

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B0950 – December 13, 2009 – Doctrine Of Preservation**

We want to finish this last event so that we can get into the appendices which will cover special issues regarding the kingdom that are preparatory for the Gospels and the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ came at a particular stage in history and we can't emphasize enough that you have to read the Bible in the sequence in which it was written. God has lesson plans and they're in sequence and there's a reason why two-thirds of the Bible was given before the coming of Christ. It's all there so we can develop the categories we need to interpret Christ. When He comes He comes as the next logical piece.

So let's finish the OT - the partial restoration when part of Israel came back into the land. Why this? There are four truths that summarize why this? First, *the partial restoration is a down payment of the ultimate greater, future and total restoration of Israel.* It's a demonstration historically that God can bring the Jews back into the land when He chooses and under the right conditions. The Gentile powers may be against it; surely the super powers of the day, Babylon and Medo-Persia, could have stopped the Jews return to the land if they wanted to. Yet despite their power God worked in, over and through their power to send the Jew back to the land. So the first thing is it's a down payment of the total restoration to come.

Secondly, *the partial restoration gives hope for the survival of Israel.* Remember we went through the blessing and the cursing and as they marched toward the Exile it was cursing, cursing, cursing and more cursing. Yet, in spite of all the cursings and the horrible suffering that God brought upon His people, the hope is that eventually one generation of Israel will repent and be brought into the kingdom and the partial restoration therefore brings hope.

Third, *the partial restoration provided for the Messiah to be born in the land among the Jewish nation*. If the Jews had never returned then the Messiah would have been born out in Babylon somewhere. What nation would He have come to? So the partial restoration provides the birthplace of the Messiah and a nation for Him to offer Himself to as their King.

And fourth, *the partial restoration is to the land of Israel*. This shows you that God is not done working with the land. Every once in a while you hear there is nothing about the land in the NT. Excuse me but where does the NT begin? The land of Israel. So God's still working toward the same land He was working toward with Abraham in Gen 12.

We want to go to the doctrine that comes out of this event. In all the other events you can visualize the historical event and realize that there was real doctrine that came out of them. In the case of the restoration we're just going to look at two areas: two categories of teaching. One has to do with the canon and preservation of the canon. We want to look at that a little more. Then we want to look at prayer, thinking of Daniel's prayer in Dan 9 and the prayers of Jews during the period of time when they came back to the land under Ezra and Nehemiah. Let's start with the canon and questions of preservation.

Alright, let's set up the issue. Here's the problem I want to deal with. We claim we have an inerrantly inspired Scripture in the original autographs, or original writings. The problem which must be faced, however, is this: what good is it to say that if it has not been accurately preserved throughout history is what we have today really the word of God? What good is an inerrant autograph if there are no texts today which precisely reflect it? Now watch this, watch the next sentence. "Quasi-biblical cults that rely on post-biblical texts like Islam and Mormonism try to contrast the supposedly 'unbroken' line between their original texts and today's texts."

Let me explain what I'm talking about here. Here's the argument: (I'm not name calling, I'm just using a theological designation), the Muslims, the Mormons, and typical extra-Biblical cults say, you Christians, you're NT ended in the 1<sup>st</sup> century. At that point you say God stopped talking. That is what we're saying. There's no problem so far in how they're arguing. The Scriptures were done in the 1<sup>st</sup> century. Now we are to study what He said and remember what He did. So far He's given us 2000 years to think about

what He said and did. The Muslims and the Mormons, etc... come along and they want another word from God. Give me a break. We have plenty of difficulties with what He's already said. You want more?

So what happened? Along came somebody down here, Muhammad, Joseph Smith, etc... and they get this thing that somehow the Bible needs an update, we need a fresh word from God. So they come out with some text, and their text was written in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and because it's more recent they're closer to their original guy than you and I are to our guy and so now their book takes center stage and our book is out. It's a classic maneuver. Of course the problem is that their book doesn't do what? How do we know that their book isn't canonical Scripture? What truth test do we use? Deut 13, Deut 18, and their teachings here don't harmonize with the teachings of Scripture, so no; there's not a continuity between our book and their book. But you can see the argument used to attract you and win your loyalty is that their book is more recent than ours and they have a clear line of texts back to their original.

We want to deal with this critique that funnels people away from Christianity and into these extra-biblical cults. We want to show how the biblical text was preserved. We're going to divide the problem in half. For today's sake all I'm talking about is the OT. We're just developing the principle out of the OT. We'll get to the NT. The OT text stopped in 450BC. Who was active in producing the OT text? The Jewish men called prophets. They stopped, the Jews in the Maccabean period knew they stopped, therefore the text stopped coming.

There are two possible problems. We'll call them problem A and problem B. Problem A is how did the prophets preserve the text? Problem B is after the prophets passed from the scene how was the text preserved? We don't know exactly all the details under the providence of God, but what can we say about the preservation of the OT text from the way it's handled in the NT?

So let's face problem A: how did the prophets preserve the text? They were custodians of the Scripture. Turn to the book of Judges. Watch what these guys did. We can be thankful to God for these men; these guys were faithful, they treasured the word of God, it was the authority to them, they loved it, they protected it, often at the expense of their lives.

In Judg 18:30, here's what we call a little comment, this is a case in point where obviously after the text had been written and circulated, it was updated. "The sons of Dan set up for themselves the graven image; and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the day of the captivity of the land." Until the day of the captivity of the land? We just got done studying that. That's the end of the OT. When was Judges written? About 600 years earlier. This was written in the Conquest and Settlement period. So how in verse 30 do we find that these graven images remained until the captivity? It's clear that some prophet came along 600 years later and updated an area in the text and made it current. Did they have the authority to do it? You bet they did. Can we do that? Absolutely not! The Scriptures say you will not add to My word; you will not take away My word. There's a curse placed on anybody that dare do this. That's the difference of the prophets. These people walking around claiming to be prophets today, I'd like them to see what could happen to them. These guys had clear cut authority to go in and update the text. But today it would be arrogant for anyone to go back and try to update the text.

There's a couple more of these places, actually there's many of them but I just want to show you 2 or 3 of them so you can see what I'm talking about when I talk about the prophets being the custodians of the Scripture and updating it. In 1 Sam 9:9 there's an explanation that was injected into the text later, after the text was originally written. It's there as an explanation because the readers later on, centuries later, wouldn't have understood what it was saying, so a footnote was put in there. Verse 9, "(Formerly in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, he used to say, 'Come, and let us go to the seer'; for *he who is called* a prophet now was formerly called a seer.)" So years later someone came in and said, hey, we've got to update the language here; people aren't going to understand the word seer, so they put that in the text to explain it. Who did that? Prophets did that, they had the authority to go in and update old vocabulary. That was their job.

2 Sam 18:18 and that will be enough to get the idea across. Someday in heaven we'll get a chance to talk to these guys, we'll go up and ask, hey, who put that note in there, who did that, find out who the guy was. "Now Absalom in his lifetime had taken and set up for himself a pillar which is in the King's Valley, for he said, 'I have no son to preserve my name.'" So he named the

pillar after his own name, and it is called Absalom's Monument to this day." "to this day." What's "this day?" The day whenever this note was put in the text. It could be centuries later. Why do you suppose that particular note is in there? When I went to Israel, one of the things that impressed me was every place that is historically important to those people has a monument. So these kinds of remarks were put in by the prophets. They do the same thing in the NT. For example, David's tomb is with us "to this day." That's the first century, if you lived then you could walk down and check it out, yep, that's David's tomb. It wasn't a mystery, these places were marked.

Turn to Jer 36 for another issue related to problem A. You want to be familiar with this chapter because it's a good chapter to show how close the word of God came to being destroyed in history and what God did to preserve it. Jer 36:1 "In the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, this word came to Jeremiah from the LORD, saying, <sup>2</sup>"Take a scroll," this is God talking, this word came to Jeremiah from the Lord. This actually shows us how Scripture was generated; the word of the Lord "came to Jeremiah," "Take a scroll and write on it all the words which I have spoken to you concerning Israel and concerning Judah, and concerning all the nations, from the day I *first* spoke to you, from the days of Josiah, even to this day. <sup>3</sup>"Perhaps the house of Judah will hear all the calamity which I plan to bring on them, in order that every man will turn from his evil way; then I will forgive their iniquity and their sin." <sup>4</sup>Then Jeremiah called Baruch the son of Neriah," watch this, this is a little technique a lot of prophets used to get it written down, "Jeremiah called Baruch the son of Neriah and Baruch wrote on a scroll at the dictation of Jeremiah all the words of the LORD which He had spoken to him." This is what you call an amanuensis, somebody who took dictation; we think Mark did this for Peter in the NT such that the Gospel of Mark is really the gospel of Peter; those are Peter's thoughts written down by Mark. Verse 5, "Jeremiah commanded Baruch, saying, "I am restricted; I cannot go into the house of the LORD. <sup>6</sup>"So you go and read from the scroll which you have written at my dictation the words of the LORD to the people in the LORD'S house on a fast day. And also you shall read them to all *the people of Judah* who come from their cities." So he did.

In verse 17 and 18, the people that hear him reading the scroll asked him a question, <sup>17</sup>And they asked Baruch, saying, "Tell us, please, how did you write all these words? *Was it* at his dictation?" <sup>18</sup>Then Baruch said to them,

“He dictated all these words to me, and I wrote them with ink on the book.”  
<sup>19</sup>Then the officials said to Baruch, “Go, hide yourself, you and Jeremiah, and do not let anyone know where you are.” Now watch what happens to the scroll. They go into the king with the scroll, verse 21, “Then the king sent Jehudi to get the scroll, and he took it out of the chamber of Elishama the scribe. And Jehudi read it to the king as well as to all the officials who stood beside the king. <sup>22</sup>Now the king was sitting in the winter house in the ninth month, with *a fire* burning in the brazier before him. <sup>23</sup>When Jehudi had read three or four columns, *the king* cut it with a scribe’s knife and threw *it* into the fire that was in the brazier, until all the scroll was consumed in the fire that was in the brazier. <sup>24</sup>Yet the king and all his servants who heard all these words were not afraid, nor did they rend their garments. <sup>25</sup>Even though Elnathan and Delaiah and Gemariah pleaded with the king not to burn the scroll, he would not listen to them.”

There’s a picture of hatred of God. This is the king, this is a guy in David’s line, remember how David treated the word of God? He studied it almost every day. Now they’ve decayed to the point they take a knife, cut it up and burn it. So there’s the destruction of the only copy of the book of Jeremiah at that point. Now we’ve got a problem. They’ve destroyed the word of God.

Then what happens? Verse 27, “Then the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah after the king had burned the scroll and the words which Baruch had written at the dictation of Jeremiah, saying, <sup>28</sup>“Take again another scroll and write on it all the former words that were on the first scroll which Jehoiakim the king of Judah burned.” And it goes on to describe the process all over again. God is determined that His word will get recorded in history and it will not be destroyed by anyone, including high political administrators. They try but they don’t ultimately succeed.

The point we want to make here is the function of the prophets. When the only copy of the word of God was destroyed, who rewrote it? The prophets did. See how prominent a role the prophets played in Israel? Israel’s a chain of prophets. You remember this because when you think about Chinese religion or Indian religion, or some of the other religions, where’s their line of prophets from century to century to century, hundreds of years, thousands of years, etc. Where’s the line of prophets? Israel has a unique characteristic of history. There’s that constant prophetic voice, century after century of

prophetic lives overlapping, all saying the same thing from the same Lord of revelation.

Alright, when we come to 450BC, Malachi writes and he's the last of the prophets and we know that because the Jews called him "the seal of the prophets." It was closed after that, nobody else got in. A bit later the Maccabees record for us that they don't have any prophets. So it's well known there were no living prophets in this time and that presents a new problem. Problem B.

Problem B is after the prophets go away so how does the text get preserved? We don't know all the details of how the text gets preserved, but we know that the text has continuity to it, and I'm going to show you with a test case. Here's our argument. We can go to the NT and look back in time and ask ourselves: how did Jesus and the apostles treat the text here? We've got from 450BC down to the first century, we'll say 400 years, a 400 year gap here. And during those 400 years the text was transmitted along several lines, so that in Jesus' day you have the Greek LXX out of Alexandria, Egypt, you have a Hebrew text out of Babylon, you have a Hebrew text out of Jerusalem and you have the Qumran scrolls; all these texts are floating around. There are variations in the texts. We looked at Isa 53 last week and did a little test. So there are variations but you saw they weren't big things, they were spelling differences, very small things. Jesus and the apostles quote from all of these texts in the NT.

You say well, gee, how can you be sure that the text was preserved for those 400 years? There were no prophets around, they weren't watching over the text. Let's look at some verses where the NT authors are quoting OT texts. Turn to Matt 22:32. Here's Jesus, and He's building an argument. We want to see if the variants were so great that they rendered the copies null and void. He says "I AM THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC, AND THE GOD OF JACOB"? He is not the God of the dead but of the living." That particular verse, if you have a marginal reference, is a quotation from an OT text. What is Jesus quoting that text for? Verse 31, the argument that He's getting into is an argument over the resurrection, "But regarding the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken to you by God?" and He cites the text of Exodus, "He is not the God of the dead but the

God of the living.” That is a hard argument. If you diagram the logic of this argument there are four or five steps in there.

Let me try to summarize it for you. The argument is that there’s a present tense in that citation, “I am the God,” not I *was* the God, “I *am* the God.” What is Jesus arguing? He’s arguing on the basis of a present tense that God is always God and if God is always the God of believers then the believers must be resurrected, otherwise He’s not always God of believers. In the Bible it’s not enough for salvation to be of the spirit only, that’s the Greek mentality. In the Hebrew mentality it’s the body and the spirit together, the material and the immaterial that must be saved. So Jesus says if you’re going to have the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, and these guys are going to be worshiping Him forever and ever, and Yahweh is going to be their God, they have to have resurrection bodies. They’ve lost their other bodies. So his argument is that resurrection could be drawn out of Exodus simply from the present tense of this verse, “I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

Now let’s look at this text argument. Matt 22 was spoken when? ~AD30, something like that. When was Exod written? It was written by Moses so ~1400BC. So now we have 30 plus at least 1400, so we’re talking about almost 1500 years. And He says, you know the text they read in the synagogue every Sabbath. It’s so accurate after 15 centuries that I can argue on the basis of a present tense for the resurrection. Jesus, not having a PhD like modern skeptics didn’t understand that the text might have gotten contaminated along the way, He forgot about that. He’s only the Son of God, He wrote the text.

Let’s look at another reference, Luke 16:29, this gets into a more sobering application of this truth, what it means to us today. In Luke 16 it’s the story that tells of Lazarus. Background: verse 22, “Now the poor man died and was carried away by the angels to Abraham’s bosom;” that’s where OT saints went before the Lord’s resurrection, “and the rich man died and was buried. <sup>23</sup>“In Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and saw Abraham far away and Lazarus in his bosom. <sup>24</sup>“And he cried out and said, ‘Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus so that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool off my tongue, for I am in agony in this flame.’ Notice this person didn’t go extinct. This person didn’t go unconscious. This is

a very sobering passage here; this is a foreview of what the next life looks like if you are in hell. A sobering picture that you're conscious, and worst of all you're conscious of what you could have done. Verse 25, "But Abraham said, 'Child, remember that during your life you received your good things, and likewise Lazarus bad things; but now he is being comforted here, and you are in agony. <sup>26</sup>And besides all this, between us and you there is a great chasm fixed, so that those who wish to come over from here to you will not be able, and *that* none may cross over from there to us.'

A side note here, remember the diagram we always draw on good and evil? We point out in the Christian view of evil, what do we notice on the right side of that diagram? That there's a separation; that's the Christian solution to evil. We really are thoughtless and sloppy when we fuss about it. We're fussing because there's evil in history and we want to get rid of it. God says I'm going to, I've got to separate it. Now we're fussing at Him because He separated it. So what's He supposed to do? This is what's happened. There's a time of good and evil between the fall and the judgment, there's a time when repentance works, that's a time when grace functions. The problem is that when you pray "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and you want to resolve and get rid of evil, suffering and sorrow, here's what we're praying for, right there. The horrible thing is that once that event occurs, there is a great gulf fixed and there's no more room for repentance; the day of grace is finished. Grace does not go on forever in that sense; the products of grace go on, but not the opportunity to respond to His grace, that's finished.

Here's the situation, this guy is caught. Verse 26 says there's a great chasm and you can't cross it. The time for repentance is over; the time to trust God's solution is past. It's too late. <sup>27</sup>"And he said, 'Then I beg you, father, that you send him to my father's house— <sup>28</sup>for I have five brothers—in order that he may warn them, so that they will not also come to this place of torment.'  
<sup>29</sup>"But Abraham said, 'They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them.' Isn't this striking, "they have Moses and the Prophets," when was Moses and the Prophets? Quite a few centuries before this. So what does he mean when he says "they have Moses and the Prophets"? They have the OT text. What do they read in the synagogue every Sabbath? They read Moses and the Prophets. You don't see anyone saying, well, that was centuries ago and so many errors have crept in that now there's just no way we have the

word of God, we're not sure that's really Moses. No. We're talking about heaven and hell here, and we're talking about responsibility, and it's being measured against copies of the original text, not against the original, this is the contemporary text that's being cited as the standard of judgment. No matter what's going on here between 450BC and AD30 (there may be lots of versions floating around) Jesus claims that everybody in those 1<sup>st</sup> century synagogues that heard those versions heard Moses and the Prophets.

Acts 15:21, this is a Church council, a very critical Church council, the first in history, trying to solve a theological issue and it shows you how it should be done. They make their judgment, verses 19-20. Then in verse 21 this statement occurs. "For Moses from ancient generations has in every city those who preach him, since he is read in the synagogues every Sabbath." Since he is what? "He is read in the synagogues every Sabbath." The question you want to ask yourself is if this contamination of text is a really serious problem, then can't you get off the hook here? Couldn't you argue that well, we can't be sure of Moses, maybe the text is incorrect? Do you think that excuse is going to work? I don't think so, this is the apostles talking and the last verse we went to was Jesus talking, and they're both saying that the texts that existed in the 1<sup>st</sup> century, this one in Acts 15 is from the Greek LXX. That's a translation of the OT and still they are held accountable to a translation. A translation was good enough to resolve the first theological issue of the church which just happened to be about the way of Gentile salvation. So there's clearly some latitude in what constitutes the Scriptures.

Finally we come to a really neat argument. If the other verses didn't convince you, this one ought to, about the preservation of the text after the prophets died away. Remember we're in problem B, the first half of the lesson was problem A, and we showed how the prophets were the custodians of the OT text and as long as they were around they could update the text. Now we're in problem B - we've got a 400 year gap and we're asking the question, do Jesus and the apostles accept the copies as the word of God? They said the copies that are read in every synagogue are the word of God. In Heb 7:14, a point is made by this author. It's the story of Melchizedek, Melchizedek was the guy in Genesis 14. He shows up and there's no comment in the text about who he was the son of, usually it's the son of so and so, the son of so and so, the son of so and so, etc. This guy just appears in the text, without any kind of genealogy.

The author of Hebrews picks this theme up and he says in verse 14, “For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, a tribe with reference to which Moses spoke nothing concerning priests.”<sup>15</sup> And this is clearer still, if another priest arises according to the likeness of Melchizedek,” and it goes on and points out that Melchizedek had no genealogy. But in this case, as he builds this whole issue of Jesus being like Melchizedek, the priesthood being like Melchizedek in the sense that Melchizedek had no genealogy, Jesus was not of the right tribe to be in the Levitical priesthood. What tribe was Jesus from? Judah. But he makes the point in verse 14 for our purposes, “it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah,” now look at this clause, “a tribe with reference to which Moses spoke nothing concerning priests.”

What’s the logic behind verse 14? Let’s think about it, let’s catch the argument. It says Moses said nothing about the tribe of Judah being in any way connected with priests. How do you know he didn’t? You’re sitting in a Jewish synagogue in the first century, Moses wrote that 1500 years before you took your seat in synagogue, they read Moses, they read the Prophets. How do you know Moses didn’t say something about the tribe of Judah having a priesthood? What’s the assumption of this verse? That not a single word has dropped out of the OT text of Moses, because you couldn’t say that if a word of Moses’ writings accidentally dropped out. See, the assumption of the NT authors is that the OT has been preserved. Nothing dropped out. The NT arguments don’t make sense unless the OT is preserved faithfully and is the living word of God.

So the resolution of category B type arguments are that God somehow preserved the OT canonical text during four centuries of prophetic silence such that the existing manuscripts in NT times could, for all intents and purposes, be considered as the word of God. This fact being so, modern believers can be confident that today’s NT manuscripts are the word of God in spite of obvious textual variations here and there.” Textual variations mean nothing as far as the authority of the word of God today.

But it goes further than that. If that all is true, and what we’ve said is true, it implies something about the nature of language and translations. So I want to conclude with an application about the Bible and language. *“Human language can have textual and semantic range without nullifying its meaning.*

In fact, translations of the OT from Hebrew to Greek and the subsequent identification of the Greek text as the word of God by Jesus and the Apostles implies that *translation in principle does not nullify meaning either.*” Assuming it’s actually a translation and not some loose thing; that they’re really trying to translate the actual text.

Getting the intended meaning through translation is possible. It’s possible to get truth through a translation. Why do we say that? Because God fractured languages at Babel centuries ago knowing that He would need to disseminate His word to all men everywhere. So He must have fractured them in such a way that when the word of God was to go out to people of other languages those languages would have the capacity of carrying sufficient meaning. If the gospel is for all men, and remember the gospel is right now being preached in many languages, then such languages after Babel must have sufficient ‘translationability.’ It must be able to be translated without losing its original meaning or else we could only come to know Jesus Christ through the language of Koine Greek. Did you come to know Christ through Koine Greek? No, you came through English. Was that sufficient? Of course.

Now here’s the conclusion as we move over and introduce Islam. Islam has the idea that the Koran cannot be translated, they translate the Koran, but the idea is that if you are a believer in Islam you must learn Arabic in order to read the word of Allah in his language. And the reason they hold to that is they feel that the word of God is lost in translation. So there’s a collision here between the theory of language of Islam and the theory of language of Biblical Christianity. “Thus the objection of Islam that the word of Allah cannot be translated from the Arabic original and still technically remain the word of Allah is built upon a theory of language foreign to the Bible.” We haven’t got time to go into the details but I want you to notice what I’ve touched on. You want to try to replicate this thinking. If you’ve got a problem with language, studying language, translation, think about it in terms of Biblical history. What do we know about language?

Let’s conclude with this. Maybe you’re grappling teaching reading to students; maybe you’re teaching how to interpret text. We live in a very anti-language culture. I feel sorry for you if you’re trying to teach language to people but you have an immensely important job. Modern people say language is very inadequate. Modern music, art and poetry are telling us

this. So we're fighting just to be able to get kids to put a noun with a verb. So when you think about language, think about what the Scriptures have to say about language.

Here's how you start thinking about it correctly. You think back to the framework, do any of these events teach you anything about language. We go back. God called Abraham out and now what happened with the Call of Abraham as far as gospel truth. It was confined to what language? Hebrew. So does that mean if God confines His revelation to Israel to the Hebrew language it can't go into Spanish, it can't go into German, it can't go into Arabic, it can't go into places like Africa or Europe? No, that doesn't sound right because what did God say Abraham would do? In him all the families of the earth would be blessed. So that tells you that there's something screwy about the idea that meaning and truth can't be communicated in other languages. What else happened before the Call of Abraham? The Tower of Babel happened. That's where God fractured human language. So that's how you train yourself to think about these topics, you think through these framework events.

We've been through 14 OT events, you want to train yourself to pick these up and use them as little tools to answer all kinds of questions. Then you can go back and say what if I go back to the Creation, way back to the beginning, what do I know about language? Who spoke the first words? God did. What happened when He spoke? The universe came into existence. God didn't use pre-existing atoms to build the universe. He didn't use any tools. Think about that. The only tool that God used, if you can call it a tool, was His own word. He spoke and it was done. Then who did He talk to? He talked to Adam after Adam was created. He sat Adam down and He described to Adam, I did this, I did this, I did this, I called the light day, I called the expanse sky, I called the water sea, He was giving Adam's his first dictionary. Then he said to Adam, after I give you the dictionary, now what are you doing Adam? You add to the dictionary. How do you add to the dictionary? By going into my creation and thinking My thoughts after Me. I send you on an adventure Adam, I ask you to go dig into the depths of My creation. I've already thought it out, I've given you the blueprint, now you go find the blueprint, it's already named, I've categorized it, but I'm going to give you an exercise, you go and you take those animals and you look at them, you see how I designed them and you give them a name.

See the power of the language is built on God as the Creator. That's the Biblical view of language. Motivated that way, we want to learn to read. If children can see that language is the tool that we use to learn about our God and Creator with, there's the motivation to read. But if God isn't there, then who cares, as long as I can get a paycheck each week, who cares about this learning language. And a lot of kids say why bother with it all, why do I have to learn all that, I've got five four lettered words that seem to cover most of my situations. You see, the point is, they're right. There is no motive to learn apart from the Biblical view. It's only in the word of God that you get all these questions answered.

That's what we want to finish with, and hopefully in the preservation and translation of the text you'll see that the word of God is there. There may be variations, but the meaning is there and it's sufficient for our needs. Next week we'll deal with the doctrine of prayer, also related to language. Can our prayers really communicate with God?

So we'll finish with that and if there are any questions I'll be glad to comment. I left some things unsaid about translations so that may be an area of interest to you. Does anyone have anything?

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2009