

denying inerrancy is that they say the NT does not believe in inerrancy because they say the NT does not quote the OT exactly. Others say going to the other extreme: The NT is will build a whole argument on one word. Both of those statements are false. The NT never builds a whole argument on one word of the OT. That's not the way God wants us to deal with the Bible. The NT does not quote ~~xxx~~ exactly. How could a book written in Greek quote a Hebrew book exactly?

When I read a verse of Scripture, somebody could say, You're not giving exactly what the original says. You can't give exactly what the original says unless you read it in the original. I give a translation and try to make a good one. Ordinarily I don't make my own translation when I'm speaking or writing, I use the commonly used translation with which ~~xxx~~ you are familiar. That translation may not always get the sense of the word. But if it gets a good representation of the original on a particular point I want to make, then it is a sufficiently accurate translation for my purposes. So the NT quotes the OT, and if the common of the LXX gives the particular idea that it is desired to bring out, it quotes the LXX. Maybe half the quotes of the NT quote the LXX. But wherever the idea of the original is not especially (specifically) well brought out, the idea in the original that the writer wants to bring out, he makes his own translation. and that's done in practically half the quotations in the NT. Instead of giving the LXX, the writer gives his own translation. from the original Heb. or Aramaic.

So we don't want to go to the NT quotations from the OT and say this necessarily represents every detail of what that OT verse meant. In the points the NT is bringing out, it represents it correctly. There is another point it is important to have in mind also -- some people say the NT builds a whole argument on the fact it says in the NT that God is the God of Abraham, and that word is in italics, with emphasis on it. Of course in KJV italics means it is not in the original. The OT simply says God(is) the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It does not put in the is. You could supply, he was, he is, or he will be. The argument is not based on the is, it is based on the thought of the whole passage. In NT quotations of the OT sometimes it is very puzzling, because the NT writers says, As you read in -- and then he quotes 6 words. Then he goes on and gives an argument on how those ~~6~~ six words prove that. Well, they are not supposed to prove it. He is reminding them of an OT passage, and you read that OT passage in its whole context and you find ~~xxx~~ that what was taught there is what the NT writer is referring to. He's not building an argument on precise words, but he is building an argument on the thought of that OT passage. So the fact that the passage is translated differently in the OT than in the NT does not in any way affect our doctrine of inerrancy.

We believe inspiration may involve apparent contradictions but no real contradictions. Some people say there are no contradictions in the Bible. I don't quite like that. I say there is no error. But to say there is no contradiction, look at Ps. 55:22/