

There are 1000 very weak arguments, any one of which can easily be answered. I think of a book published by John Knox press: Introduction to the OT. It is the work of a German scholar, Mr. Khul, translated into English. He says = Look at Gen. 1 and 2. You have the order of creation different. In Gen. 1 you have vegetation created and later on you have man created. In Gen. 2 you have man created and later on you have vegetation; a different order." Well, Well where do you find vegetation created in ch. 2? You read in v.8, "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden. There he put the man whom he had formed." If every time one of us plants a garden, he's creating vegetation, well we've had an awful lot of creations of vegetations! But he simply refers to this and says that it puts the creation of vegetation in a different order from Gen. 1. It is amazing that a great scholar would give such a silly argument.

You know one thing I have found? I found it is never safe to take anything simply on authority. Because the greatest scholars -- not just the critical scholars -- but the greatest scholars in any field who have done very very excellent work in one particular part of that field, which they have studied and worked in very very carefully, when they write a book will take over all sorts of things uncritically from other writers. They take over these things from others writers, and people think of their authority as being back of it and sometimes they even do it with things they would know were different if they would only stop and think. It's amazing how we come across these things in the works of famous scholars of the critical school, and also of great scholars who are true Christians. It simply shows we should not take things on authority but go with the facts.

I was amazed of one instance of this I came across a few years ago. A friend of mine wrote a rather popular article in a religious magazine, and in this article on the verbal inspiration of Scripture, he said that verbal inspiration is proven by the fact that in the book of Galatians Paul builds a whole argument on the fact that a certain word in the Hebrew had been singular rather than plural. He said, רֶמֶס "to thy seed will I give this land". Paul said "seed" as of one, not "seeds" as of many, and this one is Christ. So I wrote the man and said, I think you ought to leave out that particular argument because the word seed is collective, it can mean one or a great deal. Paul is not building an argument on the fact it says "and to thy seed will I give this land" because two verses later he says, Thy seed shall be as the sand of the sea shore for multitude. That's the same singular word clearly; it represents a great number there. The word is not used in the plural in Heb. It is used in the singular and may be an individual or collective. There are one or two other instances like that I pointed out, and he wrote back a very nice letter and thanked me for the correction, but he said in extenuation of my error, may I be permitted to point out that == and he named 5 or 6 outstanding Christian writers including some very great scholars who have given exactly the same argument. Men who know the Hebrew perfectly, and who if they had stopped to think would never have made that mistake.