**Notes**


4. “By [“inerrant”] we mean that the Scriptures possess the quality of freedom from error. They are exempt from the liability to mistake, incapable of error. In all their teachings they are in perfect accord with the truth” (Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 113).
Young explains:

By the term infallible as applied to the Bible, we mean simply that the Scripture possesses an indefectible authority. As the Lord himself said “it cannot be broken” (John 10:35). It can never fail in its judgments and statements. All that it teaches is of unimpeachable, absolute authority, and cannot be contravened, contradicted, or gainsaid. Scripture is unfailing, incapable of proving false, erroneous, or mistaken. (113)

“The clarity of Scripture is that quality of Scripture which, arising from the fact that it is ultimately God’s effective communicative act, ensures the meaning of each biblical text, when viewed in the context of the canonical whole, is accessible to all who come to it in faith and dependent upon the Holy Spirit” (Mark D. Thompson, “The Generous Gift of a Gracious Father: Toward a Theological Account of the Clarity of Scripture,” in Carson, Enduring Authority, 618).

See part one, pp. 25–27.


Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, 299–348.


We could press the matter even further here and insist that, in a robust biblical worldview, there is no such thing as “raw data.” The most basic bits of data are not, in the words of Cornelius Van Til, “brute facts.” K. Scott Oliphint explains: “Thus, for Van Til, there are no brute facts, not because every fact carries our interpretation with it, but because every fact is a created fact. As created, every fact carries with it God’s interpretation. God speaks the facts themselves into existence, and he speaks through all that he has created” (Cornelius Van Til, The Defense of the Faith, ed. K. Scott Oliphint, 4th ed. [Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008], 18 n. 78) (emphasis added).

Some human philosophies may also originate from demonic deception.

“How are men to be brought into contact with that wisdom? It is through the apostolic teaching. Once again Scripture, when it considers the matter, directs us to special revelation” (Weeks, The Sufficiency of Scripture, 20).


Oliphint, “Because It Is the Word,” 7. In this context, Oliphint is referring to the Westminster Confession, but the principle he expresses can apply to any interaction between Scripture and human statements about or intersecting with Scripture.


In using the expression “from the foundation of the world,” Jesus is affirming that humans were created and lived when the world itself was created. The same expression is found in Matthew 13:35, 25:34; John 17:24; Ephesians 1:4; Hebrews 4:3; 9:26; 1 Peter 1:20; and Revelation 13:8 and 17:8. Paul indicates that the knowledge of God has been perceived through the created order by human beings “ever since the creation of the world.” The

22 Wayne A. Grudem (*Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994], 106) notes:

In a day when it is common for people to tell us how hard it is to interpret Scripture rightly, we would do well to remember that not once in the Gospels do we ever hear Jesus saying anything like this: “I see how your problem arose—the Scriptures are not very clear on that subject.” Instead, whether he is speaking to scholars or untrained common people, his responses always assume that the blame for misunderstanding any teaching of Scripture is not to be placed on the Scriptures themselves, but on those who misunderstand or fail to accept what is written. Again and again he answers questions with statements like, “Have you not read …” (Matt. 12:3, 5; 19:14; 22:31), “Have you never read in the Scriptures …” (Matt. 21:42), or even, “You are wrong because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God” (Matt. 22:29; cf. Matt. 9:13; 12:7; 15:3; 21:13; John 3:10; et al.).

23 The apostle Peter similarly asserts that the Word of God is surer than his own personal witness to the transfigured Jesus (2 Pt 1:16–21).

24 These allusions to Adam’s fall are more explicitly drawn out by the apostle Paul in Romans 5:12–21 and in 1 Corinthians 15:21–22 and 15:45–49.

25 God’s divine activity in inculcating understanding of His truth in persons is also reflected in Job 33:16; Psalms 40:6; 119:18; Acts 16:14; 1 John 5:20; and Isaiah 50:5.

26 Jesus promises to send the Holy Spirit to empower selected disciples to write the New Testament covenant documents: “But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you” (Jn 14:26). This same idea is also indicated in John 16:12–15:

I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth, for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you.


28 See Dr. Scott Stripling discuss this phenomenon in Associates for Biblical Research, “Ritual Purity in the Days of Jesus,” *Digging for Truth*, episode 91, June 14, 2020, video, 26:01, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cQ4H66oiT9g.

29 Note: I am NOT calling Christian ANE scholars “pharisees.” What I am saying is that my brethren are, in principle, making the same egregious error.


We should also see in the miraculous events of Pentecost a sign of the future and permanent reversal of the universal confusion of languages at Babel (Gn 11:1–9; Acts 2:1–11).


Paul H. Seely, “The Date of the Tower of Babel and Some Theological Implications,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 63/1 (Spring 2001): 15–38. Seely wrote several similar articles on Genesis 1–11. For a devastating critique of Seely’s methodology, his errors, and his distortions of the views of John Calvin, B. B. Warfield, and Charles Hodge, see Scott, “Inspiration and Interpretation” (pts. 1 and 2). Scott eventually concludes, “Indeed, we have seen Seely misrepresent his sources so often that one should hesitate to accept anything that he says about them without independent verification” (“Inspiration and Interpretation” [pt. 2], 253 n. 4). Weeks also critiques Seely in “Cosmology in Historical Context.”

“Inspiration and Interpretation” (pt. 2), 250 n. 8.

For more on hermeneutical deism, see Bowald, “Rendering Mute the Word,” 367–81.


45 Another especially well-known example is N. T. Wright, who no doubt believes that “the scholar is the final arbiter of historical truth,” not Scripture. For more, see John M. Frame, “N. T. Wright and the Authority of Scripture,” in Garner, Affirming the Truthfulness, 125: 107–27; D. A. Carson, “Three More Books on the Bible: A Critical Review,” review of Holy Scripture: A Dogmatic Sketch, by John Webster, Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament, by Peter Enns, and The Last Word: Beyond the Bible Wars to a New Understanding of the Authority of Scripture, by N. T. Wright, in Collected Writings on Scripture, comp. Andrew David Naselli (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 283–301. Wright’s methodology is ultimately undergirded by the illegitimate divorce between the authority of God and the authority of Scripture. Once this bifurcation is permitted, the mind of man does its inevitable work of biblical deconstruction.

46 Outside of the possible exception of Philo of Alexandria with his pervasive allegorical exegesis, I am aware of no other writer from this early period who departed from the chronological interpretation of Gen 5/11 and the subsequent patriarchal narratives of Genesis.

47 These sources are documented in articles for the Genesis 5 and 11 Research Project. Extensive documentation will be found in my forthcoming book, From Adam to Abraham.


50 Sexton, “Evangelicalism’s Search.”


50 Shaw explains this system:

The sexagesimal system is a system of mathematics based on the number 60, as the modern “decimal” system is based on the number 10. Thus, in the sexagesimal system numbers are counted in units of sixty rather than units of ten. For example, in the decimal system the number “111” represents 1 unit of 10² (one hundred) plus 1 unit of 10¹ (ten) plus 1 unit of 10⁰ (one), for a total of one hundred eleven. In the sexagesimal system, the number “111” represents 1 unit of 60² (thirty-six hundred) plus one unit of 60¹ (sixty) plus 1 unit of 60⁰ (one), for a total of three thousand six hundred sixty one [sic]. The sexagesimal system was widely used in Sumeria and later in Babylon (“Genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11,” 139–40 n. 14).


61 A helpful summary and survey of these assertions is found in Michael A. Grisanti, “Recent Developments in Patriarchal Chronology: Key Issues and Overview of the Big Picture” (paper, 71st Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, San Diego, CA, November 2019).


65 “Hermeneutical Problem,” 19.
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