

principles then that we are looking at. It is not simply the words but it is the principles; ^{Now} of course principles are contained in words. We believe in verbal inspiration, but by verbal inspiration we don't mean that you take three words out of context, and that gives you the answer to any particular problem. We mean that these words are words ^{which were} that ~~are~~ chosen by the Holy Spirit to convey exactly the truth He wants conveyed and not to contain ideas that would be false. But to ^{fit} put these words together to see their relationship, ^{to see} /their meaning for us at a particular time ^{can} may take prayerful study and thought. Of course we are in much better position to do this than people were 2000 years ago because we have the light of the NT. As Augustine said, The New is in the Old contained, the Old is by the New explained. That does not mean that everything in the Old is explained by the New by any means; nor that everything in the New is contained in the Old by any means, but it does mean we have a tremendous help in interpretation of the OT ^{with} in the light we get from the New but there may be many matters of great importance ^{for us in the OT} that are not presented or dealt with in the NT. It is the principles not the ^{mere} words.

I picked up an article by a good friend of mine in a magazine a few years ago in which he ~~said~~ spoke about the verbal inspiration of the OT, and among evidences of it, he said, One evidence of it is that the NT builds a whole argument upon the fact that a certain word in the OT ~~in the~~ is in the singular, not in the plural. Thus he said in Gal. 3.16, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He said not ^{and} to seeds as of many, but as of one to thy seed which is Christ." And so he said, here be ~~by~~ builds a whole argument on the fact that one Heb. word is singular rather than plural. Well I wrote him a letter and I said that I thoroughly believed in verbal inspiration, that every word ^{of script} that was given is true, but I don't think that is a valid argument at all because this word "seed" can refer to one seed or it can refer to many seeds as we say ~~that~~ today he sowed seed over the whole field. The one word ^{can} ~~can~~ be ~~singular~~ singular or it can be collective. ^{don't} I think it is an argument at all. And if you look back at Gen. - the place to which it is referring, there is a note at this point in my Bible which refers to Gen. 22:18, and you look at 22:18, and