

University Heights Church
of Christ
445 Columbia Ave.,
Lexington, KY 40508
(859) 255-6257
www.uheightschurch.com

WORSHIP SERVICES

Sunday

Bible Study: 9:45 AM

Worship: 10:45 AM; 6:00 PM

Wednesday

Bible Study: 7:30 PM (This is
immediately followed by a
short worship period)

First Friday of Each Month

Singing: 7:30 PM

LEADERSHIP

Elders

David Collins

John Thompson

Troy Antle

Evangelist

Adam Litmer

Deacons

Richard Brundige

Matt Thompson

Adam Litmer

Bill Morelan

Jim Parsons

Pat Seabolt

Adam Daniels

Jamie Powell

NOTE

The idea for the series of articles on “You Can’t Use The Bible To Prove The Bible” comes from Doy Moyer in his book, “Mind Your Faith. Essays In Apologetics.” I *highly* recommend our brother’s book to every Christian, young or old.

IN NEED OF PRAYERS

The Daniels’ family, Julie Patton, Karen Spivey, Rick Small, Jeff Howerton, Rhonda Boyd (and her sister, Dorothy), Louis Harrod, Paul Atkisson, Brianna Ratliff, Julia-Ann Dixon, Ed Allison, Dwight Antle, The Bays and Robbins family, Keia Burton, Robert Brundige, Valerie and Barry Boyd, Janett’s mother, Sandy Driver, Erlene Young, Larry Sells, Evelyn Damron, Jean Gartland, John Blessing, William Roberts, Paul Lyda, Pete Soro, Jamie Powell’s father, Harleigh Spartman, Mattie Johnson, Elijah Epling, Leland Wells, Linda Moore, Sheila Johnson, Virginia Gordon

University Heights Messenger

Volume 10--Number 5

February 4, 2018

“You Can’t Use The Bible To Prove The Bible” 2

Adam Litmer

In the first article we began considering the above assertion. Unfortunately, many brethren have surrendered the point and thus hinder their ability to win souls to Christ. Romans 3:23 and Hebrews 11:6 say: *So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ...And without faith it is impossible to please Him, for whoever would draw near to God must believe that He exists and that He rewards those who seek Him. Without faith one cannot please God and saving faith comes through the words of Christ. To leave God’s Word in an effort to prove that it is the Word of God is not just unreasonable, it is spiritually harmful.*

I believe the assertion is based upon faulty premises and unjust biases. We began to discuss them in the first article and I encourage you to read it if you have not done so as I do not intend to traverse ground we’ve already covered. While that first article dealt with the nature of the Bible, here we want to consider the Bible as a historical book.

Another faulty premise and bias leveled against the Bible for why it cannot be used in its own defense is that it claims to be inspired. The argument goes something like this: “You are using the Bible’s claims of inspiration to prove that the Bible is

inspired.” If that were true then the process would be flawed simply because of the nature of such a claim. However, no thinking person I know accepts the Bible’s claim to inspiration blindly. 2 Timothy 3:16 clearly claims inspiration, but why and how did any thinking Christian come to accept that? There is far more to it than the argument above suggests.

It all starts with the historic claims of Scripture. In this way God’s Word is subjected to the same tests any ancient writing is subjected to. If the historic claims of a book bear up then it is considered trustworthy. If the historic claims of the Bible hold up then it must be considered trustworthy as well. Someone may object that most other books do not claim inspiration and I grant them that. However, determining the accuracy of historical claims is not a matter of inspiration. That conversation can come later. This is simply about determining historical accuracy.

Consider the opening to Luke’s gospel. *Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things that have been accomplished among us, just as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word have delivered them to us, it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may have certainty concerning the things you have been taught.*

Notice Luke makes no claim to inspiration here (which does *not* mean the marks of inspiration are not present or that Luke’s gospel should not be accepted as inspired), but explains that he is writing an historically accurate description of the things that had occurred. He spoke to eyewitnesses with firsthand knowledge and also implies familiarity with what others had written. His stated goal

is compiling a careful, accurate account. Doesn’t fairness demand that we approach Luke’s gospel from the perspective of his own stated intent?

Also, can it honestly be claimed that this bears the marks of the introduction to a fairytale? Luke says he intends to write about things that *have been accomplished among us* and that he would make use of *those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses*. Further, he claims to have *followed all things closely for some time past* and his goal is that Theophilus *may have certainty concerning the things you have been taught*. Luke’s aim is careful investigation and communication with eyewitnesses. To claim that Luke cannot be used to verify historical claims is to imply that the history he presents is flawed. But it’s not. Luke has provided (both in his gospel and Acts) a wealth of verified information on people, places, and geography. Indeed, the historic accuracy of Luke is unparalleled.

So why is Luke called into question? The obvious answer is supernatural bias. Luke does not just record information on people, places, and things; he records miracles performed by Jesus. Thus, many critics default to a position demanding the whole thing be tossed out. Is that fair? There is a difference between simple historical claims and the reason why things happened as they did. Most of Luke’s historic claims on things besides supernatural events have been verified by other sources (archeology, secular writings, etc.), and *none* have been proven untrue. To let bias cause stubborn dismissal of *verifiable facts from eyewitnesses* is simple dishonesty and does not bode well for serious historical investigation.

