original text and Paul's integrity can therefore not be questioned, but what was done to the text (in translation) has in the process, indeed changed the text (or then more specifically, at least some portions thereof, even done in a slight way). This of course pertains to the Old Testament for the New Testament also has its own textual problems and therefore many learned are always working closely together to produce the best translations, adding of course footnote commentaries to throw light on the core meaning of the text (Old and New Testaments).

We may just think of St Jerome's Vulgate applying the feminine gender to the woman's offspring (Gen. 3.15) in stead of getting to the true interpretation of the text, i.e. pointing to Jesus, the Son of God, as unique Messiah and Deliverer - very obviously done by some earlier scribe to accommodate the Virgin Mary's doctrinal role in salvation and therefore, as was the case in St Jerome's day and age, something that was already fully in sway and clearly underscoring a general mother worship trend (Jerome used the Latin New Testament version for his Vulgate translation of the New Testament, and with this specific issue in mind, proving of course just how strongly in sway was this type of worship in especially Northern Africa (Tunisia/Alexandria and of course also branching out to the broader geographic area).

Had it therefore not been for recurrent translations and New Testament traditions, we could still to this day have sat with umpteenth "subtle scribal errors". Some of course have been sticking up until now and therefore Jesus' words (Math. 18.16 – by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall stand) still applies to this day.

However, what we must be able to accept, is that especially when doctrinal issues are at stake (that which directly has a bearing on the pillars of our faith as I would call it here, or perhaps better expressed as the *foundational truths* on which Christianity is based) then we must at least have the integrity and honesty to APPLY what Jesus has taught us. Wouldn't He, more than any other teacher, have known what was going to happen to the written Word? And especially on the water baptism which, to this day, is regarded as giving us access (entrance/initiation) to the Body of Christ, not so?

Therefore, we cannot approach this "inerrancy" of the "Scriptures" naively. And it is indeed even "learned" theologians who are to this day very quick to reprimand every focused searcher for Truth - those who are searching the text in order to bring glory to Jesus, the Redeemer of the world - namely that we should not bicker about dogmatic trivialities, yet who themselves are so rigidly standing on their own "solid" (inerrant) traditions, such unquestionable (!) traditions often going back to the earliest schism that had taken place in Apostolic times and which schism was directly the cause why and how the Master who had redeemed us, was denied (1 Pet. 2.).

The Amplified Bible translation of James 2.7 reads: "Is it not they who slander and blaspheme that precious name by which you are distinguished and called (the name of Christ invoked in baptism)?" And does *Acts 2.38* (Audio Book, *Two Baptismal Commands, the Road to Confusion* published on this web site) not stand as a testimony against this type of cardinal denial of Christ Jesus? (Also see 1 Cor. 6.11 for justification and spiritual purification by the Name of Jesus). No other name then.

Therefore Eph. 4.5 ("One Lord, one faith, one baptism") stands as ultimate witness against Math. 28.19 – and which text, honestly spoken, again stands on its own, in other words against multiple New Testament witnesses acting in the Name of Jesus (the Son who came to save sinners with His shed blood – 1 Tim. 1.15; Acts 4.12).

The big question then truly remains: Why make such a fuss of the “inerrancy of the New Testament text” yet denying the Name of the Master who had redeemed us, i.e. in baptism? Because, and this should be admitted by any Christian who is boasting in the Cross and Salvation, also Biblical “truth”, i.e. that the majority of Christians are soothing themselves with the “inerrancy” of the New Testament text, yet they are, in a very strange way, so very willing to deny the Name of their Master in baptism! Following this way of course in a tradition that was clearly part and parcel of that schismatic group which had joined the apostles but only later again withdrawing their membership, shunning their divinely inspired New Testament teachings this way (John's Pastoral Letters, No. 2 and 3, ties in well with this very issue).

If only we, *bloodwashed* believers, want to strive *earnestly* for the faith that was once delivered to the saints as we are reading it in Jude v3, then we will perhaps be able to discern properly the subtle deception of satan always pulling us away from Truth introduced by Jesus Christ Himself – John 15 deals with the Holy Spirit as the *Spirit of Truth* and this Spirit of Truth had time and time again testified in the Bible, Old and New Testaments, that Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God incarnate.

This is of course the Old-time Gospel Truth you and I must then respect for then we will see a revival of the heart, i.e. like an old-time reality, as never before unfolding before us! (This is the last prophetic message God has in store for His truly bloodwashed flock for the Name of His Son is at stake today – most Christians are already prepared to only refer to “God”, even on Christian programmes - but this Name (Jesus/Yeshua) was given ABOVE all other names (Eph. 1.20-21)! This is then the Name we must honour and respect! Our Saviour has a name!

And in order to accomplish what God desires of us, His bloodwashed, we will have to turn around, facing Peter, God's appointed first leader of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 2.38). For this very cause, and in order to fully commit ourselves to Jesus, Son of God, Saviour of the world, we will have to be prepared to let go of our tenaciously maintained, traditional approach to Scripture, accepting with a willing heart the words of our Master, namely that by the mouth of two or three witnesses EVERY word shall stand (Math. 18.16)!

Questions you may ask:

Is it possible that Jesus could have given a different baptism to the Apostle Matthew?

Wouldn't Jesus, had He indeed done so, Himself have caused a rift within His Church by giving Matthew a baptismal tradition totally different from the one He had given Peter on Pentecost Day AND indeed after having first and foremost baptized Him with the Spirit of Truth, namely the Holy Spirit?

Why would Jesus/Yeshua have chosen Peter introducing the baptism in the Messiah's Name, yet rejecting Him at the same time? Wouldn't this have questioned Jesus' integrity?

Wouldn't we have learned, through the very important Apostle Paul's ministry, of Matthew's baptism had there indeed, at the time (the first century C.E.), been such a baptism in place among the Apostles of Jesus?

Does one have to be rebaptized, that is if one is unwilling to do so?

(Go to Audio, *Two Baptismal Commands, the Road to Confusion?* For answers to these and more questions).

WHY IS THE BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF JESUS SO BOLDLY BROUGHT ON THIS WEB SITE?

The Baptism in the Name of Jesus (Yeshua) is brought to the Body of Christ with the sole purpose of promoting Apostolic truth and so that the broader Body of Jesus can, at this point in time, also accommodate those who are called from this type of CHRISTIAN background.

Jesus wants to work healing and love within His Body, especially in South Africa where the baptism in the Name of Jesus has been rejected as "heretical" far too long and because His Name does not get the honour and glory it should elicit from His followers, we are striving to unify the Body bringing the fruits of the Spirit as being of utmost importance, especially Christian patience and love, and so that Jesus can put in action the local revival He so much desires to kindle in our fair land .

The time has arrived for placing JESUS ABOVE all we desire to do for God! For God, the Father, wants us to honour His Son and giving Him all the glory He so much deserves (Col. 3.17).

*Ester Blomerus
13 March 2017*